



MEETING NOTES

TO:	Mike Flanagan Town of Wellfleet 300 Main Street Wellfleet, MA 02667	DATE: August 2, 2015
		BCE# 34031
		RE: Town of Wellfleet Dredging
FROM:	Russell Titmuss	SUBJ.: Pre-Application Meeting July 28 th , 2015

TOWN OF WELFLEET MAINTENANCE DREDGING PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

Location: Wellfleet Town Hall

Attendees: See attached list

1. BCE gave an overview of the proposed dredging project referencing plans as attached.
 - a. Two Areas of Dredging
 - i. Area I is around the Town Pier and to the north of the Federal Navigation Project.
 1. Includes channels around pier providing access to marina
 2. Last dredged approx. 2002
 3. Approx. 15.5 acres
 4. Approx. 120,000 cubic yards
 - ii. Area II is south of the Federal Navigation Project
 1. Town Mooring Basin
 2. Last dredged approx. 1957
 3. Approx. 22 acres
 4. Approx. 250,000 cubic yards
 - iii. All areas are mostly outside ACEC
 1. ACEC was drawn around previous dredging limits
 2. Area II has slight discrepancy between MA GIS mapping of ACEC and previous dredging license plan
2. Question was asked if Town project could be combined with proposed US Army Corps (USACE) Dredging
 - a. Due to current TOY restrictions unlikely to be possible. Estimated volumes would require separate dredging plant for each area to complete in limited time. This would lead to conflicts between barges, dredge plant.
 - b. Expect separate projects
 - c. USACE has no funding in place yet
 - d. Current TOY for USACE project is July and August
 - i. Winter flounder Jan - June
 - ii. Shellfish June - Aug
 - iii. Right Whale Jan - ?



- iv. Diamondback Terrapin – TBD but prefer dredging while still active – before October
 1. Study performed by Town found some individuals brumate in channels
 2. # in channels was small percentage but still some present
 3. Mostly still moving October to December
 4. MESA – to avoid take, not one individual can be impacted. Unless dredging is Jul, Aug there is likely to be a take however small.
 5. Need to continue to monitor, TOY revision would require more definite evidence to find no take.
3. USACE Project
 - a. Proposed Disposal is offshore at Cape Cod Bay Disposal Site
 - b. A proposed option to use spoils for Herring River restoration has been considered but is considered unlikely
 - i. Material proposed to be hydraulically dredged and placed on marsh
 - c. BCE to review samples to verify organic content and possible suitability of dredge spoils from Town project
4. All dredging will be by mechanical method
 - a. Material is “black mayonnaise” and would be dredged using environmental bucket
 - b. Silt curtains are not practical to reduce turbidity – comply with TOY
5. Anticipated Durations of work
 - a. USACE Project estimated at 12 to 14 week
 - b. Area I dredging around 10 weeks duration
 - c. Area II dredging around 16 weeks duration
 - d. USACE noted that TOY restrictions are compressing project duration and leading to significantly higher costs on projects.
 - i. Duxbury was cited as example.
 1. 200,000 cubic yards
 2. \$5.7 million - \$1.5 million over budget
6. Comments/Concerns
 - a. NOAA Fisheries
 - i. Area II is larger concern
 1. Area
 2. Time since last dredging
 3. Shellfish resources
 4. Need more detailed EFH assessment with impacts
 - b. MA DMF
 - i. Intertidal areas are Special Aquatic Site – need clear determination of acreage impacted
 - ii. Anticipated TOY
 1. Winter flounder Feb 1st to June 30th
 2. Shellfish Sept 1st to Nov – needs to be reviewed to confirm if required
 - c. USACE
 - i. Special Aquatic Site may require mitigation
 1. DCR expressed concern that maintenance project would require mitigation
 2. USACE Operations and Engineering would not expect mitigation for USACE maintenance projects



- d. MEPA office
 - i. Would need to consider if Area II is maintenance or improvement dredging. If many years have passed, may not be considered maintenance
 - 1. DCR expressed concern that this was against established precedent
 - If area is shown to have been previously dredged, should be maintenance
 - Long period may lead to more review but still maintenance within regulations
 - Dredging Coordination Committee has discussed previously and, if approach is changing, should be discussed again
- e. NHESP
 - i. Process for terrapins
 - 1. MESA review – hard to avoid a “take”
 - 2. Require Conservation Amendment Permit
 - Minimize impacts
 - Insignificant number of individual impacted – study already supports this
 - Mitigation is required
 - Need to provide net benefit for species
 - Mitigation could be habitat restoration, funding for research, etc.

The foregoing reflects the writer’s understanding of items discussed and conclusions reached. Any discrepancies or misunderstandings should be brought to the attention of the writer immediately. Please forward any comments, errors, or omissions to these meeting notes to Russell Titmuss at rtitmuss@bournece.com.