

**FINAL**  
**SUMMARY OF THE MARYLAND BAY ENHANCEMENT WORKING GROUP**  
**CONFINED AQUATIC DISPOSAL SUBCOMMITTEE**  
**September 12, 2024, 1:00 PM**  
**Hybrid Meeting**

***Members Attending:***

*Anne Arundel County Department of Planning:* Kelly Krinetz

*Anne Arundel County Waterfront Community Representative:* Kelly Hunt

*Baltimore City Waterfront Community Representative:* Adam Lindquist

*Baltimore County Waterfront Community Representative:* Tasha Gresham-James

*Bay Enhancement Working Group:*

*Anne Arundel County Department of Public Works:* David Braun, Karen Henry

*Baltimore County Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability:* David Riter

*Baltimore City Department of Planning:* Grace Hansen

*Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF):* Gussie Maguire

*Maryland Board of Public Works (BPW):* Bill Morgante

*Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR):* Gwen Gibson, Roland Limpert, Richard Ortt

*Maryland Department of the Environment:* Matthew Wallach

*Maryland Environmental Service:* Dallas Henson, Lauren Mentzer

*Maryland Geologic Survey (MGS):* Stephen Van Ryswick

*Maryland Watermen's Association:* Tim Mortus

*National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA):* Kevin Schabow

*University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (UMCES):* Andrew Heyes, Elizabeth Price, Lorie Staver, Lisa Wainger

*U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):* Maria Teresi

*U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Chesapeake Bay Field Office (CBFO):* Robbie Callahan

*U.S. Geological Service (USGS):* Forrest Vanderbilt

*Blue Water Baltimore:* Daniel O'Leary

*Maryland House of Delegates Representative:* Brian Chisholm, Nic Kipke

*Senate of Maryland Representative:* Bryan Simonaire

***Support Staff and Others Attending:***

*Angie Ashley Consulting:* Angie Ashley

*Anchor QEA (Anchor):* Mark Reemts

*Community Members:* Darrell Abed, David Copley, Dawn Hagerty, Ray Henn, John Garofolo, Noland North, Greg Sliviak, Ruth Sliviak, Chuck Thompson

*EA Engineering, Science and Technology (EA):* Peggy Derrick\*, Cynthia Cheatwood

*Johns Hopkins University:* William Ball

*Maryland Environmental Service (MES):* Kenna Oseroff

*Marylanders Grow Oysters (MGO) Program:* Carl Treff

*Maryland Port Administration (MPA):* Jennifer Guthrie, Katrina Jones, Holly Miller, Darren Swift

*National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA):* Karen Greene, Briana Yancy

*The Terrapin Institute:* Marguerite Whilden

*U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):* Rachel Kierzewski

\*Confined Aquatic Disposal Subcommittee Facilitator

### **Action Items:**

- The Maryland Port Administration (MPA) will gather information on the implementation of Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) in other states.
- The final meeting materials including the PowerPoint presentation from the 9/12 CAD Subcommittee meeting will be uploaded to the [file Share Folder](#).
- The Maryland Geological Survey (MGS) study [Baltimore Harbor Multi-Dimensional Sedimentary Metals Study](#) will be shared with the Subcommittee.
- A hydrodynamic expert will be invited to an upcoming meeting to aid discussions on tidal flow influences and modeling.
- MPA will follow up with Sen. Simonaire to aid in providing sediment quality data of the Baltimore Harbor in relation to the greater Chesapeake Bay.
- MPA will request information from MDE about how the 2016 CAD pilot project was deemed “confined”.
- A summary of community questions and concerns related to a proposed second CAD pilot will be added as a future agenda item to the November meeting.
- MPA will post the CAD Subcommittee meeting summaries on the CAD Subcommittee DMMP webpage when finalized.
- Recommendations generated by the CAD Subcommittee will be available to the public in meeting summaries and in the resulting report to the DMMP.
- "Consensus" will be clarified within the CAD Subcommittee prior to scoring options for a second CAD pilot location.

