

**Minutes**  
**NEPA Technical Committee Meeting**  
**Craney Island Expansion Feasibility Study**  
**April 3, 2002, 1- 4 pm**

1. Follow-up from last meeting (October 24, 2001) – The expanded scope of NEPA to address the indirect impacts of port development was discussed. Malcolm Pirnie is the contractor working for VPA to address this portion of the NEPA evaluation and documentation. This evaluation will be included in the Corps NEPA document.
  
2. Mitigation Analysis – Focus of meeting today - What is “mitigation?” EPA and USFWS addressed this question from their perspective(s). George Ruddy (F&WS) cited the NEPA definition of mitigation in the CEQ regulations (Sec. 1508.20) and F&WS policy (1981) as regards mitigation. The losses associated with eastward expansion of Craney Island (open water habitat primarily) are designated as Resource Category 3 (medium to high value). F&WS will accept out-of-kind mitigation for this type impact, however, the closer to impact area the better. Regina Poeske (EPA) referenced her scoping letter sent to the Corps dated December 18, 2001 discussing mitigation which can be found on the Corps web site at <http://gisweb.nao.usace.army.mil/Craneyee/Correspondence.asp>. EPA is looking for mitigation of range of impacts to include direct and indirect impacts. Since in-kind mitigation does not appear to be possible, EPA would accept out-of-kind compensatory mitigation.
  
3. A Powerpoint presentation was made (Seltzer) to review mitigation options previously suggested and discussed by the NEPA Technical Committee. The presentation was provided to demonstrate that they will compensate, to varying degrees, for functional benefits lost with the proposed expansion (loss of open water habitat). The mitigation options currently being considered include oyster restoration, SAV restoration, sediment clean-up in the Elizabeth River, wetland restoration/conservation, riparian buffers, shoreline/wetland stabilization, and fish habitat enhancement via dam removal.

4. An attempt was made to rank or prioritize the various mitigation options by evaluating functional benefits they will provide and using various weighting factors. This is required because the Corps must do a cost/benefit analysis of the mitigation options in order to demonstrate that "...the most cost effective mitigation measure(s) has been selected" (ER1105-2-100, Appendix C, paragraph C-3). This exercise was attempted using the attached matrices and definitions (attachments 1 and 2). For the most part, this exercise proved to be difficult, and the group could not reach consensus on the application of this methodology. The general feeling among the group members was that they could not rank the alternatives until they have specific information on where the proposed options would be sited and how large they would be. This specific information is not available.

5. It was decided that a subcommittee from this group should be identified to continue to work on the details of mitigation. Volunteers were requested and a list of the "Mitigation Subcommittee" prospective members was compiled (attachment 3). EPA (Poeske) requested that the subcommittee be provide all existing natural resource background information for the (proposed) project area at least 2 weeks prior to the subcommittee meeting. The Corps agreed to provide this information.

5. The meeting adjourned at 4 pm. List of attendees is attached (attachment 4).

## Craney Island Expansion Mitigation Subcommittee

Participant's Name	Agency
Craig Seltzer Betty Grey Waring	Corps of Engineers
Regina Poeske	EPA
Heather Wood	Virginia Port Authority
George Ruddy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Chesapeake Bay Field Office)
Morris Roberts Walter Priest Tom Barnard	Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS)
Bert Parolari	VA Dept. of Environmental Quality – TRO (DEQ)
Dan Dauer (suggested by Corps)	Old Dominion University
Traycie West (suggested by Corps)	Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC)
Ruth Boettcher	Virginia Dept. of Game & Inland Fisheries (VDGIF)
Ruth Beck	College of William & Mary
Carl Fisher Marjorie Mayfield	Elizabeth River Project (ERP)
Patti Jackson	James River Association
Lee Hill	Dept. Conservation & Recreation

Craney Island Expansion  
 NEPA Technical Team Meeting - Apr. 3, 2002  
 List of Attendees

Agency	Name
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Chesapeake Bay Field Office)	Mr. George Ruddy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Ms. Regina Poeske
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Mr. Craig Seltzer      Ms. Helene Haluska Mr. Peter Kube        Ms. Betty G. Waring Mr. Doug Stamper Mr. Doug Martin Mr. Dave Schulte Mr. Larry Holland
Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS)	Mr. Tom Barnard Mr. Walter Priest      Dr. Morris Roberts
Virginia Dept. of Conservation & Recreation (DCR)	Mr. Lee Hill
Virginia Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Tidewater Regional Office	Mr. Bert Parolari
Virginia Dept. of Game & Inland Fisheries (VDGIF)	Ms. Ruth Boettcher
William & Mary	Ms. Ruth Beck
MARAD	Mr. Willie Barnes
Virginia Port Authority	Ms. Heather Wood Mr. Mike Crist
Elizabeth River Project (ERP)	Dr. Carl Fisher Ms. Marjorie Mayfield Col. Joe Thomas
Malcolm Pirnie	Mr. Bruce Aitkenhead
City of Portsmouth	Mr. Jim Guildea