

Norfolk Harbor and Channels
Eastward Expansion of Craney Island
Feasibility Study

Meeting with VDOT and VPA

November 13, 2000

Per Mark Mansfield:

- Shana attended Port Readiness Meeting
- Geotechnical Report has been completed and the CDs by the contractor. (Need to incorporate into GIS)
- Third Crossing Draft EIS comments in the mail

Purpose of Meeting: As a result of the meeting on 30 October 2000, Michael Baker (contractor for VDOT) revisited the 12 footprints to determine if any of the 12 footprints could be modified to work with the Third Harbor Crossing. The meeting was an opportunity to present their findings.

Mr. Phil Shucet, Michael Baker, indicated that Options 1 –5 and 10 – 12 created serious safety concerns. Moving the port westward onto Craney would decrease the distance between interchanges and would cause unsafe weave conditions. Mr. Shucet indicated that VDOT did not have a problem with the Westward Expansions depicted in Options 1-5 for the use of a dredged material placement area.

As mentioned in the VDOT's review comments dated September 27, 2000, Option 7 would not cause any conflicts with the Third Crossing. Options 6, 8, and 9 can, however, be modified to lessen any impacts to the Third Crossing.

Option 6

This option depicts a Northward Expansion of Craney Island for the use of a Port Facility. The Port would connect to the Third Crossing by an interchange located near the northeast corner of Craney Island as the westbound lane exits the tunnel. The road would have to allow clearance for double stacked rail cars. The road would then return back to +17 ft to connect to the Monitor – Merrimac Bridge. The Port Facility would have a wharf elevation of +12 ft and would increase in elevation as it neared Craney Island. The slope would be 1% or less. It was estimated that the elevation of the port facility once it connected with Craney Island could be +30 ft. To allow the road to remain at an elevation equal to that of the Monitor – Merrimac Bridge, a valley would have to be constructed between the existing Craney Island and the proposed Port terminal. The road would then be built on grade.

Option 8

This option depicts an Eastward Expansion for Port use and a northern expansion for a dredged material placement site. For the Option 8 to work with the Third Crossing, Bud Morgan, Michael Baker, presented a placement area that was reduced to allow the roadway structures to remain over the water. Rapidly settling dredged material could cause significant structural problems.

Option 9

This option depicts both a northern and eastward expansion for Port Facility use. As in Option 6, a valley would need to be constructed between the northern expansion and Craney Island to allow the Third Crossing to remain at the same elevation as the Monitor – Merrimac Bridge.

IN SUMMARY

Options 1-5 and 10 – 12 will cause significant impacts to the Third Crossing and thus are not feasible from VDOT's perspective. Option 7 will not cause any significant impacts and is the preferred plan by both VPA and VDOT. However, Options 6, 8 & 9 can be modified to suit VDOT's needs in relation to the Third Crossing. Additionally, VDOT does not have an objection to adding a westward expansion to Options 6 – 9 for the use of dredged material placement. VPA is designing the Port Facility to accommodate 60 ft depth in front of the wharf. The question was asked if the new tunnel would allow the channel to be dredged to 60ft. It was assured that the tunnel could be constructed to allow for a 60 ft channel depth.

Phil Shucet and Bud Morgan indicated that they would brief VDOT further on this discussion and that VDOT would continue to work with the Corps and the rest of the Craney Island stakeholders to identify feasible options.