### **1.0 Welcome and Introduction**

**Ms. Peggy Derrick, EA**

Ms. Derrick welcomed attendees and called the meeting to order. A list of the CAD Subcommittee members was presented for review. Ms. Derrick requested all members of the CAD Subcommittee, as well as community members, to announce their names and affiliations.

### **2.0 CAD Subcommittee Framework**

**Ms. Peggy Derrick, EA**

Ms. Derrick provided an overview of the CAD Subcommittee framework. Senate Bill 353 (SB 353) was submitted in January 2024 and detailed the formation of a CAD Task Force. Although SB 353 did not pass into law, the Maryland Port Administration (MPA) is committed to moving forward with a CAD Subcommittee under the Dredged Material Management Program (DMMP) Bay Enhancement Working Group (BEWG) to explore the technical aspects of CAD.

Ms. Derrick reviewed the structure of the DMMP committee system. The BEWG provides scientific and technical guidance to other committees in the DMMP. The BEWG is composed of

technical personnel with expertise relevant to environmental issues in the Chesapeake Bay region. BEWG members represent resource management and regulatory agencies at the federal and state levels, local governments, and stakeholder groups. The BEWG develops and utilizes tools to assess both environmental and social impacts/benefits associated with dredged material management options. The BEWG provides technical review, feedback, and recommendations for the state of Maryland's DMMP.

As a subcommittee of the BEWG, the CAD Subcommittee will review the technical aspects of CAD. The CAD Subcommittee will provide recommendations and findings through the DMMP committee structure, including the DMMP Management and Executive Committees.

Ms. Derrick reviewed the structure of the CAD Subcommittee membership. The CAD Subcommittee is set to be diverse and represent multiple stakeholders, including BEWG members, one member of the Senate, one member of the House of Delegates, Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning, and three members who represent a waterfront community in close proximity to the Baltimore Harbor. The committee is a technical working group; however, public attendees are welcome to join the CAD Subcommittee meetings. Public attendees are given time at the end of the meeting to interact with the technical members and to ask questions.

The expectations of the members were reviewed. To allow the progression of meaningful discussion, CAD Subcommittee members should provide consistent participation. The duties and responsibilities of the members include providing feedback and advice as requested; serving as a liaison to other people within their agencies/community; participating in as many meetings as possible; and reviewing meeting materials in advance. It is requested that members be fair-minded and considerate of others' viewpoints. The CAD Subcommittee brings together technical expertise and awareness of relevant issues and topics, so it is requested that members be collaborative, provide input, and review information as requested. Members should also have the willingness to be non-biased and to objectively review the scientific information that is discussed in the CAD Subcommittee.

Ms. Derrick reviewed the goals and objectives of the CAD Subcommittee. The goals and objectives include, but are not limited to, reviewing the overall concept, need, viability, and available options associated with the second CAD pilot project; identifying and reviewing potential environmental and socio-economic benefits and impacts associated with the second CAD pilot project; assessing the sediment quality of the dredged material that will be placed within the second CAD pilot site; reviewing and collaborating on the site selection process for a second CAD pilot site; and developing a report with a group consensus to be submitted to the DMMP Management and Executive Committees.

Ms. Derrick reviewed the schedule and structure of the CAD Subcommittee meetings. Currently, five (5) hybrid meetings are anticipated to be held on the second Thursday of each month from 1:00 to 3:00 pm. The meeting agenda includes 90 minutes for presentations and technical discussion, followed by 30 minutes of open discussion for committee and community members. Ms. Derrick also reviewed the meeting topics that are anticipated to be discussed during the five (5) meetings. This schedule can be adjusted if it is determined that additional investigations are needed to help guide the CAD Subcommittee toward better understanding and recommendations.

Sen. Simonaire asked when the concept, need, and viability of a second CAD pilot project will be discussed. Ms. Derrick and Mr. Reemts shared that this topic will be discussed as a part of the current and future meetings including as a part of the DMMP capacity planning and the 2021 site selection background discussions.

Mr. O’Leary asked if the slideshow would be available to the public. Mr. Swift shared that all meeting materials can be found through the [file share folder link](#) located at the bottom of the meeting agenda. The meeting materials can also be found on the [DMMP website](#).

