

Craney Island Expansion  
NEPA Committee Meeting Notes  
24 October 2001

1. The meeting began with introductions (list of attendees attached) and a brief history of the Craney Island Expansion NEPA Technical Team and its goals and objectives as agreed upon in previous meetings. It was noted that minutes of the previous two meetings (November 27, 2000; May 15, 2001) are on the Corps web site. Several mentioned difficulty using the Corps web site link to Craney Island (note: Michele Banton is working with PAO. The web site was taken down due to security issues raised as a result of the 11 Sep 2001 terrorist attacks and was reinstated on 7 November).
2. John Boon (VIMS) presented the final historical runs of the 3-D Hydrodynamic Modeling. The options brought forward for analysis included a 944 -acre west expansion, a 539-acre east expansion and a combination of the two. The historical runs did not indicate any significant differences/changes to global features compared to the single variable runs. The complete report for the single variable runs is available at the Craney Island/VIMS link at the Corps web site and the historical runs will be available in the near future on the same site.
3. Following John's presentation, the floor was opened to allow a period of comments/questions/observations. The following paragraphs are a synopsis of this dialogue.
4. Several individuals expressed a need for clear numbers, i.e., how much acreage and capacity would be gained from the eastward expansion, how long would it last, how much material would be going in it from the construction of the eastern cell itself and the access channel dredging. What is the clear and demonstrated need for additional capacity?
5. The EPA representative (Regina Poeske) needs a summary of what the study entails as well as the study authorization. (She could not access web site)
6. Patti Jackson of the James River Association expressed dismay at the possibility of a western expansion. She and others felt the port expansion element should be included in a comprehensive EIS, otherwise we would be analyzing this in a piecemeal fashion. She wanted more information on why we were doing a least cost analysis, not a benefit/cost analysis and information of the study's baseline assumptions. (Note: The District team did some further investigation on the issue of benefit analysis. Policy Guidance Letter # 47 condenses the Cost Sharing portion of Section 201 of WRDA '96. It specifically states in Section 9, part (a) of the PGL, that cost sharing on any project concerning additional disposal capacity at Craney Island will be done in accordance with the original authorizing document. The original authorization was done in 1946 on a least cost basis. We are not doing a benefit/cost analysis because we were specifically directed by congressional legislation not to.)

7. The Corps and VPA explained that the NEPA requirements would be fulfilled with the preparation of two NEPA documents. The Corps will prepare the NEPA document to cover construction of the cell(s) for dredged material containment and VPA will prepare the NEPA document to cover port facility development on the cell.

8. Patti J. asked if we would be analyzing water quality (Doug said “yes”) and who would be the POC for the water quality analysis (we would get back to her on this).

9. Several Bullet Items were listed on board near the conclusion to emphasize salient points made during the meeting:

- EIS should be inclusive (to address):
  - Additional cells
  - Development and operation of cells
  - Construction of port terminal, including cargo operations, supporting infrastructure, etc.
  - Defense utilization
- Quantify dredging for port access (the areas between the port facility and the channel) and port operations
- Quantify capacity of east and west cells (and remaining capacity of Craney Island)
- Eastward expansion is defined to include access dredging. The alternative of eastward expansion w/o port development was not modeled (we do not know the impact of flushing).
- Original impetus for state law banning westward expansion was concerns over water quality. Corps is addressing water quality.
- Any effluent from expanded containment will have to comply w/state & Federal Regulations (original Craney Island was probably grandfathered). There may be a NPDES permit requirement for new cell/facility
- "Eastward cell will not be constructed unless the access dredging is done." (Need to dredge out much of material to construct the levee.)

10. Follow up Meetings – The next meeting of this NEPA Technical Committee will take place early next calendar year to provide resolution of issues raised during this meeting and to discuss compensatory mitigation related to proposed expansion alternatives.

11. Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Craney Island Expansion NEPA Technical Team  
 October 24, 2001 Meeting at Norfolk District  
 List of Attendees

Participant's Name	Phone	Agency
Craig Seltzer Doug Martin Pete Kube Jim Thomasson Mark Hudgins Larry Holland Helene Haluska	(757) 441-7390 (757) 441-3538 (757) 441-7504 (757)441-7112 (757) 441-7107 (757) 441-7774 (757) 441-7008	Corps of Engineers
Regina Poeske (call-in)	(215) 814-2725	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mike Crist Heather Wood	(757) 628-8222 (757) 683-2152	Virginia Port Authority
George Ruddy Jason Miller	(410) 573-4528 (410) 573-4522	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Chesapeake Bay Field Office)
Morris Roberts Walter Priest John Boon Harry Wang Mac Sisson	(804) 684-7260 (804) 684-7385  (804) 684-7215 (804) 684-7209	Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS)
Dan Dauer	(757) 683-4709	Old Dominion University
Traycee West	(757) 247-2256	Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC)
Ruth Boettcher	(757) 442-2429	Virginia Dept. of Game & Inland Fisheries (VDGIF)
Carl Fisher Marjorie Mayfield Joe Thomas	(757) 426-7446 (757) 625-3648 (757) 481-5941	Elizabeth River Project (ERP)
Willie Barnes	(757) 441-3280	MARAD, So. Atlantic Division
Patti Jackson	(804) 730-2898	James River Association