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(The hearing commenced at 6:31 p.m.)
MR. HABEL: Good evening, and welcome to the public hearing for the New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Project.

My name is Mark Habel. I'm Chief of the Navigation and Environmental Studies Section for the United States Army Corps of Engineers, New England District. I will be your moderator and facilitator tonight.

Before we begin, I would like to thank you for getting involved in this review process for the New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Project Study.

The New Haven Harbor deepening study is being undertaken by the Corps of Engineers in partnership with the project sponsor, the New Haven Port Authority, and with the Connecticut Port Authority.

Our hearing officer tonight is John Kennelly, Chief of the Planning Division for the Corps in New England.

Also here from the Corps New England District are Barbara Blumeris, our Project Manager, and Todd Randall, who helped write the Environmental Impact Statement; Lisa Winter, from
our Coastal Engineering Unit.
Should you need copies of the public notice, hearing procedures, or other pertinent information, it is available at the registration table in the back of the room.

Following this introduction, the project sponsors will give brief remarks. Judi Sheiffele is the Executive Director of the New Haven Port Authority. And following Judi will be Evan Matthews, the Executive Director of the Connecticut Port Authority.

Our hearing officer, John Kennelly, will then address the hearing. John will be followed by Barbara Blumeris, who will provide information on the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the New Haven Harbor Study. And Barbara will be followed by Todd Randall, who will provide an overview of the environmental investigations conducted during this study.

At the conclusion of these briefings, I will then review the Corps of Engineers responsibilities in this process and explain the hearing procedures.

Following that, I will open the floor to
public comment, utilizing the Corps of Engineers hearing protocol.

One additional reminder: We are here tonight to receive your comments, not to enter into any discussion of those comments or to reach any conclusions. Any questions should be directed to the record and not to the individuals on the panel.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to call on the representative from our non-federal study sponsor, Judi Sheiffele, Executive Director of the New Haven Port Authority. Judi?

MS. SHEIFFELE: Thanks, Mark.
My name is Judi Sheiffele, and, as Mark has told you, I am the Executive Director of the New Haven Port Authority.

The subject of tonight's hearing is to hear the Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement on the Navigational Improvement Project which would involve the deepening and widening of the federal channel in New Haven.

Deepening the channel from its current authorized depth of 35 to 40 feet is a major infrastructure improvement that when constructed will improve the safety and increase the efficiency
of the movement of vessels through the Port of New Haven.

Over the past three years, the Connecticut and New Haven Port Authorities have worked with the Army Corps of Engineers to assess the conditions in New Haven Harbor and make a determination as to whether a deepening is warranted. Tonight the Corps will be presenting the draft findings.

And in closing, I would like to thank you you all for coming, your interest in this project, and we look forward to hearing your comments.

MR. HABEL: Thank you, Judi.
Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to introduce Evan Matthews, Executive Director for the Connecticut Port Authority.

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you, Mark. My name is Evan Matthews. And I'm the Executive Director of the Connecticut Port Authority, headquartered in Old Saybrook, Connecticut.

We have enjoyed partnering with the New Haven Port Authority to fund this study. I want to thank the Army Corps for conducting this hearing and moving the project forward. We have used the resources of the CPA in recent weeks to
try to encourage involvement in this process because we believe public input leads to better results.

From the Port Authority's perspective, this project is entirely consistent with our overall goals outlined in the Port Authority's Connecticut maritime strategy, which is available on our website, which was released in August.

And that strategy puts an emphasis on maximizing the potential of Connecticut's three deep-water ports. Obviously, New Haven is one of those ports. As you'll hear in some of the analysis later on, it's one of the larger ports complexes in the state.

New Haven is particularly important in that strategy and long overdue for navigational improvements.

I'm sure that there are many ideas on how to improve the draft plan you have published. We look forward to hearing the public's input in person at these two hearings -- we were in West Haven last night -- and online, and I'm confident that you will take those public comments into account as the plan is finalized. Thank you very much.

MR. HABEL: Thank you, Evan.
Ladies and gentlemen, John Kennelly. MR. KENNELLY: Good evening. I would like to welcome you tonight to this public hearing regarding the New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Project Study.

I would also like to thank you for your involvement, for involving yourself in this study, and for providing us with your views and comments.

By conducting this public hearing, we, the Corps of Engineers, continue to fulfill our requirement to seek public comment and input relative to the New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Study.