### **3.0 DMMP Capacity Planning and Needs**

**Mr. Darren Swift, MPA**

Mr. Swift reviewed the DMMP capacity plan and associated needs. Throughout the years, the Port of Baltimore has been successful due to its relatively inland location. To maintain safe and efficient passage for ships through the channel system, the channels must be dredged to maintain its depth. Each year the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) removes five million (5,000,000) cubic yards (cy) of dredged material. Placement options for this material are dependent on the dredging location.

Mr. Swift reviewed the long-range capacity plan which is a 20-year rolling plan that was established under the Dredged Material Management Act of 2001 to oversee the dredged material placement capacity. MPA annually assesses the capacity of placement sites using historical data and estimates from the USACE. Sediment dredged from the Baltimore Harbor, which is defined as water north and west of the North Point / Rock Point Line, is placed at Cox Creek DMCF and Masonville DMCF. The dredged material management solutions for the Baltimore Harbor channels were developed collaboratively through the DMMP committee structure, including the Harbor Team Committee and the BEWG in 2011.

In November 2018, MPA advertised a research and development (R&D) request for proposals related to dredged material end uses. The Maryland Board of Public Works (BPW) approved eight (8) innovative reuse (IR) R&D contract awards to investigate high-volume sustainable reuse applications to potentially support large-scale IR at the Port of Baltimore. All materials used to produce IR products were evaluated and tested thoroughly through the *Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) Innovative Reuse and Beneficial Use (IRBU) of Dredged Material Guidance Document* in which they have met all the necessary criteria. Results from six (6) of the projects have been shared with the public and the final presentations are available on the [IRBU Program Webtool](#). An additional opportunity arose outside of the R&D projects with the COMUS company. COMUS developed natural supplementary cementitious material using dredged material which yields a more durable product of Portland cement. Development of cement using this method reduces resulting water infiltration and reduces greenhouse gas emissions by not using any fossil fuels. MPA believes that the IR program will be a major contributing factor that ensures the extended life of the Cox Creek DMCF.

The Cox Creek Sediment Technology and Reuse (STAR) facility was purchased by MPA to be used for IR. The Cox Creek STAR facility is in close proximity to the Cox Creek DMCF, strategically making it an ideal location for IR. The property was previously under heavy industrial

use including the manufacturing of titanium dioxide, so it is anticipated that the property will undergo a phased remediation over the next ten (10) years. As various phases of the remediation work are being completed, units will become available for the development of IR. MPA has submitted remediation action plans to MDE for approval associated with the project, and the last plan is anticipated to be submitted in November 2024. After the plans are approved, the next step is physical remediation work.

Mr. Swift reviewed MPA's short- and long-term goals for IR operations. The short-term goal is for MPA to establish a geotube field for large-scale dewatering activities. Planning is currently underway for a dewatering area, stockpile locations, and material hauling routes on the property. To aid in the understanding of and in preparation for the completion of remediation work, a geotube pilot project has been initiated. It is exciting for MPA to have readily available IRBU material for projects and the capacity to continually dewater material. This has previously been an issue due to limited space and significant space is needed for such a program. The long-term goal for the IRBU program is to establish multiple large-scale IR production facilities at the Cox Creek STAR Facility. MPA is in the process of drafting a Request for Information (RFI) to collect information from potential developers. The intention of this RFI is to support future coordination with developers with the goal of lease opportunities at the Cox Creek STAR Facility. Overall, the ultimate goal is to phase in capacity recovery through the IRBU program increasing the reuse of 500,000 CY annually.

Ms. Derrick requested clarification on how CAD fits into the long-range capacity plan. Mr. Swift stated that there are pinch points in the capacity plan schedule which are dependent on the timing of the establishment of the IR program at the Cox Creek STAR facility. Therefore, it is important to explore all viable options for the management of dredged material. Completing a second CAD pilot project would help MPA further investigate CAD, which is critical in the determination of CAD as a viable placement option.

