

DRAFT
MARYLAND BAY ENHANCEMENT WORKING GROUP
CONFINED AQUATIC DISPOSAL SUBCOMMITTEE

March 13, 2025, 1:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **Introduction and Agenda:** Ms. Derrick facilitated the meeting. The agenda, committee members, and observers were introduced. A table was shared with the CAD Subcommittee showing agencies/organizations/stakeholders' overall attendance. All meeting materials can be found in the Subcommittee [share file](#) including the [meeting recording](#).
- **February Final Meeting Key Takeaways:** The final key takeaways from the February 13th meeting are available in the [share file](#) including the [audio recording](#).
- **Action Items Review:** Ms. Derrick reviewed the action items from the previous meeting, categorizing them as completed or in progress, and provided updates on each item. Mr. Swift provided an update on action items related to the MPA's coordination with Senator Simonaire. (The list of action items can be found in the [March 13th meeting presentation](#)).
- **Meeting Schedule:** Ms. Derrick noted that the meetings are scheduled at the Cox Creek Operations and Maintenance Facility on the second Thursday of each month from 1:00 to 3:00 PM. However, the March meeting is anticipated to be the final CAD Subcommittee meeting, so the schedule has been modified to include an additional 30 minutes. The meeting agenda will include 120 minutes for technical presentations and discussion, followed by 30 minutes of open discussion for both Committee members and observers.
- **Report Process:** Ms. Derrick reviewed the outline of the CAD Subcommittee report process. As a reminder, the report will include the following components: final scoring matrix consensus dissents, recommendations for future studies, parameter information for all attributes, and community input. The Subcommittee members will be provided with the draft report on April 28th and will have three (3) weeks to review and provide comments. During the 3-week period, two (2) "drop-in" review sessions will be held to allow members to discuss edits to the report. The review sessions will be held virtually, and meeting invitations will be provided via email. The dates for the review sessions are currently scheduled for May 8th and May 14th. The Subcommittee's comments on the draft report are due on May 19th. The comments will be incorporated into the report, which is anticipated to be finalized by June 2nd. The finalized CAD Subcommittee report will be shared at the next Bay Enhancement Working Group (BEWG) meeting as well as the upcoming Dredged Material Management Program (DMMP) Management Committee, Executive Committee, and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings. The current report schedule is as follows:

Event	Date
Report Due to CAD Subcommittee for Review	April 28, 2025
“Drop-in” Review Session for Comments #1	May 8, 2025
“Drop-in” Review Session for Comments #2	May 14, 2025
CAD Subcommittee Comments on Report Due	May 19, 2025
Final Report Due	June 2, 2025
BEWG Meeting	TBD – Early June
Management Committee Meeting	June 18, 2025
Executive Committee Meeting	August 18, 2025
Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting	September 24, 2025

- **Scoring and Parameters Review:** Ms. Mentzer reviewed the scoring matrix and parameters.
 - **Scoring Framework:** Scoring for most parameters will consider the end result of the CAD pilot project. The scoring considers long-term environmental and human use impacts associated with operations of a site or process, and selected short-term temporary impacts associated with construction as determined by the Subcommittee. The scoring also examines short-term social impacts, such as aesthetics, noise, public health, and public safety. Ms. Mentzer reminded the Subcommittee that each of the individual parameter scores is based on the Subcommittee’s consensus. Caveats will be added for any dissent from the consensus.
 - **Raw Scores and Scoring:** Each parameter will be assigned a score of +1, -1, 0 or 0. The raw scores are based upon existing data, historical information, and collective experience and knowledge of the Subcommittee and technical study team. The scoring will particularly depend on input from members with subject matter expertise. The Subcommittee will review the weighting factor, parameter descriptions, and scoring for each attribute.
 - **Regions for Potential CAD Pilot Cell:** A map was presented to outline the nine (9) regions that will be scored for further investigation for a potential CAD pilot cell. The nine (9) regions are listed in the 2025 draft scoring matrix.
 - **2025 Draft Scoring Matrix:** The Subcommittee continued reviewing the 2025 draft scoring matrix, and scores were assigned or adjusted based on group consensus. Comments and questions received from agencies via email prior to the March CAD Subcommittee meeting were also reviewed and discussed during the scoring process. Dissents received from agencies were noted to be included in the final report. The following dissents and caveats were noted during the March CAD Subcommittee meeting:
 - A dissent was noted from Blue Water Baltimore (BWB) for the long-term “Benthic Community” attribute. The consensus for this attribute is 0, underscore (0) for Regions 1 through 8, and 0 for Region 9. BWB advocated for Region 9 to also be 0 to align with the other regions. BWB noted that the consistent dredging of the channels should not preclude restoration of the benthic community.
 - The consensus for the “Protected Species” attribute is 0 for all regions. The Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) noted that there are no

species on the Sensitive Species Project Review Areas (SSPRA) list to negatively impact the Patapsco River at this time. A full consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and DNR would be required to determine if there are any new data/impacts.