While no decision will be made tonight, we welcome your comments on the New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Project Study. Your comments will be considered in our development of the Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement.

Please feel free to provide comments that you would like to enter into the record.

Additionally, we will receive written comments tonight and through November 15th, 2018. I assure you that all of your comments, written or
oral, will be addressed during this process, will be treated equally on the record, and will be considered in the development of the final report.

It is crucial to the public process that your voice be heard, and we're here to listen to your comments, to understand your concerns, and to provide you an opportunity to put your thoughts on the record should you care to do so.

The primary purpose of this hearing is to solicit the public's comments and input. However, the hearing will begin with the project team providing background information on the Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement, including details on the existing deep-draft navigation problems, alternatives evaluated, information on the Tentatively Selected Plan, and information on the dredge material and placement sites.

These presentations, at the beginning of each public hearing, will assist the public and agency reviewers in understanding the documents and the evaluation process which was followed; thus, aiding the public as they review the draft report. In addition to providing comments at the public hearing, the public may provide written
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| 1 | comments at any time during the public review |
| 2 | period. I would like to emphasize this is your |
| 3 | hearing, and we need you to assist us in this |
| 4 | public review process. |
| 5 | We want your comments on the draft report |
| 6 | so that we can consider all of the comments that we |
| 7 | receive, those made here tonight, as well as those |
| 8 | submitted during the public review period, in |
| 9 | preparing the Final Integrated Feasibility Report |
| 10 | and the EIS. Thank you. |
| 11 | MR. HABEL: Thank you, John. |
| 12 | Ladies and gentlemen, Barbara Blumeris. |
| 13 | MS. BLUMERIS: Good evening. Tonight |
| 14 | Todd and I will present summary information on the |
| 15 | planning process to reach the Tentatively Selected |
| 16 | Plan. |
| 17 | The slides that we share tonight will be |
| 18 | posted on our project website on Thursday. The |
| 19 | project website is included in the Fact Sheet, on |
| 20 | the back of the Fact Sheet. So you can see here's |
| 21 | the link to the project website. And they'll be |
| 22 | posted on that site |
| 23 | This first slide illustrates the Corps |
| 24 | planning process. We're about in the middle of the |
| 25 | process right now, starting on the reviews. So we |

have public review right now to November 15th. We also at the same time are conducting concurrent reviews with the agency technical review. That's an internal team of four reviewers, and then an independent external review by our panel of reviewers.

Next slide. The non-federal sponsors are here with us tonight. And they are cost-sharing this particular effort, 50 percent federal, 50 percent non-federal.

To conduct the study, we needed congressional authorization. And this slide provides the authorization that was provided by Congress in 2007 to conduct this feasibility study.

In 2015, we entered into that cost-sharing agreement with the Port Authority, and we started in earnest in 2016 on the effort.

The purpose of the study is to investigate improvements needed to provide a safe, reliable, efficient, and environmentally sustainable waterborne transportation system into New Haven. We're going to be determining whether the navigation improvements to the existing federal project at New Haven Harbor are warranted and in the federal interest.

tonnage.
In terms of total tonnage, this is the second largest port in New England, and the largest port in Connecticut. In 2016, the total freight traffic was 8.8 million metric tons, representing about 24 percent of all waterborne commerce in New England, and about 81 percent of all waterborne commerce in Connecticut.

The Northeast maintains a large refinery production/demand deficit, and must rely heavily on imported volumes of petroleum products in order to meet demand.

The port is a crucial import location for refined petroleum products, which supplies demand within Connecticut as well as the broader Northeast region.

The majority of the landside acreage in the Port of New Haven is devoted to energy-related uses. This represents a long-term land use and economic asset for the economy in the state of Connecticut.

Next slide. Petroleum products have historically constituted about 70 percent of channel tonnage. Data from 2016 is shown on this pie chart, with the petroleum products in blue.
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| 1 | You can see that, based on this one year, that, |
| 2 | yes, petroleum constitutes the most. |
| 3 | But we also have other important things |
| 4 | coming into the port, including dry bulk and break |
| 5 | bulk, including salt, sand, cement. And also we |
| 6 | have steel, rebar, and steel billets, steel rail. |
| 7 | But then we also have an export, which is |
| 8 | the scrap metal, which you probably may have |
| 9 | noticed as you drive on the highway, there's a huge |
| 10 | pile of scrap metal. And this is an export. |
| 11 | There's approximately 1 million tons of scrap metal |
| 12 | produced annually within the state, and |
| 13 | approximately half of that amount is exported |
| 14 | through the Port of New Haven. |
| 15 | Next slide. This, shows our port |
| 16 | terminals. Magellan, Motiva, and Gateway, one of |
| 17 | the larger terminals. So this is just a slide |
| 18 | showing the location of the facilities in the |
| 19 | harbor. |
| 20 | Next slide. |
| 21 | There are several problems with the |
| 22 | existing channel. One is the insufficient depth of |
| 23 | the main channel and the turning basin. And then |
| 24 | also there's a problem at the bend. So there's a |
| 25 | bend between the two breakwaters that protect the |