Sen. Simonaire inquired about the amount of dredged material that would be contained in a second CAD pilot project. Mr. Swift stated that the specifics of a second CAD pilot are among the CAD Subcommittee discussion items. However, in general, the capacity area cannot be determined until estimates are provided by the USACE. Sen. Simonaire also expressed the importance of considering the community's concerns when moving forward with the CAD pilot project. Mr. Swift agreed and stated that more information regarding site selection would be provided, as well as the use of a scoring matrix to help determine locations for a second CAD pilot project.

Del. Kipke inquired about HarborRock, a private company that has been involved in proposing options for IR of dredged material and whether their projects were being considered as viable options for management of dredged material. Mr. Swift confirmed that HarborRock will be the last award under the R&D RFP projects. They will study the feasibility of using Cox Creek dredged material as lightweight aggregate and supplementary cementitious material.

Mr. Ortt summarized his understanding of the long-range capacity planning needs stating that approximately 1,000,000 cubic yards of material is dredged from the Baltimore Harbor channels annually and requires management. Within the next 20 to 27 years, it is projected that the current placement capacity will be exhausted. However, it is imperative to identify additional capacity for

dredged material placement to maintain the Port of Baltimore's operational continuity and long-term economic viability. Additionally, most of the aforementioned companies MPA is looking to partner with are looking for long-term commitments, so MPA needs to demonstrate a viable strategy far beyond the 20–25-year timeframe. Mr. Swift concurred and elaborated that the major placement capacity challenges are related to the Baltimore Harbor channels.

Sen. Simonaire raised a question regarding the prohibition on placing dredged material from the Baltimore Harbor beyond the North Point/Rock Point Line, inquiring whether there is scientific evidence supporting the placement of this material outside of the designated boundary. Mr. Swift responded that MPA has not investigated this issue, as placing dredged material from Baltimore Harbor outside of the established parameters is prohibited. Mr. Ortt added that several environmental groups, including the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Maryland Geological Survey, and EA, have conducted sediment sampling. The results indicate that sediment in certain areas of Baltimore Harbor is of similar quality to the sediment found outside the North Point/Rock Point Line. If the legislation were amended to establish scientific parameters rather than an arbitrary geographic boundary, it could potentially balance the approach to managing sediment.

#### **4.0 2016 CAD Pilot Project Review**

**Mr. Mark Reemts, Anchor**

Mr. Reemts informed the Subcommittee that he will review the 2016 CAD pilot project, focusing on completed studies and key findings. Given the extensive information available on this program, the presentation will cover summary points, while more detailed information is available in the [CAD Subcommittee share folder](#).

The 2016 CAD pilot project originated as a recommendation from the DMMP Harbor Team in 2011 and was completed after several years of initial studies and stakeholder coordination. This was a novel concept for Maryland and was implemented to evaluate CAD as an option for sediment management in the harbor and to address questions about its regulatory viability. After undergoing the public notice and permitting process, construction began in 2016, with material placement starting in early 2017, followed by several years of monitoring to assess the behavior of the placed material and whether it was effectively confined.

The project was constructed within a vessel berth adjacent to the Masonville DMCF. To create the pilot CAD cell, approximately 130,000 cy of primarily sandy material was removed. Approximately 62,000 cy of maintenance material from the nearby Ferry Bar channel was then placed in the pilot CAD cell. The dredging operation took approximately 20 to 30 days, with the placement completed in about seven days. Due to material bulking during placement, a larger volume of space was required, with material initially expanding as it was placed before consolidating over time. The final amount placed was 62,000 cubic yards.

Qualities identified for an ideal pilot site by the prior BEWG planning recommended a relatively thin layer of fine grain sediment, a nearby placement site for the fine grain sediment, relatively low tidal current velocity, a surrounding area already covered with unsuitable sediment, and existing channels and anchorages that have been dredged within the Patapsco River target area. The Masonville site was selected due to known information following the construction of the

Masonville DMCF and close proximity to placement within the Kurt Iron Slip within the DMCF. Vessel activities taking place in the active berth proved to be a major challenge resulting in construction difficulties and indications of scour in the CAD site.