- The consensus for the “Habitat of Particular Concern (HAPC)” attribute is 0 shaded (not applicable) for all regions as submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) is the only type of HAPC in the Patapsco River; it was deemed as ‘double counting’ if it is also scored under HAPC. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) dissented to the consensus as NOAA believes the HAPC rating should match the “SAV” attribute for consistency.
 - BWB noted that although the attribute is specific for the NOAA definition of HAPC, the Patapsco River is susceptible to human induced degradation and is environmentally stressed. For this reason, the Patapsco River should be particularly preserved and protected.
- The consensus for the “Wading and Shorebird Use” attribute is 0 for all regions. DNR noted the colonial nesting colony on Fort Carroll, which slightly overlaps between Regions 5 and 9. Given the required 0.25-mile distance and time of year restrictions, DNR recommends assigning a value of 0 to these regions, provided that any placed CAD pilot cell remains outside the 0.25-mile buffer of the nesting colony.
- The consensus for the “Aesthetics” attribute is -1 for Region 1, 0 for Regions 7 and 8, and 0 for the remaining regions. The University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (UMCES) noted that the scoring in Regions 7 and 8 would depend on the exact location of the CAD pilot cell given the regions' large geographic areas. A CAD pilot cell located 0.5 miles or less from the shore would have an aesthetic impact.
- The consensus for the “Noise” attribute is -1 for Regions 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. The remaining regions are 0. UMCES noted that these scores are dependent on the specific location of the CAD pilot cell, particularly distance from the shore, which includes 1,600 feet (ft) during the day and 6,400 ft during the night.
- The consensus for the “Commercial Socioeconomics” attribute is 0 for all regions. UMCES noted that there are two (2) active pound net locations near Region 7, at the southern end of North Point. These pound nets may be of concern for short-term impacts.
- The consensus for the “Environmental Justice” attribute is 0 for all regions. UMCES noted two caveats. First, a potential long-term impact of anything ‘of concern’ would be considered an Environmental Justice component in which scores would need to be reassessed. Second, scores related to the overburdened communities should be revised when data/information becomes available in the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) tool.
- The consensus for the “Beneficial Use-Other” attribute is 0 for Regions 1, 4, 7, and 9; +1 for Regions 2 and 8; and 0 for Regions 3, 5, and 6. The

representative for the office of Senator Simonaire dissented from the consensus by stating that all regions should be given a 0 since it was unknown how much beneficial material could be extracted from Region 8. The representative also expressed concern about how much material could be captured for reuse compared to how much sediment would be removed from the CAD pilot cell.

The subcommittee reviewed the final ranking order for the 9 regions. Region 9 had the highest score while Region 5 had the lowest score as shown in the table below.

Region	Rank
CAD Region 1 - Inner Harbor	7
CAD Region 2 - Masonville	2
CAD Region 3 – Dundalk Marine Terminal & Seagirt Marine Terminal	6
CAD Region 4 - Curtis Bay	8
CAD Region 5 - Sparrows Point Northwest	9
CAD Region 6 - Lower Patapsco West	4
CAD Region 7 - Sparrows Point Southeast	5
CAD Region 8 - Lower Patapsco East	3
CAD Region 9 - Federal Shipping Channels	1

- **Next Steps:**
 - Draft the CAD Subcommittee report and share the report with the Subcommittee for review.

Members Attending:

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:

Anchor QEA (Anchor): Mark Reemts

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

Baltimore City Department of Planning: Grace Hansen

Baltimore City Department of Public Works (DPW): Kimberly Grove

Baltimore County Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability: David Riter

Chesapeake Bay Foundation: Gussie Maguire

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

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE): Matt Wallach

Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR): Roland Limpert

Maryland Environmental Service (MES): Dallas Henson, Lauren Mentzer, Christine Offerman

Maryland Port Administration (MPA): Rachael Gilde, Kelvin Moulden, Darren Swift

Maryland Watermen's Association: Tim Mortus

National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA): Jonathan Watson

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. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA): Byron Riggins
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS): Robbie Callahan
Blue Water Baltimore: Alice Volpitta
Senate of Maryland Representative: John Garofolo

Additional Agency Members, Support Staff, and Others Attending:

Angie Ashley Consulting: Angie Ashley
Maryland Environmental Service (MES): Saeka Foreman
Maryland Port Administration (MPA): Holly Miller
Observers: William Ball, David Copley, Greg Sliviak, Ruth Sliviak, Chuck Thompson, Carl
Treff, Marguerite Whilden
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE): Kevin Fenyak, Rachel Kierzewski

*Confined Aquatic Disposal Subcommittee Facilitator