

**Dredged Material Management Program
Bay Enhancement Working Group
Meeting Summary
February 24, 2011
10:00 AM, Maryland Environmental Service**

ATTENDEES:

ARCADIS: Gwen Gibson

Department of Natural Resources: Roland Limpert

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology (EA): Peggy Derrick, Kaitlin McCormick

Ecologix Engineering, Inc. (EcoLogix): Chris Correale

Gahagan & Bryant Associates (GBA): Carter Stinchcomb

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE): Angela Valdez, Robert Rushlow, Robert Cuthbertson

Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR): Roland Limpert

Maryland Environmental Service (MES): Lauren Franke, James Jett, Megan Simon, Kristen King

Maryland Geological Survey (MGS): Jeff Halka

Maryland Port Administration (MPA): Nathaniel Brown, Steve Storms

Maryland Sea Grant (MSG): Jonathan Kramer

Moffatt & Nichol (MN): Pete Kotulak, Kristen Piggott

Phoenix Engineering, Inc. (Phoenix): George Harman

University of Maryland, CES (UMD): Dennis King

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (USACE): Robert Blama

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS): Bob Zepp

Action Items:

- Ms. Franke will resend the scoring parameters, along with the caveats from 2003, to the BEWG Team and allow an opportunity for comments.
- Ms. Franke will add in language referencing those that took part in the 2003 development process.
- Fact sheets on the list of sites are anticipated to be available by March 17th; the BEWG Team will be asked to review these in preparation for scoring on March 29th.

Welcome and Introductions

Lauren Franke, MES

Meeting Goals

Ms. Franke stated that the goals of today's meeting are:

- To begin the process of selecting a back-up option or options to Sparrows Point, which the Harbor Team recommended to MPA in 2003;
- Have the BEWG review the draft scoring parameters in order to prepare for future scoring of the options selected by the Harbor Team. These options have been sent to the technical team for fact sheet preparation;
- Dr. Jonathon Kramer of Maryland Sea Grant will discuss the Baltimore Harbor Sediment Quality report that was completed in October 2009 by an independent technical review team (ITRT).

Baltimore Harbor Sediment Quality Report Presentation Dr. Jonathon Kramer, MDSG

Dr. Kramer stated that this study was based on available historical data and new data was not gathered for this effort. He added that after reviewing the data, it was determined that there was sufficient data to conduct a baseline screening assessment. The study evaluated sediment quality in the channels, compared sediment found within the Harbor and Main Bay channels, and considered significant trends and/or differences between legacy and recently dredged sediments in maintenance channels. Dr. Kramer stated that Maryland soil standards were used wherever possible and added that considerations for reuse options will require consultation between regulatory agencies and the Innovative Reuse Committee.

The ITRT developed screening criteria that included four categories of suitability for innovative reuse: unrestricted upland, residential, non-residential and exceeds non-residential.

Dr. Kramer presented only on the metals data that was studied and not the data regarding organics. For metals, none of the sampled locations met the Maryland criteria for unrestricted upland reuse; however, a limited number of locations met criteria for residential reuse, such as manufactured topsoil. A majority of the sites met criteria for non-residential reuse options such as flowable fill, mine reclamation, and lightweight aggregate material. Dr. Kramer stated that, for metals, locations outside of the actively dredged Harbor channels did not meet criteria for either residential or non-residential reuse options. Dr. Kramer added that this suggests that channel sediments have limitations in respect to the most stringent options for reuse of dredged material but that there is good potential for reuse under the options currently being considered.

Dr. Kramer stated that the ITRT did not find any data to suggest that channel sediments should be left in place; off-channel data would suggest careful consideration before dredging activity commences in these areas.

Dr. Kramer stated that the study's main finding was that site-by-site assessment will need to be conducted relative to anticipated risk factors for reuse options and will require active engagement of all parties associated with the project.

Sparrows Point Update

Megan Simon, MES

Ms. Simon stated that assessment activities by MPA continue on the Coke Point peninsula at Sparrows Point in recognition that there are some documented environmental concerns that were the subject of a Consent Decree ordered by MDE and USEPA for clean up. Ms. Simon stated that a site assessment was conducted by EA Engineering in 2008 and a Report of Findings was developed in November 2009; the purpose of the report was to determine the impacts to the adjacent offshore media (sediment and surface water) from inputs related to historical site practices and current site conditions.

Ms. Simon stated that a Pre-Pilot Study was conducted to determine if environmental or operational controls could be used during project-related activities to limit any potential migration of contaminants. Ms. Simon stated that there was an additional offshore contaminant delineation performed in order to better define the limits of offshore contamination identified in the site assessment.

Most recently, EA has been working on an Ecological and Human Health Risk Assessment the purpose of which is to determine the likelihood of risk to human health and the environment that may be attributable to site conditions on Coke Point. Ms. Simon stated that a Corrective Measures Study is also being drafted in order to determine how to best address the environmental impacts that have been documented. She added that the two primary sources of landside contamination include Light Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (LNAPL) in the Benzol Processing Area and Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL) in the Coal Tar Storage Area.