Stakeholder engagement was a pivotal aspect of the project planning, involving extensive communication with state agencies to address concerns related to sediment mobilization and potential nutrient releases into the water column. After review of potential risks, there was an emphasis on monitoring and understanding nutrient dynamics, particularly nitrogen, in the context of total maximum daily loadings (TMDLs) in the Chesapeake Bay. The permitting process adhered to standard regulatory protocols, including engagement of the Joint Evaluation Committee related to tidal wetlands licensing and a water quality certification.

Studies focused on sediment characterization from both the CAD cell and the material slated for placement. A comprehensive monitoring program was established, including baseline and during construction water quality studies and post-placement bathymetry assessments to evaluate consolidation and sediment behavior to determine whether the placed material was confined in the CAD cell. Both sediment and elutriate samples were collected. Sediment samples were analyzed for various contaminants, including heavy metals, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and pesticides, using established screening criteria. Results indicated that sediment quality was generally below established effect ranges, with only minor exceedances noted.

The investigations also included a nutrient assessment to gauge potential nutrient releases during material placement. Baseline sampling and modeling efforts demonstrated localized nutrient dynamics, with results indicating transient increases in nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations immediately post-placement, followed by rapid dissipation.

Throughout the construction phase, monitoring focused on both nutrient levels and turbidity following guidance from regulatory stakeholders. The results consistently fell within the ranges established in baseline monitoring, suggesting minimal, short-term impact from material placement. Overall, the monitoring data reaffirmed the effectiveness of the CAD approach while addressing stakeholder concerns regarding sediment behavior and water quality impacts.

The post-placement consolidation monitoring was conducted to evaluate the behavior of material after its placement and to assess how it consolidated over time. Hydrographic surveys were performed immediately following placement and at regular intervals, specifically at two weeks, one month, and subsequently at increasing intervals, as consolidation was anticipated to decelerate. Initial findings revealed consistent consolidation across the footprint, generally following expected consolidation rates. However, the nine-month survey identified an unexpected reduction in elevation in a specific area, suggesting potential scouring caused by vessel propeller activity.

In response to the findings from the nine-month survey, monitoring frequency and duration were increased to ascertain whether the observed scouring was a transient occurrence or indicative of a more persistent issue. Subsequent surveys conducted at the 12 through 21-month marks demonstrated a return to expected consolidation rates, with no further scour observed and the material consolidating effectively within the footprint.

By the two-year mark which ended the initial monitoring program period, consolidation remained as anticipated with the exception of the scour impact in one corner of the CAD footprint. Recent surveys indicated a positive deposition trend, with survey data illustrating increased elevation across the majority of the footprint although potential propwash influence is evident in reduced deposition in the same location as previous scouring. The project incorporated collaborative efforts with multiple stakeholders and ongoing evaluations to understand the influences affecting consolidation, identify potential data gaps, and derive insights for future projects.

Ms. Staver inquired about the current status of the berth area associated with the 2016 CAD pilot project, specifically whether it remains active and if material accumulation has occurred during its active use. Mr. Reemts confirmed that the site is still operational, with vessels regularly entering the berth area. He noted that deposition continues to be observed within the footprint, indicating ongoing material accumulation in the area.

Ms. Gibson inquired whether the results from the sediment testing were assessed in relation to the IRBU Guidance Document. Mr. Reemts shared that such a comparison was not conducted. However, it can be speculated that the material would likely fall within Category 2 due to the background concentrations of arsenic. Ms. Derrick further clarified that the IRBU Guidance Document would only be relevant to the dredged material that was removed to create the cell, rather than to the material that was subsequently placed into the CAD cell.

Mr. Ortt raised a question regarding the legal definition and classification of material placement options, in particular, whether material placed in the CAD cell qualifies as open water placement or beneficial use under existing legal frameworks. Mr. Wallach clarified that a CAD cell is not considered beneficial use but is considered a placement site. CAD cells are permitted under current regulations as they are considered confined, which was demonstrated by the first pilot project. Mr. Garofolo asked where the definition of “confined” can be located. Ms. Mentzer clarified that the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) states that Baltimore Harbor dredged material cannot be placed in an unconfined manner and provides examples of confinement.