inner harbor, and the ships have to transect this bend.

The existing channel bend from the entrance channel to the interior is about 35 degrees, with the outer portion with a bend to the west. Large ships coming in on the flood are set further west because the current runs east to west. This pushes them towards the steep outer bank of the curve.

To compensate for this, pilots approach the bend on the far right side of the channel. As they come out of the bend, they go hard over full ahead to make the turn to not have the stern hit the west bank. This makes straightening the ship toward the next set of buoys very difficult since moving forward and turning at a high speed.

So the two problems here that we're trying to address are the channel depth as well as the bend in the channel.

Next slide. As I mentioned, the channel is authorized to minus 35 feet mean lower low water. So this provides unrestricted draft of 31 feet, which requires 4 foot of underkeel clearance. That means 4 feet of water below the bottom of the ship. Ships greater than 31 feet are
restricted. So they either have to come in on high tide or they have to lighter outside of the anchorage. This creates transportation inefficiency and results in additional transportation costs of bringing the cargo into the port.

Without an improvement project, shippers will continue to be limited to the size of the vessels they can call to port, leaving them unable to achieve the economies of scale of larger vessels, and ships would begin to bypass the port as they cannot bring their larger ships in and unload the cargo at the current dimensions of the channel.

Next slide. Once we identified the problem, we wanted to identify alternatives to correct the problem.

So one of the issues is the depth. So we looked at a range of depths from 37 to 42 feet to increase the efficiency of ships coming in. We also looked at widening the channel. As the ships get larger, they're a little bit more width. So we increased the width of the inner harbor by a hundred foot and the width of the outer harbor by a hundred foot, 50 feet on either side.

We also looked at increasing the bend width, as I mentioned, to go from 560 to 700 feet. This slide shows the quantities associated with each of those alternatives. And quantities are important because they drive the cost of the alternative.

So this is the amount of material that would have to removed from the sea floor dredge in order to create that deeper channel, create those water channel widths, and to create that bend. Costs were estimated for the federal base plan placement as well as for beneficial use plan placement, which Todd Randall will talk about in a few minutes.

Next slide, please. So we have the cost side of the equation, how much is it going to cost to build this. So we have to estimate the benefits side of the equation. And that's the transportation cost savings that will be realized over the 50 -year period of the analysis. So that is the amount of cost reduction for ships to bring in the cargo into the port.

So without the project, it costs -- on an average annual equivalent basis, it costs 64 million, approximately, to bring in the cargo to
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| 1 | the Harbor. So with each of these alternatives, it |
| 2 | will cost less to bring that same amount of cargo |
| 3 | in. And that is the result of the fact that they |
| 4 | no longer have to lighter, no long have to wait for |
| 5 | the tide, but they can also move some of the cargo |
| 6 | to a slightly larger ship, and receive the |
| 7 | economies of scale of that larger ship. |
| 8 | So the next step is we take those two |
| 9 | things, the cost of the project and average annual |
| 10 | equivalent, and then we compare it against the |
| 11 | benefits of the project, the average annual |
| 12 | equivalent, and we get the total net benefits for |
| 13 | the project. So you can see in the fourth column |
| 14 | the total net benefits. |
| 15 | And we looked for the project that |
| 16 | maximizes the net benefits. So in this case, the |
| 17 | project that maximizes the net benefits is the |
| 18 | 40-foot project. And that has a BCR of 1.9. So |
| 19 | that's a benefit-to-cost ratio, and it's a positive |
| 20 | project which shows federal interest in this |
| 21 | alternative. |
| 22 | After we selected the Tentatively |
| 23 | Selected Plan, which is the 40-foot project, we did |
| 24 | a refinement on that using the ship simulation down |
| 25 | at our facility in Vicksburg, Mississippi. So we |

created a computer model of the channel and the coastal hydraulics, and we were able to then simulate the ships coming into the port.

