

Norfolk Harbor and Channels
Eastward Expansion of Craney Island
Feasibility Study

Review of Preliminary Footprint Options

September 6, 2000

Attendees:

John Stuart	Moffatt and Nichol Engineers (A/E for VPA)	(804) 320-1996
Mike Knott	Moffatt and Nichol Engineers (A/E for VPA)	(757) 683-2139
Philip Shucet	Michael Baker Engineers (A/E for VDOT)	(757) 631-5422
Bud Morgan	Michael Baker Engineers (A/E for VDOT)	(757) 631-5436
Pete Kube	USACE, Norfolk District	(757) 441-7504
Rich Winterfield	USACE, Norfolk District	(757) 441-7113
Michelle Banton	USACE, Norfolk District	(757) 441-7491
Gene Batty	USACE, Norfolk District	(757) 441-7482
Fred J. Kiffner	Virginia Department of Transportation Location and Design Programs Engineer	(804) 786-6275
Christopher Reed	Virginia Department of Transportation Project Manager	(703) 519-9462
Jeff Cutright	Virginia Department of Transportation Hampton Roads Crossing Study Project Engineer	(804) 225-4958
Ken Wilkinson	Virginia Department of Transportation Hampton Roads Crossing Study Project Manager	(804) 371-6758

Purpose of Meeting:

1. To present 12 preliminary footprint options being considered by the Corps in the feasibility study for the expansion of Craney Island to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).
2. Coordinate the efforts of the above agencies in the review of the Hampton Roads Crossing Study and the Craney Island Expansion Study.

Purpose of Feasibility Study:

1. Ms. Michelle Banton provided a brief overview of the feasibility study. Specifically indicated that it was looking at meeting the needs of the Corps & VPA for additional placement area and a fourth port terminal respectively.

Craney Island Expansion Options:

1. Mr. Knott explained Moffatt and Nichol Engineers' involvement in supporting VPA.
2. VDOT raised some concerns about the footprint depicting a port facility on the northern dike (Option 6). They indicated that there might not be enough room

between the necessary Third Crossing interchanges and any interchange the port may need.

3. Mr. Pete Kube asked if only an eastward port facility was being investigated. Mr. Knott indicated that VPA was *only* interested in pursuing an eastward port facility. Mr. Kube stated that the Corps was looking at expansion on the north, west and east sides of Craney Island, in addition to other alternatives in accordance with what is required by NEPA.
4. Five options depict northward and/or westward expansions of Craney Island in combination with a marine terminal built on Craney Island with the wharf structure off the eastern levee of Craney Island.
5. The northward and westward expansion footprint options (Options 1- 5) were reviewed in a Draft Information Report¹ conducted in 1990.
6. Mr. Knott displayed some conceptual construction and layout plans for the eastward expansion/port facility (Option 7).

Hampton Roads Crossing Study:

1. Mr. Kube inquired as to the construction sequence of the Hampton Roads Crossing Study Build Alternative No. 9
2. Mr. Shucet indicated that the first phase of construction would include the tunnel and structures from NIT to the Monitor-Merrimac Bridge Tunnel.
3. The second phase would involve construction of the parallel tunnel to the Monitor Merrimac.
4. The third phase would connect the third crossing with the Western Freeway (164) across Craney Island.
5. The fourth phase of construction involves improvements to I-664 on the Peninsula.
6. The fifth and final phase would involve improvements to I-664 on the Southside.

Marine Terminal:

1. Mr. Knott noted that while the new marine terminal would begin with a 3000 ft wharf structure.

Interactions:

1. Mr. Philip Shucet noted that the Hampton Roads Crossing Study (Third Crossing I-64 Connector) had independent utility. While it would benefit the new marine terminal if it existed, its existence did not depend on the construction of the new marine terminal.
2. Road structures - Ms. Banton indicated that Craney Island levees could be raised to +55 feet² and inquired as to how VDOT would accommodate for that.
 - a. Mr. Wilkinson indicated that VDOT was aware of that possibility and when the Hampton Roads Crossing Study began, they designed a structure system which would allow VDOT to cross Craney Island while allowing

¹ Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Long-Term Disposal (Inner Harbor), Virginia, Draft Information Report, June 1990

² Feasibility Study: Strip Drains in the Dikes at Craney Island, May 1997. It references the ability to raise Craney Island levees to +65 ft CEMLW

operations to continue on Craney Island either in placement area management or now, marine terminal traffic.

3. It was noted that if the third phase of the Hampton Roads Crossing Study was not built in time to accommodate VPA, that VPA could construct that portion of the project
4. Mr. Knott noted that as needs increased and the terminal expanded northward, the need would become greater for the Western Freeway connection to the Third Crossing.

Timing/Schedules:

1. Mr. Mike Knott indicated that VPA would need the new marine terminal in operation by 2012 to continue business. He noted that VPA could support a new terminal as early as 2008.
2. The Hampton Roads Crossing Study is in its seventh year, whereas the Norfolk Harbor and Channels Eastward Expansion of Craney Island Feasibility Study is approximately halfway through its 3-year feasibility process.
3. VDOT schedule, as presented:
 - Have a general engineer contractor on board – Feb 01
 - ROD should be signed by then
 - Notice to proceed – May 01
 - Expect final design – August 01
 - Preliminary Field Investigations – 25 – 30% complete (1-2 years)
~ May 02 – May 03

Questions/Concerns/Action Items:

1. VDOT asked what was the criteria for a footprint option to go forward. *The new placement area, to satisfy long-term dredged material placement needs, needs to have a capacity of 180 million cubic yards.*
2. VDOT stressed the urgency for coordination. They indicated the need to know the Feasibility Study schedule as quickly as possible if they were to be of any assistance.
3. VDOT, the Corps and VPA all stressed the need for continued cooperation and coordination as these two important projects are further evaluated.
4. Ms. Banton agreed to distribute copies of the preliminary footprint options and meeting minutes, as well as provide VDOT with a project schedule.