Mr. North asked if the need for a cap would be a part of the discussion regarding CAD. Mr. Reemts explained that caps are typically employed to manage heavily contaminated materials, serving to prevent the leaching of contaminants into the water column or physically separating the material from aquatic life. In this instance, the sediments involved in the pilot CAD project were comparable to other sediments in the harbor which did not present significant contamination concerns and did not require installation of a cap. Ms. Derrick stated that the issue of a cap could continue to be considered as a discussion topic within the subcommittee.

Mr. Limpert inquired about the dredging history of the Masonville Vessel Berth, the site of the first CAD pilot project, prior to its implementation. Mr. Reemts confirmed that the area, being an active berth, had undergone dredging in the past. As one of the Harbor Team recommended options, the selected pilot site had reduced overburden material to manage, which is advantageous for a CAD site.



Mr. Treff inquired whether a study would be conducted to predict potential scouring or sediment migration from the selected site prior to construction. Mr. Reemts responded that, for the previously proposed second pilot location, a model had been utilized to assess factors such as water currents, tidal cycles, wind, waves, and storm activity that could influence sediment movement. This model incorporated site-specific data and tracked particle movement to predict sediment behavior. Mr. Garofolo followed up by asking if hydrodynamic measurements would also be evaluated. Mr. Reemts confirmed that such measurements had been recorded at the previously proposed second pilot location.

Mr. Ortt inquired whether sediment cores were collected during each monitoring survey for bulk weight analysis. Mr. Reemts clarified that no cores had been collected for this purpose. However, he noted that bulk weight analysis and other relevant studies could be conducted depending on the timeline for the second CAD pilot project.

Mr. Copley inquired about the CAD project area and if methane generation from the overburden material, as a result of the sediment's high organic content and decomposing vegetative matter, was a concern. Mr. Reemts shared that there is no difference between the dredging of the CAD cell and any other dredging activity, sediment is handled similarly, and methane does not impact removal or management. Mr. Reemts noted it would be ideal to find a site with a minimal layer of overburden as this material would need to be managed the same as other dredging projects.

Ms. Sliviak raised a question regarding potential coordination between the CAD project and the reconstruction of the Francis Scott Key Bridge, especially considering plans to increase the bridge's size and the involvement of multiple agencies in reviewing the CAD effort. In response, Mr. Reemts clarified that the CAD project and the bridge reconstruction are independent and unrelated initiatives, with no direct overlap between the two. Additionally, while the new bridge may have an increased clearance, the USACE has set dredging depth limits.

Mr. Ortt shared that his recollection of the CAD recommendation from 2011 under the BEWG was specific to previously modified areas, such as channels and slips, rather than virgin bottom areas. This distinction is critical to ensure that current plans align with earlier environmental and regulatory guidance. Ms. Mentzer clarified that the 2011 recommendation was to further study the CAD process. Ms. Derrick elaborated that a more in-depth review of the 2011 process will occur in the next CAD Subcommittee meeting.

Ms. Derrick asked if the nutrient sampling was conducted throughout the year and if not, were the sampling events restricted to seasons with respect to nutrient releases. Mr. Reemts believes the nutrient sampling was conducted during a specific season to match the expected timing of the future filling operations but could confirm if needed. Additionally, there were no seasonal restrictions.

Mr. Treff expressed interest in having distinct core samples taken from potential CAD cells to determine whether a legacy toxin layer might be present. In response, Mr. Reemts explained that the 2016 CAD pilot project had collected core samples that captured the entire depth of the targeted CAD cell and homogenized the material for each sample location. Additionally, the 2021 proposal

involved sampling two distinct layers, including the upper surface overburden material and the deeper sand.

Ms. Sliviak voiced concern about the potential disturbance of the Chesapeake Bay bottom, particularly in light of recent improvements in water quality, and requested that the Subcommittee consider this during the project's review. To aid the Subcommittee with an understanding of community member concerns, Ms. Sliviak suggested a review of the legislative hearings. In response, Mr. Reemts shared that environmental assessments are an integral part of the project process and are conducted to address such concerns.