And we had two pilots come down and drive those ships so they could test the different scenarios. So they could test the width of the channel, test the bend, test the turning basin under various conditions.

As a result of that, we came up with some design refinements on the plan. We verified the inner and outer harbor channel widths. But we did determine that the bend needed to be greater than 700 feet, up to 800 foot wide. So we added an additional hundred feet on the bend widening.

And we also determined that the turning basin we had turned to the north in the original plan, but because when we tested it in the model, we found that the existing location was optimum, and that all we needed to actually do was widen it 200 feet to the north. So this results in a refinement of the quantities, which, as you know, is important 'cause it drives the cost.

So the quantity of ordering materials is similar, but the quantity of rock went up from about 30-something thousand cubic yards to 43,000
cubic yards. So you can see that's going to be a little bit of an additional cost.

Next slide. So this is a summary of the Tentatively Selected Plan, the 40 -foot plan, with those refinements. So the cost went up slightly, so that means our benefits go down a little bit. Our BCR went down slightly to 1.6 .

But we will be looking at these numbers, both the costs and benefits over the next few months, and we will be refining this design as we go forward. So those numbers might change again as we check some of the different parameters. And so you might see slightly different numbers in the final report. But the good news is this is still a positive project.

So the TSP will result in more efficient transportation of the commodities into the port. It will increase the safety and maneuverability for the larger ships.

Next slide. This slide shows the cost share for the non-federal and federal share. Total project cost, including the beneficial use site, is \$71 million. And cost shared, you can see the numbers broken down. Federal cost share will be 75 percent, and the non-federal will be 25 percent.
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| 1 | So that's highlighted in yellow. |
| 2 | Once construction is completed, the |
| 3 | non-federal sponsor will be required to pay an |
| 4 | additional 10 percent of the cost of the general |
| 5 | navigation features. |
| 6 | The federal government would be |
| 7 | responsible for a hundred percent of the navigation |
| 8 | project maintenance, as it is today. So we |
| 9 | currently maintain the channel about every 10 |
| 10 | years. |
| 11 | In the construction of the salt marsh |
| 12 | site, beneficial use site is included in that cost, |
| 13 | and it would be cost shared at $65 / 35$ with the |
| 14 | non-federal sponsor. |
| 15 | So that's the Tentatively Selected Plan. |
| 16 | And now we'll welcome Todd up to talk about the |
| 17 | placement alternatives. |
| 18 | MR. RANDALL: Thanks, Barbara. Thanks, |
| 19 | everybody, for coming tonight. I'm just going to |
| 20 | talk about the placement alternatives that we have |
| 21 | for this 4.2 million cubic yards of material that |
| 22 | we have coming out of New Haven. |
| 23 | We had a meeting back in January of this |
| 24 | year, where we essentially ran through these |
| 25 | alternatives. Two alternatives have been added to |

this list: The West River borrow pit, which was identified in our January meeting, and then a potential confined aquatic disposal cell. And we'll talk about this in a couple minutes.

Next slide, please. Before we go into detail on all the placement sites, I'll go through a brief discussion of how the sediment that are going to be dredged are characterized.

Using the study's initial design that Barbara had talked about previously, a sample and analysis plan was developed that was intended to characterize the sediment using that largest project footprint. So an expanded turning basin and 42 -foot depth is what we sampled for. Because you'll see chemistry takes a long time to sample, to analyze, and then to make sense of the results. Next slide, please. Sediment classification and determining sediment suitability for alternative placement options is determined by a tiered process of sampling, testing, evaluating, and modeling. These processes are all aimed at determining the risk of contaminants to human health and ecological health.

Next slide. Sediment classification is basically done with a tiered process. As you can
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| 1 | see here in the pyramid, tier 1 is basically |
| 2 | examining the history of harbor testing, looking at |
| 3 | the industry that's in the Harbor. So basically |
| 4 | evaluating existing data. Tier 2 is the actual |
| 5 | physical sampling and testing to determine the |
| 6 | physical nature of the sediment, is it sand, is it |
| 7 | silt, and what the chemistry is. It should be |
| 8 | noted that chemical concentrations alone are not a |
| 9 | driver of -- a reliable tool for determining a |
| 10 | sediment's toxicity. That really comes in tier 3 |
| 11 | and tier 4. |
| 12 | Tier 3 involves performing water column |
| 13 | testing of the sediments, water column chemistry, |
| 14 | performing toxicity on testing on benthic |
| 15 | organisms, the critters that actually live in the |
| 16 | sediments, and then bioaccumulation testing on |
| 17 | organisms that are exposed to the sediments for a |
| 18 | period of time. These are the real drivers that |
| 19 | determine the toxicity. And then also performing |
| 20 | sub-lethal bioaccumulation tests and risk models |
| 21 | that basically evaluates ecological -- potential |
| 22 | for ecological risk and human health risk. |
| 23 | This tiered methodology allows us to |
| 24 | assess the actual effects of the sediment's |
| 25 | chemistry to biological organisms and through |

