

**US Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District  
Dredged Material Management Program (DMMP) Review  
Meeting Summary  
June 28, 2013  
1:00 PM, Maryland Port Administration**

**ATTENDEES:**

**Gahagan & Bryant Associates (GBA):** Carter Stinchcomb and Dan Behnke  
**Maryland Environmental Service (MES):** Karen Cushman, Stan Snarski and Maura Morris  
**Maryland Port Administration (MPA):** Frank Hamons, David Blazer, and Steve Storms  
**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (USACE):** Robert Pace, Kevin Brennan, Dan Bierly, and Andrew Roach

---

**Action Items**

**Meeting Summary**

Mr. Brennan began the meeting by explaining the process of drafting the 2013 DMMP. It began by reviewing the 2005 DMMP to determine what alternatives were listed. Brainstorming then occurred to determine if there were any possible alternatives that were not listed. The Harbor Team Inner Harbor Report was also reviewed during this time to see if the alternatives were consistent with the 2013 DMMP.

In the 2005 DMMP, the Philadelphia District's material was not included in estimates (their channels begin at the Sassafra River reach). Because the Philadelphia District may affect Baltimore District's projects (Poplar Island), placement of that material was included in the 2013 DMMP (although this does not include the Canal Proper). Mr. Bierly stated that alternatives were not looked at exclusively for the lower Chesapeake and Delaware (C&D) Canal approach channel's material. He added he was not aware that Courthouse Point and Pearce Creek were not available at this time. When he discussed placement of this material with the Philadelphia District in the past, their response was that they could place at Pooles Island. Mr. Hamons stated as Philadelphia District began to look for a solution around the time open water placement was mandated to end in Maryland, they discovered how high the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) costs would be when placing dredged material at Poplar Island. This is why Pearce Creek and Courthouse Point are important.

Mr. Brennan began reviewing the alternatives for each reach section. Among the reach sections, a small amount of alternatives overlapped (i.e. some alternatives could be used for both the Harbor and C&D reaches etc.) Each alternative had a number of assumptions associated with capacity, costs, etc. Mr. Hamons stated that MPA has information/assumptions for the innovative alternative that could be provided. He requested the Corps review this information in an effort to keep assumption consistent.

Mr. Snarski questioned if the Base Plan had changed. Mr. Brennan stated that the plan consisted of deep trough for the approach channel material, Cox Creek for the Harbor material, and Courthouse Point for the C&D material.

Mr. Brennan stated in order to compare alternatives, after adding descriptions of each alternative, costs (both construction and life costs) were standardized. All alternatives were placed on a master spreadsheet. After making assumptions about the design of each alternative, the screening process used for each of the Maryland approach channels, C&D approach channels, and the Harbor channels alternatives looked at capacity and cost. The 2005 DMMP costs compared to the 2013 DMMP costs and a percentage difference was assigned. As the alternatives were initially screened, some alternatives were moved to more suitable reaches, while others were ruled out quickly (mostly due to cost or minimal capacity). Alternatives that are no longer being considered are highlighted in orange (limited by cost) and yellow (limited by capacity) on the master spreadsheet.

As Mr. Brennan reviewed the alternatives, Mr. Hamons discussed the concern with using Aberdeen Proving Ground for placement of dredged material. He concluded that Carol Creek or placement at Aberdeen is most likely not feasible due to placement potentially affecting the mission at Aberdeen.

Mr. Brennan again talked about alternatives being removed due to high costs (more expensive than Poplar Island) and low capacity. He stated the thought process to this screening would allow the Corps to have a good idea of where the alternatives ranked before the environmental screening began.

Mr. Brennan explained that the environmental values will be tabulated by the Corps and sent through the Bay Enhancement Working Group (BEWG) for review and approval. The BEWG does not consider costs or capacity when scoring. Mr. Brennan hopes that environmental permits will be discussed during the environmental scoring process as well.

Mr. Snarski commented on the high costs associated with Cox Creek Expanded. Mr. Brennan explained that these costs were estimates because of the lack of data. Cost used for Coke Point and Cox Creek Expanded were draft numbers.

Mr. Hamons questioned how the Virginia channels were being dealt with. The Corps stated they were happy with the current placement plan of the material; and for the purpose of this DMMP, alternatives did not need to be found.

It was stated that the overall environmental community's opinion was islands should not be created above the Bay Bridge. Mr. Hamons added that islands could be restored. He then discussed the expansion of Pooles Island. Although it may not be feasible, it still remains an option. The Corps will have to seek clarification about island creation.

Mr. Blazer stated more information on capacity for the shoreline restoration alternative will be needed in the future. Shoreline restoration may become a popular option/fix in the future with Governor O'Malley's and President Obama's focus on climate change and sea level rise. Mr.

Brennan stated the challenge with shoreline restoration is the composition of the material used (silt not sand). The group then discussed the unanswered questions on the affects that sea level rise would have on dredging volumes.

Mr. Snarski noticed that Cox Creek Expanded was shaded and asked if it was removed as a possible alternative. Mr. Brennan stated that it was not removed as a Harbor alternative. Mr. Hamons questioned if the building product alternative was comparable to innovative reuse. Mr. Brennan and Mr. Roach confirmed this.

Mr. Brennan stated that the creation of the 2013 DMMP was still on schedule. Mr. Hamons asked what the result would be if the document did not remain on schedule. He asked specifically how Poplar Island would be affected. Mr. Brennan stated that funding for the expansion of Poplar Island has already been authorized. He hopes to have the report completed by February 2014.

Ms. Cushman questioned if the same parameters used in the past for the environmental scoring were going to be used for the 2013 DMMP environmental scoring. Mr. Roach stated that he did not see a need to create more parameters. He added that he hoped to have the preliminary environmental scoring completed by the end of July.

Mr. Snarski asked who determined the feasibility of the alternatives after the environmental scoring, capacity, and cost were tabulated. Ms. Morris stated final decisions on the most feasible alternatives are made at a management level where everything is taken into account.

It was stated that the purpose of reviewing the DMMP was not only to update the previous version, but to prove that all alternatives were assessed/reassessed. Mr. Blazer reiterated the importance of consistency among the assumptions.