Ms. Sliviak inquired about the sand dredged as a part of the CAD cell development process, and which IRBU project it would relate to. Mr. Reemts stated that the use of any material generated from a future CAD cell is not known at this time, and the use will depend on the timing of the potential CAD construction and identified IR needs at that time.

Mr. Garofolo asked if a citizens' group could have the opportunity to present their perspectives to the CAD Subcommittee and enter a document for record. Ms. Derrick indicated that the request could be considered but may not be accommodated until the November CAD Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Swift suggested that the presentation may be better suited for the CAC.

Mr. Ball suggested that an expert in hydrodynamic modeling could assist the CAD Subcommittee in understanding the uncertainties associated with the hydrodynamic model and specifically asked how to differentiate between scouring and compaction in relation to a negative value in the hydrodynamic model. In response, Mr. Reemts indicated that the hydrodynamic modeling group at Anchor could support this request. He further explained that analyzing the movement and accumulation of sediments outside the CAD cell is crucial for determining the distinction between scouring and compaction.

Mr. Limpert inquired whether the previous surveys of sediments in Baltimore Harbor were sufficiently robust to determine what percentage of the harbor meets the criteria for CAD. In response, Mr. Ort stated that several studies have been conducted, including the [\*Baltimore Harbor Multi-Dimensional Sedimentary Metals Study\*](#) completed by the MGS, which collected samples to inform the MDE IRBU Guidance Document, noting that he is not familiar with the site-specific criteria for CAD.

Ms. Whilden expressed her concerns about the CAD project, specifically regarding the perceived imbalance in representation among community stakeholders. In response, Ms. Derrick shared that the CAD Subcommittee is committed to using scientific principles to objectively evaluate CAD as a management option for dredged material. The Subcommittee will thoroughly examine all available information to assess whether CAD is an appropriate method for implementation.

Mr. Henn asked if new core samples would be obtained given the recent bridge collapse, which could have caused sediment disturbance in the area. Ms. Derrick stated that although the previously recommended second CAD pilot site was in an area near the Francis Scott Key Bridge, it is not certain that the same site would be recommended again. Data collection would be considered depending on the proposed sites.

## **5.0 Future Planning and Next Steps**

**Ms. Peggy Derrick, EA**

Ms. Derrick reviewed the CAD Subcommittee schedule. The next hybrid CAD Subcommittee meeting will be held on October 10, 2024, from 1:00 to 3:00 pm. The in-person portion will be held at the Cox Creek Operations and Maintenance Building. The next meeting topics are planned to include the 2011 BEWG CAD recommendation process and matrix scoring, and the 2021 site selection and permitting procedures.

## **6.0 Open Discussion**

**Ms. Peggy Derrick, EA**

Mr. Copley inquired about the project's goals, stating that the potential positive outcomes associated with the project are highlighted but there is an absence in regard to potential negative impacts. Ms. Derrick emphasized that a thorough analysis will be incorporated into the scoring process, which will include considerations of both negative and positive implications.

Ms. Sliviak requested that contingency planning in the event that the CAD project moves forward, and unforeseen situations arise also be investigated. Ms. Derrick concurred that this could be a future topic for the Subcommittee.

Mr. Morgante expressed support for a presentation conducted by a community group noting that such contribution would make the process inclusive.

On behalf of Sen. Simonare, Mr. Garofolo inquired about the availability of the meeting summary on the website, if there will be voting on the recommendations, and if the final recommendations would be made public. In response, Mr. Swift confirmed that meeting summaries will be posted to the website. The exact posting date has yet to be determined, however, the intent is to share the summary with the committee members in advance of the next scheduled meeting. Regarding the final recommendations, these will be developed through a consensus-building process among the group members. Once finalized, they will be published publicly in line with existing transparency protocols, similar to other DMMP publications, such as the DMMP Annual Report.

Mr. Garofolo suggested that a topic at an upcoming meeting be the process for determining and scoring consensus, noting that the details are unclear. Coming to a "consensus" will be clarified within the CAD Subcommittee prior to scoring options for a second CAD pilot location.

## **6.0 Adjournment**

**Ms. Peggy Derrick, EA**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 pm.