modeling to human and ecological health.
For the New Haven Harbor project, all the testing results that $I$ discussed can be found in Technical Supporting Document 1 on our website, which we'll leave up at the end and, as Barbara pointed out, is on your Fact Sheet.

And if you just want a simple breakdown of the chemistry results and toxicity tests, I'll refer you to Appendix $J$, which is the suitability determination for the material. Both of those documents are on the Corps website.

Next slide. Dredge material which is found to be toxic or poses significant risk to the environment or human health is deemed unsuitable. Such materials must be managed to isolate them from the environment or undergo some kind of treatment to reduce their level of contaminants to the point that other uses or placement options may become acceptable.

Only materials that are deemed to be nontoxic and low risk are suitable and may be placed unconfined in open water. So we have suitable and unsuitable material.

This slide just shows the decision-making process in flowchart form. Sediment proposed for
dredging is tested. If it fails the toxicity test, the tier 3 testing that I talked about before, it's deemed unsuitable. Bioaccumulation tests, if it passes the toxicity, are performed. And then the models are prepared. And if there is significant risk found, it's deemed unsuitable.

Next slide. So here's the initial
New Haven Harbor footprint that we have and the samples that we took. As you can see, we had in the inner harbor, there were six transects that were represented by 17 stations.

These transects cover the areas that we were looking to improve, the widening and the deepening alternatives, as well as that expanded turning basin to the north. I'll show you another picture in just a second and we'll discuss that turning basin.

Next slide. And then in the outer harbor we had six stations that were represented by those two transects that you can see there with the green dots.

Next slide. Here's just a quick graphic that illustrates how the samples are obtained. A coring device is vibrated down through the sediment to the proposed depth you want to get to. The core
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| 1 | is then sampled for the chemistry and physical |
| 2 | parameters. And then gallons of all of this |
| 3 | sediment are collected to prepare those water |
| 4 | column tests and toxicity tests. |
| 5 | Next slide. So if we go back to that |
| 6 | tiered evaluation concept, the chemistry data for |
| 7 | each sample -- I'm sorry -- the chemistry data for |
| 8 | New Haven, which, again, I said can be found in |
| 9 | Technical Supporting Document 1, or Appendix J, |
| 10 | basically dictated that we move into biological |
| 11 | testing. |
| 12 | And so here are the results of the |
| 13 | biological testing for New Haven. Using the tiered |
| 14 | testing approach, the first decision point is the |
| 15 | whole sediment toxicity test. That's what you'll |
| 16 | see in the second and third columns there. |
| 17 | This test uses two different species that |
| 18 | are representative of native fauna. And as you can |
| 19 | see, all the transects passed for the amphipod |
| 20 | Leptocheirus. That's the second column. However, |
| 21 | in the third column, there was composite 6, failure |
| 22 | for the Americamysis. That's a kind of shrimp. So |
| 23 | that, according to our hierarchy, would kick it |
| 24 | into unsuitable material. |
| 25 | The water column testing, which is in |

column 7, basically met the required standards for all but transects 6 and 7. So again, back to the hierarchy testing, transects 6 and 7 failed that. They are deemed unsuitable.

So today, as it stands right now, transect 1 and 2, which were in the outer harbor, and then transects 3, 4, and 5, which are in the kind of mid-harbor region, and then transect 8, which is all the way up in the top at the head of navigation, are considered to have suitable material, and transects 6 and 7 are considered to have unsuitable material.

So if we zoom in and examine the two transects that are currently unsuitable, we see they encompass both the channel area to the east and that expanded turning basin that was expanded to the west and to the north in our initial design.

So if you see, the map on the right shows that the existing location of this widened -- so that's the existing location of the turning basin, right? But the expanded footprint actually overlaps into what is currently a 16-foot anchorage area right there.

