

NBH – SER

6/4/10: Conference Call w/Ken Kimmel et al re additional specific guidance on aquatic resource characterization and impact evaluation

@ South Terminal Site:

- Need aquatic resource impact areas described and quantified by federal CWA types (F&V rpt, pg 5)
 - o filled areas for terminal
 - o dredged areas for berths to connect to navigational channels
- Levels of PCBs/other contaminants in sediments of areas to be filled for terminal
- Description/Characterization of aquatic resources (not the isolated fw wetland)
 - o ESA – Roseate Tern potential feeding area issue must be addressed: Mike Amaral at USFWS 603-223-2541 (x-23)
 - o Other bird use – shore, wading
 - o EFH – Chris B.
- Adverse Impacts
 - o incorporate additional information from above, then describe and evaluate direct and secondary effects from construction and operation of marine terminal
 - Direct: quantitative and qualitative (i.e., how will the principal functions be affected?)
 - Secondary: quantitative where possible, otherwise qualitative
- Compensatory Mitigation
 - o Re-characterize per federal CWA aquatic resource impact areas (disregard isolated fw wetland)
 - o Address affected areas/principal functions, likelihood of success (short/long term) and constraints/risks (e.g., sw discharges, continual disturbance, recontamination), near other protected habitat (?)
 - o Concept to consider: Address City's CSOs.

Alternative sites in NBH (North Terminal, Pope's Island, others?):

- Similar information needs . . . or will they attempt to make the argument based upon practicability?

Ports and Infrastructure Analysis Report: Will we receive the entire report and when?

NEPA Secondary Effects on landward areas from construction/operation

- socio-economic, e.g., traffic, infrastructure improvements, etc.