

**Craney Island Eastward Expansion
Footprint Review**

20 July 2000

1300

1. Progress Overview, Future Events and Meeting Goals
2. Review and discussion of Footprints
 - a. **1a. (Eastward Expansion – maximum)**
 - b. **1b. (Eastward Expansion – minimum)**
 - c. **2a. (Eastward Expansion with Northern Placement Area)**
 - d. **3 (Northward Expansion)**
 - e. **4a. (Northward and Eastward Expansion)**
 - f. **5a. (No Expansion – Port Located on Existing Craney Island)**
 - g. **5b. (Northward Expansion for Placement of Material, Port Located on Existing Craney Island)**
 - h. **5c (Larger Northward Expansion for Placement of Material, Port Located on Existing Craney Island)**
3. Ranking of Footprints based on discussion – Possible Elimination
4. Ranking Review and Action Items Identified
5. Adjournment

**Craney Island Eastward Expansion
Footprint Review Meeting
20 July 2000**

Attendees: Shana Heisey, Helene Haluska, Richard Klein, Steve Powell, Sam McGee, Doug Stamper, Rich Winterfield, Michelle Banton

The purpose of this meeting was to aggressively review the footprints submitted to us by Moffatt and Nichol Engineers. To narrow the scope of focus and eliminate, if possible footprints that would not be in the best interest of the Corps or were simply not feasible. Mr. Matthew Byrne, could not attend the meeting, but met with Michelle before the meeting and shared his views on the footprints. These views were shared with the team at the meeting.

The review began with Footprint 1a which represented an eastward expansion with a setback from the Norfolk Harbor channel of 300'. Footprint 1b represented an eastward expansion with a setback from the Norfolk Harbor channel of 800'. Both footprints raised concerns on how they would impact vessel traffic. Additionally, there was a concern as to how passing traffic would affect moored ships. Utilities are located within the East levee. The utilities may have to be relocated to accommodate the port facility. A concern was raised as to how VDOT would handle a highway across Craney's levee without significantly impacting operations. Would the highway be elevated?

Footprint 2a depicted an eastward expansion(channel setback 300') in addition to a northern expansion designated for dredged material placement. This footprint would call for a 1400' northward shift of the Third Crossing. This footprint was viewed as a longer-range plan as Footprints 1a/1b did not preclude a northern expansion for dredged material placement. It was anticipated that the northern expansion could create design concerns for VDOT in having to compensate for negative skin friction where support pilings for the 164-connector interchange go through the northern expansion. Additionally, there were concerns as to how a dredge would access Craney Island. There were legislative concerns as it the footprint could be contradictory to current legislation. With the setback 300' off the channel, the additional concerns for 2A were similar to that of Footprint 1A.

Footprint 3 shows a northward expansion for port facility use. This footprint generated initial legislative concerns similar to that of Footprint 2A. A noted advantage for Footprint 3 was that it appeared to have less of an operational impact on Craney Island and vessel traffic. However, a channel accessing the port on the north side of Craney Island would have to be 100% locally supported, as its maintenance would not be in the Federal interest. An additional concern was the resulting required dredging associated with the new channel. While the Port would have to fund the maintenance dredging of that channel, the material would still have to be placed somewhere.

Footprint 4A depicted a northward and eastward expansion for a port facility. The concerns were similar to those of first five footprints; wharf proximity to channel, current legislation, etc. Currently, a fuel pipeline comes out of the northeast corner of Craney Island and crosses Norfolk Harbor to the Naval Base.

Footprint 5A depicted a port facility located on Craney Island. This footprint would have dramatically impact the operations at Craney Island. Additionally, material removed to bring the elevation of that portion of Craney Island to project height and the significant amount of initial and future maintenance dredging would drastically reduce the amount of area remaining for dredged material placement. Additional methods would have to be employed to compensate for the lack of storage area remaining. There were no foreseen benefits for the Corps associated with this footprint. Footprints 5B and 5C had similar to 5A with the exception of the addition of northward expansions for dredged material placement.

Ranking of footprint options based on discussion:

1A – Less dredging required,
1B
2A
4
5 A

Footprints recommended for elimination:

3
5 (B&C)

Action Items:

- Continue review of footprint options
- Coordinate with Virginia Pilots Association

Synopsis of Issues for Footprints											
Alternate 1A		Alternate 1B		Alternate 2A		Alternate 3		Alternate 4A		Alternates 5A - 5C	
Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
Limited amt of dredged due to setback	Possible impact on maneuverability of ships	Less impact on vessel traffic than Alternate 1A	More dredging required than 1A	Longer range plan variation of Alternate 1A.	Legislation Concerns	Less impact on Craney Island Operations	Legislation Concerns		Legislation Concerns		No foreseen benefits to Corps
	Greater predicted impact on flow	Less impact on flow than Alternate 1B	Less storage space for VDOT		Negative skin friction on pilings		Negative skin friction to VDOT pilings for Third Crossing(same as 2A)		Significant increase in required dredging		Major impact on Craney Operations
	Greater potential to impact vessel traffic				Greater potential to impact vessel traffic (same as 1A)		Significant increase in required dredging		Negative skin friction to VDOT pilings for Third Crossing(same as 3)		Significant amount of dredging required.
	Accessibility of C.I. by dredges				Accessibility of C.I. By dredges dredging North of Craney		Possible impact on current flow		Greater potential to impact vessel traffic (same as 1A)		
									Greater predicted impact on flow		