So the reason I'm bringing this to your attention is as the project progressed, we had
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| 1 | in-depth discussion with the pilots, as well as |
| 2 | running the ship simulation model, it was |
| 3 | determined that that expanded turning basin wasn't |
| 4 | needed. |
| 5 | So as a result, the footprint of the |
| 6 | turning basin is being reduced. And essentially |
| 7 | it's being pulled out of that 16-foot anchorage |
| 8 | area. And the reason that's relevant is because |
| 9 | that 16-foot anchorage area hasn't been dredged |
| 10 | since the 1950s. So we think that may be a driver |
| 11 | of the failures. |
| 12 | Next slide, please. So we have made the |
| 13 | Corps go back out and resample in those areas with |
| 14 | a reduced footprint. Here is an overlay of the |
| 15 | reduced turning basin design and the additional |
| 16 | sampling that we're doing in green. These |
| 17 | sediments will be evaluated with that tiered |
| 18 | testing. |
| 19 | So as of today, our conclusions indicate |
| 20 | that we may have unsuitable material to manage. |
| 21 | And as such, we've included a CAD cell in the |
| 22 | placement alternatives I'll discuss in just a |
| 23 | second. |
| 24 | But it should be noted that should the |
| 25 | data from the sampling of this reduced footprint |

show the material to be suitable because it's been pulled out of that old 16-foot anchorage, a CAD cell may not be needed.

So what is a CAD cell? Basically, a CAD cell is short for a confined aquatic disposal cell. And it's a way to sequester unsuitable material.

If a CAD cell is required, this schematic shows the general process behind the creation of one. You find an area where you have suitable material and dig that out, and then fill the cell with the unsuitable material. And then following the filling, you cap it with a layer of suitable material.

So with that one in mind, I'll go through all the placement alternatives that were carried forward in the study.

The base plan consists of two borrow pits, one at the entrance of the West River, and one borrow pit in Morris Cove. Now, these two alternatives will be used to place only suitable, silty material. The plan would be to fill these pits to the elevation that are within 1 to 2 feet of their surrounding elevations.

Some of the silty sand that we have from the outer harbor can be placed in an area behind
the east breakwater, represented by that blue triangle. That's just a conceptual area. The material wouldn't take up that whole area.

But the idea there would be to raise the bottom elevation slightly and create a slightly sandier bottom than currently exists to create a better substrate for oyster habitat.

As Barbara noted, there's going to be some blasted rock coming out from between the east and middle breakwater. That material would be placed just to the south of the west breakwater, where Lisa is circling, basically to create a rock reef for habitat.

And then the remainder of the suitable material, which, again, is mostly silt, would be placed at the central Long Island Sound disposal site. It's not shown on this map, I'll give it on the next one, but just a little bit south of New Haven Harbor.

There is also an additional beneficial use alternative within the plan that's beyond the federal base plan. This involves using the silty material to create approximately 70 acres of salt marsh and tidal creeks in the vicinity of Sandy Point in West Haven. There were a lot of questions
last night as to where that line is. It's basically from -- if you know the West Haven boat ramp out to Sandy Point, the area essentially in front of the sewage treatment plant.

And then also as I noted during the sediment characterization and CAD cell discussion, a potential CAD cell has been planned in the event that we need to manage unsuitable material. And the proposed cell is located just to the west of the channel in the vicinity of Sandy Point, where Lisa just pointed to.

Next slide, please. This is just a closer look at the base plan placement sites. About a million cubic yards will be placed throughout these sites in the Harbor, and the remainder will be placed out at central Long Island Sound to cover up historic disposal mounds that were placed out there before sediment testing requirements came into being.

And should a CAD cell be required, the material that would be excavated from that, the suitable material, would be placed at one of these alternatives, and the unsuitable material would be placed in the CAD cell.

Next slide. The beneficial use placement
site above the base plan, it's the salt marsh that I was talking about. About 840,000 cubic yards of silt could fit in there.

From this perspective, it's basically -well, like I said, from the boat ramp out to Sandy Point. And we would keep that sandy beach feature and the little marsh and lagoon feature. And it would be meant to basically complement that sanctuary.

Next slide. This slide is a summary of projected measures that, once we get through the process, we could use the protect resources in New Haven Harbor. Construction windows for dredging and blasting would be used to minimize impacts to essential fish habitat, shellfish, anadromous fish resources, and marine mammals.

