RETURN TO SER AR INDEX

8/14/12 meeting w/ Commonwealth re info needs

#1) Gary -
- 6 parcels in play. Still work in progress.
They understand any of them will require arch. + enviro.
Chet - commissioned subk'er to do historical assessment of wide area so whichever area is chosen will be covered
Gary - will have better understanding of what site will look like next week
Jay - re 3rd item - he reads it as saying give us info gathered or planned rather than "do an assessment."
Kim - as far as TSCA is concerned, it's up to the Commonwealth. But advises doing good due diligence. Encourages at least a phase I.
Anything discovered after TSCA det. won't be covered

#12) upland areas - that's what arch will do
inter + sub tidal - they thought they provided that - Carl suggests calling Hann. For pot. dredging in federal channel the arch survey isn't needed. - They'll explain that

Mike Stover - just ~~met~~ met w/ Tribes yesterday - Gary
Tribes asked if any ~~seated~~ arch. investig. was done for CAD cell. Chet says yes - assoc. w/ DMMP
They do believe they've sent both Jan + ~~Feb~~ June submissions but they need to double check
R draw their attention to the timetable

SDMS Doc ID 529017

5) shellfish
Jay asks where 24 million
R explain + CEC
Jay - Commonwealth felt we had a "deal" on 9.5 million + everyone was pretty surprised to put it mildly + it adds substantially to the cost. Given the poor quality + the fact the density is artificial
Elaine - b/c its a clean up - they don't remediate in SF + that's why they don't replace shellfish
Gary thinks we reached an agreement on 9 million last October / January.
It's a huge budget issue - he'll know more in a few days.
Reseeding vs. relaying

Mike pulls out p. 328 from submission says 23 million

Jay - proposes - the shellfish in fed. navig. area. 1) not sure will happen. 2) Can we discuss whether should be mitigated + if so at what ratio?
Jay - Commonwealth had a dollar number in mind + tried to back in.
R also threw out idea of possibly more time - 12 or 15 yrs?

Elaine asks about areas w/ more specificity
Commonwealth will be relying on DMF to manage the area.
Paul asks about acreage density capability

6) Chet asks about length of time of monitoring
Maybe 5 yrs at the outset + if all is stable seek to decrease frequency or delete altogether

7) ~~no~~ ISMP
- Item 1 re invasives on site.
Chet - some of the wording was carried over from another project. May be some invasives on property beyond the Comm's control
- bulkhead colonization - is this an indefinite condition? Suggest talk to Phil

8) Chet - need to have discussion about TOY restrictions → detail project
Ralph - NMFS said need to go into informal consult. Recognition that ideal TOY wd prevent the project. So the discussion focused on noise issues from blasting + pile driving + sound waves reaching the channel
* Ralph needs to forward the noise info from NMFS.
- They would like to avoid TOY restrictions altogether. Eg. TOY on blasting may actually force them to blast b/c not time to do investigation. So wd prefer to take protective measures. Pile driving lasts for 10 months - so if restricted can only allow 4 months
We can't start the informal consult until we have the noise study, info on dredging techniques, etc.
Commonwealth - owner
Designer, etc. - CEC - if any TOY restrictions get applied, it means they can't meet the deadlines for making the project work on time.
If modeling shows there would be impacts, then they want to focus on mitigating measures.
Ralph mentions next Tappan Zee bridge will be placed w/out any pile driving
? remind that if info doesn't show not likely to adversely affect, then into formal consultation
Jay - precedent w/ other SER - went beyond fish windows

4) Mitigation - - after redesign, not same amt of SM area as orig. proposed. Orig. proposal - remediation of intertidal, etc.
w/ redesign, high & low marsh dropped + intertidal increased.
is the subtidal remed. ~~be~~ valuable? Seems like

~~.09 ac new~~ mitig - .37 .19
.42
.61 = 1.22
impacts - .19

intertidal remediation - could be done w/out affecting salt marsh in the further northern reach
Mike - beneficial if not impacting salt marsh; more complex if ~~not~~ impacting existing salt marsh

Chet mentions an alternative that may be a viable option
Tribe have expressed desire to have cattails + bulbrush included in planting plan - means a lot to them for cultural reasons
Mike - salinity problem; impacts are to spartina + that's what we'd like to see

.3-.5 ac. → River's End Park - northern N.B. near Wood St. bridge. Requirement of another project to design (paid for by NSTAR). But no requirement to build

Discussion of .42 (?) on Config. A. Discussion of flexibility of out of kind, or ~~out~~ in kind off site

item # 2 - Qs? Gary - not yet

Chet -
all dredging cannot be done w/ envir bucket -
Can only work w/ fine grained silty material -
doesn't work w/ coarser material

8/14/12 NBH-SER South Terminal Meeting

| Name | Affiliation | E-mail address |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ann Williams | EPA - ORC | williams.ann@epa.gov |
| CARL DIERKER | EPA - ORC | DIERKER.CARL@EPA.GOV |
| Chet Myers | Apex Co. | cmyers@apexcos.com |
| Gary Davis, Jr. | EEA | gary.davis@state.ma.us |
| Jay Borkland | Apex | jborkland@apexcos.com |
| Elaine Stanley | EPA | stanley.elaine@epa.gov |
| KIM TISA | EPA | TISA.Kimberly@epa.gov |
| PAUL SNEERINGER | U.S. CORPS OF ENG | PAUL.J.SNEERINGER@USACE.ARMY.MIL |
| MICHAEL MARSH | EPA | marsh.mike@epa.gov |
| Michael Stover | EPA | stover.michael@epa.gov |
| JACKIE LECLAIR | EPA | leclair.jackie@epa.gov |
| Ralph Abele | EPA | abele.ralph@epa.gov |