Ms. Simon stated that samples have also been collected from offshore surface and sub-surface sediments, and surface water. This sampling program analyzed for VOC's, PAH's and metals. She added that there were also some forensic analyses conducted to determine if contamination was linked to site conditions or existing conditions of the surrounding area and an expanded analysis was conducted to address the predicted potential public concerns. Based on these sampling results, a conceptual site model was developed.

The findings to date include:

- The presence of landside and offshore contamination has been confirmed.
- There is evidence of ongoing surface water contamination via transmission of contaminants through groundwater.
- There are significant concentrations of metals and PAH's in offshore sediments.
- Landside and offshore remedial actions are necessary and compatible with a dredged material containment facility (DMCF).

Ms. Simon stated that a conceptual-level DMCF design has been generated and although the conceptual-level design is highly dependent on the conceptual DMCF footprint, there is a potential for 10-20 mcy of capacity at the site. Ms. Simon stated that since a large volume of information has been generated by MPA regarding contamination at the site, there is strong legislative and community support for the project.

Ms. Simon stated that the site has been the subject of litigation by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation; however, they seem to be receptive to the solutions proposed by MPA. Ms. Simon stated that in preliminary negotiations, Severstal has indicated they may be willing to offer the western portion of the Coke Point peninsula to MPA.

Ms. Simon stated that currently, EA is finalizing the Risk Assessment results and MES is compiling the Feasibility Study. The Sparrows Point team also plans to develop mitigation and community enhancement options to accompany an MPA project at Coke Point. Ms. Simon stated that the project will be presented to the Joint Evaluation Committee in the near future.

Review of Draft Scoring Parameters for Harbor Options

Lauren Franke, MES

Ms. Franke will re-send the scoring parameters information to the BEWG team, with caveats included, and allow everyone time to look over the parameters and solicit comments. There have not been any changes to the language of the parameters since they were finalized by the BEWG in 2003. She added that the weighting is included in the document, which will be important relative to scoring the options.

Mr. Halka stated that, in past scoring efforts, all the weighting factors and definitions were completed first; the intention was to attempt to make the scoring as objective as possible. He suggested that the same process be followed and that if any members of the BEWG have specific concerns, those should be addressed first. Mr. Halka stated that the weighting factor for each parameter relates to how much importance is applied to that parameter. Ms. Correale asked if the weighting factors were arrived at through consensus amongst BEWG members; Mr. Halka responded that they were voted upon by BEWG members. Ms. Franke added that the caveat document captures which organizations may have had a dissenting opinion on scoring or weighting factors. Ms. Derrick stated that a sensitivity analysis was conducted on the ranked options in 2003 to determine if the rank of any option had been skewed by scoring or weighting factors; the sensitivity analysis determined that those top options would have remained ranked in a relatively similar manner if the weighting factors were adjusted.

Mr. Harman suggested that if these parameters and weighting factors are used without change, it might be appropriate to obtain a list of major players that developed the original list so that any challenges can be directed appropriately, considering the team is accepting the work of previous experts. Ms. Franke agreed and added that these parameters and weights were agreed upon by many of the current BEWG members; the caveat document also captures those organizations that helped develop the parameters and weighting factors.

Ms. Correale asked if the consultants participate in scoring the options. Ms. Derrick responded by clarifying that the consultants give input, but there still has to be a general consensus among BEWG members; consultants are non-voting members that provide information. Mr. Limpert recalled that only agencies and organizations did the actual scoring. Ms. Franke added that a draft scoring of the options will be provided to the BEWG for review and comment, as was done in previous option rankings.

Mr. King suggested that socio-economic parameters be considered separately from the environmental parameters, as a number of environmental parameters may not apply to the list of Harbor Options. Ms. Franke stated that in past scoring, parameters that were not applicable were given a score of 0 and shaded to indicate that these were not calculated into the scoring.

Overview of 2011 Harbor Options

Ms. Franke provided the team members with the list of options that the Harbor Team has requested more information on; the technical team will be compiling fact sheets for this list of options. She also provided the team with maps of the options. Ms. Franke asked that the BEWG members return with the list of options to their respective organizations and begin thinking about what information may be available to assist in the scoring process that will take place at the next BEWG meeting. These options are:

- Coke Point (Sparrows Point) DMCF
- Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD)
- Cox Creek Expanded (Upland only)
- Deep Trough – East Side of Bay
- Fairfield (Interior)
- Hart-Miller Island II
- Innovative Reuse at Cox Creek
- Innovative Reuse at Shirley Plantation
- Landfill Cover at Quarantine Road (Innovative Reuse)
- Millennium
- Ordnance Depot (GSA)

Other Updates & Next Meeting

Lauren Franke, MES

Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on March 29th, 10:00 am, in the Maryland Environmental Service Conference Room.

Ms. Franke stated that the next meeting will be a scoring meeting and that a draft scoring will be provided to the BEWG. Additionally, attendees will receive fact sheets that are currently being prepared by the consultants. She added that the goal is to have the scoring and ranking completed for the Harbor Team to review at the April 14th Harbor Team meeting.