The Corps also performed a series of cultural resource studies in the project area, and didn't uncover anything within the project's footprint that would need to be protected from a historical perspective.

Next slide. This is the details of the coordination efforts that are ongoing for the project. And so these are all documented in the EIS.
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| 1 | In terms of the public involvement with |
| 2 | the project, we had the scoping meetings in January |
| 3 | 2017, public information meetings in 2018, and are |
| 4 | now into the public review process of the EIS. |
| 5 | The website is there in green, but in the |
| 6 | very last slide it will be in big letters. |
| 7 | Next slide. Finally, here is the |
| 8 | projected schedule. As I noted, we're currently in |
| 9 | the 45-day review period for the draft EIS and |
| 10 | Feasibility Report. The comments are due, |
| 11 | requested by November 15th. |
| 12 | Following the review of the comments, the |
| 13 | agency and the sponsors will come to a decision |
| 14 | point and move towards a final report. And then |
| 15 | this final report will be circulated again for |
| 16 | comment. |
| 17 | So on behalf of Barbara and the whole |
| 18 | New Haven team, thanks for your interest in the |
| 19 | project, and thanks in advance for your review of |
| 20 | the documents. I'll turn it back over to Mark. |
| 21 | MR. HABEL: Okay. Thank you, Barbara, |
| 22 | and thank you, Todd. |
| 23 | The hearing tonight will be conducted in |
| 24 | a manner so that all who desire to express their |
| 25 | views will be given an opportunity to speak. To |

preserve the right of all to express their views, I ask that there be no interruptions.

When you came in, copies of the Fact Sheet and procedures to be followed at this hearing were available. If you did not receive these, both are available at the registration table. I will not read either of them, but they will be entered into the record.

The record of this hearing will remain open, and written comments may be submitted tonight, sent by email or by email through November 15th, 2018.

All written comments will receive equal consideration with oral statements made this evening. And both oral and written comments will be considered in the development of a Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement.

We need your participation throughout the entire process. And I thank you for contributing your comments and thoughts tonight. A transcript of this hearing is being made to ensure a detailed review of all comments. A copy of that transcript will be available at the Corps Concord, Massachusetts headquarters for review, posted on

| 1 | the Corps website for your use, or you may make |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | arrangements with the stenographer for a copy at |
| 3 | your own expense. |
| 4 | Anyone who does not comment today but |
| 5 | wishes to send written comments may do so. Please |
| 6 | forward those comments to the Corps project |
| 7 | manager, Barbara Blumeris, at the Corps New England |
| 8 | district office located in Concord, Massachusetts. |
| 9 | When making a statement tonight, please |
| 10 | come forward to the microphone and state your name. |
| 11 | If you are speaking for or representing a position |
| 12 | of an organization, please say so. |
| 13 | Since there are only five people who |
| 14 | signed up to speak tonight, we will dispense with |
| 15 | the three-minute clock, but, again, I do ask you to |
| 16 | be brief and address any more lengthy comments in |
| 17 | writing to the Corps. |
| 18 | The first individual to provide comment |
| 19 | for the record tonight is Allison Dodge, |
| 20 | representing Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro. Allison? |
| 21 | One more thing, please. The microphone |
| 22 | we have over here is held up with some tape. |
| 23 | Please don't try to move it around. And despite |
| 24 | our turning all of the volumes down to zero, it's |
| 25 | still pretty loud. So if you'd step back a foot or |

two, we'll see if that works. So Allison?

MS. DODGE: Good evening. My name is
Allison Dodge. I am the Outreach Coordinator for Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro. She asked me to deliver a statement on her behalf this evening. Many thanks to the Army Corps of Engineers for their work to complete the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Project.

As I am sure you are aware, the deepening of the federal navigation channel in the New Haven Harbor is a priority of the New Haven Port Authority, the City of New Haven, as well as the various businesses that populate the port district.

As the highest volume commercial shipping port on Long Island Sound, and the largest deep-water port in the state of Connecticut, New Haven Harbor is an integral component to the regional economy and represents a key connection in the transportation network that includes water, rail, road, and pipelines.

Already today, many vessels destined for the port must lighter their cargo before they can enter because the navigation channel is simply too
shallow for some more modern ships. With ever-advancing technologies and shipmaking design, deepening the navigation channel is critical.

Having had the opportunity to review the Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Study, I wanted to express my overall support for the project's Tentatively Selected Plan.

I was pleased to see that the Corps was thoughtful in their approach to the disposal of dredge materials, including the beneficial use plan in addition to open water disposal.

