

## EPA Official Record

---

**Notes ID:** AAE604DD0EDD4B0A85257AD80070638E

**From:** Chet Myers <cmyers@apexcos.com>

**To:** "Bachand, Michael L NAE" <Michael.L.Bachand@usace.army.mil>; "Michalak, Scott C NAE" <Scott.C.Michalak@usace.army.mil>; "Keegan, Michael F NAE" <Michael.F.Keegan@usace.army.mil>

**Copy To:** Ann Williams/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; Carl Dierker/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; Cynthia Catri/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; ElaineT Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; Kimberly Tisa/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; Jackie Leclair/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; Mike Marsh/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; Phil Colarusso/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; Ralph Abele/R1/USEPA/US@EPA; "Sneeringer, Paul J NAE" <Paul.J.Sneeringer@usace.army.mil>; "Davis, Gary (DCR)" <gary.davis@state.ma.us>; Jay Borkland <jborkland@apexcos.com>; Gregory Dolan <gdolan@apexcos.com>

**Delivered Date:** 10/09/2012 05:16 PM EST

**Subject:** New Bedford HPS - 408 Requirements for Acceptance (UNCLASSIFIED)

ATTACHMENT: 33734.03\_Hurricane Barrier Report[1].sm.pdf  
Mr. Bachand, Michalak and Keegan,

Attached please find GZA's analysis of potential blasting impacts on the Hurricane Barrier.

GZA conducted its analysis such that it determined the maximum blast charge weight that could be used and would not result in any change in the accepted factor of safety for the Hurricane Barrier. GZA conducted its analysis along a line of distances from the Hurricane Barrier and was able to produce a table of distance vs. maximum charge size (see page 5 and 6 of the report).

GZA's recommendation was to set the design charge size at 90% of the maximum recommended charge size; however, based on our conversation, it would seem prudent to discuss the issue of the design charge size before finalizing a proposal, as a larger factor of safety may be preferable to USACE. GZA also recommended a test blast program to verify the site-specific design assumptions to add to a higher level of certainty in the implementation of the program.

Would you care to review the results of the report, and then perhaps we could schedule a time to discuss the results and what would be the most prudent course of action with regard to design charge size?

Apex is now working on preparing the formal submittal, but we would prefer to get USACE's input before submission.

Thanks for all of your help!

Chet Myers  
Apex Companies, LLC  
O) 617-728-0070 x113            M) 617-908-5778

-----Original Message-----

From: Sneeringer, Paul J NAE [mailto:Paul.J.Sneeringer@usace.army.mil]  
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2012 1:45 PM  
To: Davis, Gary (DCR); Chet Myers; Jay Borkland  
Cc: Ann Williams; Carl Dierker; Cynthia Catri; ElaineT Stanley; Kimberly Tisa; Jackie Leclair; Mike Marsh; Phil Colarusso; Ralph Abele; Bachand, Michael L NAE; Michalak, Scott C NAE  
Subject: FW: New Bedford HPS - 408 Requirements for Acceptance (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

Gary, Chet, and Jay:

Enclosed for your records is the list of information that the Corps Levee Safety Team will need in order to evaluate potential impacts to the New Bedford Hurricane Protection System ("HPS") (under Section 408) associated with blasting work for the South Terminal Project.

I previously included this list as an attachment to the August 21, 2012 Meeting Note Package, but I wanted to make absolutely sure that you have this information.

Feel free to contact Mike Bachand at (978) 318-8075 if you have additional questions about the required documentation. Thanks.

Paul Sneeringer  
(978) 505-9216

-----Original Message-----

From: Bachand, Michael L NAE  
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2012 2:20 PM  
To: Keegan, Michael F NAE; Sneeringer, Paul J NAE  
Cc: Michalak, Scott C NAE  
Subject: FW: New Bedford HPS - 408 Requirements for Acceptance (UNCLASSIFIED)

As discussed during the August 21, 2012 meeting, performing blasting near or adjacent to the New Bedford Hurricane Protection System (HPS) will require USACE acceptance in accordance with guidance and Title 33 United States Code Section 408 (33 USC 408) requirements. It is likely the acceptance will require local (District level) and headquarters approval. To facilitate the approvals under the 408 process, the following information will be needed for review:

1. Test boring logs, detailed engineering drawings, and construction specifications showing the proposed locations, site conditions, and blasting techniques being proposed. The drawings should show all existing structures, utilities, easements/R-O-W, dimensions, and pertinent HPS components located in the vicinity of the proposed work area and/or impacted by the blasting.

2. A technical analysis (liquefaction, post-liquefaction settlement, and seismic/residual slope stability) and summary memorandum on the potential impacts to the existing New Bedford HPS.

3. Discussion of residual risk

4. Discussion of Executive Order 11988 considerations

5. Compliance with Environmental Protection policies.

See the attached the attached 408 Clarification Guidance memo dated November 17, 2008 and attached Submittal Package Guide at the end of Memo for detailed information required for USC 408 review & acceptance. I have also included a copy of 33 USC 408 and a policy memorandum dated October 23, 2006 for your reference.

Finally, USACE will review the draft Proposed Construction Specification for Blasting and provide suggested edits.

Regards,

Michael L. Bachand, P.E.  
Levee Safety Program Manager

United States Army Corps of Engineers  
New England District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, Massachusetts 01742  
Office: 978.318.8075  
Cell: 978.551.1656

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

- 33734.03\_Hurricane Barrier Report[1]sm.pdf