

## **Craney Island Eastward Expansion Preliminary Footprint Review Meeting**

May 24, 2000  
1 p.m. – 3 p.m.

**Meeting Purpose:** To review how footprints were created and answer any footprint specific questions that may have come up during the initial review of the footprints.

1. Brief Overview of Attendees and Backgrounds (*Team*)
2. Presentation of Footprints (*Mr. John Stuart, P.E. / Mr. John Lesnik – Moffatt and Nichol Engineers*)
  - a. Northward Expansion
  - b. Northward and Eastward Combination Expansion (L-shaped)
  - c. Eastward Expansion (setback from channel edge – 830 ft)
  - d. Eastward Expansion (setback from channel edge – 300 ft)
3. Question / Answer Session (*Team*)
4. Wrap-up - Quick Review of what has been discussed and identification of any foreseen problems for further action - (*Rich*)

## Craney Island Footprint Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: May 24, 2000

Attendees:

Richard Klein  
Steve Powell  
Doug Stamper  
Helene Haluska  
John Lesnik  
John Stuart  
Rich Winterfield

1. John Lesnik and John Stuart of Moffat & Nichol presented various alternatives to extending Craney Island. The alternatives are numbered:
  - a. 1A – eastward expansion only. This alternative depicts the maximum eastward expansion. A port facility would be located along this eastward expansion.
    - i. A design criteria that was discussed was that a fuel line appears to be located in the east levee of Craney Island at ~37'. This fuel line will need to be moved. Evidently it is not at the end of its useful life.
  - b. 1B – eastward expansion only. This alternative depicts the minimum extent of eastward expansion. There is an ~300' offset from the channel. A port facility would be located along this eastward expansion.
    - i. The minimum size was determined looking at the economics of size vs. capital costs to build.
  - c. 2A / 2B – includes ~2400' expansion to the north plus the maximum / minimum eastward expansion. The northward expansion would be used for handling dredge material (4<sup>th</sup> cell).
    - i. This would require a shift in the Hampton Roads Crossing Study Candidate Build Alternative No. 9 Parallel Crossing of I-664 (HRCS Alt. No.9), - 1400' North. The terminus would remain the same however.
  - d. 3 – 4300' northward expansion only. A port facility would be located along this north expansion.
    - i. This would require a shift of HRCS Alt. No. 9 ~1200' to the south. The terminus would remain the same.
    - ii. Road and rail access would have to be explored.
  - e. 4 – northward and eastward expansion. A port facility would be located along both expansion sites. "The mother of all port facilities."
    - i. This would require a shift of HRCS Alt. No. 9 ~1200' to the south. The terminus would remain the same.
  - f. 5 – to be drawn based on input from Ron Vann and Dave Pezza in meeting 5/19/00. In this case the eastern part of the existing Craney Island would be used/converted into a port facility. Additionally, expansion to the north would be used as a 4<sup>th</sup> cell for dredge material placement.

- i. John Stuart will create this alternative.
2. John Lesnik stated that providing heavy rail access would be very beneficial. It only needs to be a spur. This was in response to Rich's question about the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> crossing and whether it includes rail (light).
3. Richard Klein stated that he thought that this array of alternatives covered the Corps needs.
4. There was a discussion about how to stabilize poor quality material. Ideas about jet grouting and surcharging were discussed.
5. Helene discussed ongoing efforts to reduce the number of alternatives for expanding Craney Island. In a small group which has not yet reported to the larger Craney Island team, they have basically decided that they can write off the northward expansion scenarios. Because this has not been discussed in a larger setting yet, it was decided that John Stuart would draw up Alternative 5.
6. Mitigation was brought up, and briefly discussed.
7. John Lesnik was going to contact Bobby Bray by Friday, May 26, to get approval to distribute alternatives within the Corps.
  - a. There will need to be additional approvals before any images of the alternatives can be shared with stakeholders over the internet.