However, I do have some concerns with the inclusion of the repositioning of the Cross-Sound Cable and the total project cost. I will be submitting separate comments to the Corps on that issue.

I have long advocated for this
infrastructure upgrade, and look forward to working with the Corps, New Haven Port Authority, and the Connecticut Port Authority to move this project forward. Thank you.

MR. HABEL: Thank you, Allison.
Next up will be John Cox.
MR. COX: Good evening. My name is John

Cox. I live at 235 Townsend Avenue, across from the seawall overlooking the borrow pit. I've been involved in Army Corps of Engineers hearings and meetings on this since the ill-fated Bridgeport dredging proposal in 2010.

And I think most of us remember that, where they were proposing to move the toxic waste from Bridgeport into the Morris Cove borrow pit.

At the January public meeting held this year, the Army Corps of Engineers acknowledged the public's comments, and agreed that going forward they would not make any similar proposals and would only recommend that clean DEEP and EPA-approved fill would go in there. And that was absolutely what the community was looking for.

The current plan makes good on that promise. And by eliminating the borrow pit, which was basically an environmental mistake, created a huge dead zone right in the middle of the cove, what they're going to be doing is restoring life to that area, which is now dead -- and that is a very good thing -- by using the 600,000 cubic yards of fill, with sediment from the dredging project.

I applaud this move on the part of the Corps, and support your initiative. I think this
project is good for New Haven's economy, and it's also good for the environment in Morris Cove. So thank you very much.

MR. HABEL: Thank you, Mr. Cox.
Next up will be Charlie Jonas.
MR. JONAS: Good evening. I'm one of the pilots that was at the Army Corps of Engineers research and development facility down in Vicksburg, Mississippi.

And I can't speak more highly of that system that they have and the simulator. It's really, really excellent. We tested the limits of different drafts and different widths of the channel. And of course, we came up with a draft deeper than the Army Corps came up with, but that was on our wish list.

New Haven Harbor has a channel depth right now of 35 feet. To bring a ship in at low tide, we have 2 -foot underkeel clearance and we have 2 -foot squat for the ships. And that went down to 31 feet at low water.

So the pilots, because of the width of the channel, we do one-way transits. Also, when we have the deeper draft ships come in, we add a foot for every hour of tide to that 31 foot. The
maximum draft we bring in is 37 feet. Only two of the facilities are authorized for 37 feet.

With the inbound deep draft ships, we bring them in on a rising tide. And that's when we have a strong westerly set. And the biggest problem we have, as you heard, is making a turn at the jetties, a 35-degree turn. We're getting set to the left from the flood tide, and then the stern of the ship gets close to the bank, which is a very steep bank. It's 48 foot in some spots right inside the channel, but right outside the channel it's 22 feet. So we get a lot of suction in there that keeps trying to turn the ship to starboard. We can do it safely, but we're at the limits with this draft and at this stage of the tide that we're bringing ships in. But we're at the limit. We can't do any deeper or any bigger ships. The maximum length overall ship we can bring is in now is 750 feet. And that's the limit. So the pilots requested that -- this is our wish list again -- 45-foot draft channel, which we're not going to get. We'll get 40 feet, but we can live with that. And to make the channel 300 feet wider. But we're looking at a hundred feet wider.

And the big thing is the turn, making the turn. We have to make two gradual turns instead of one sharp turn. And then we also need the sloping banks where they make the channel deeper to eliminate the effects of bank cushioning.

So we're in favor of this. And now that we know the limits that we're going to go to 40 feet, we can look at the width of the channel and the bend there. So thank you.

MR. HABEL: Thank you, Mr. Jonas.
Next up is Renate Blau.
MS. BLAU: Renate Blau. I also live just off of the seawall. I look down the road and there it is. And I also overlook the borrow pit. And I'm one of many neighbors who have been following this process with a lot of anxiety about what goes into that borrow pit, and hoping that the Corps would come around to see our perspective of wanting that water to stay clean and pristine and useful to both the animals as well as for our recreational purposes. And you've done that.

So I'm here to thank you. Thank you for keeping an open mind, and traversing this long, long period of time to the point where you can see doing something that's both good for us and good
for New Haven Harbor as well. So thank you.
MR. HABEL: Thank you, ma'am.
And next is John Hilts.
MR. HILTS: Good evening. My name is John Hilts. I'm a self-employed consultant who has 30 years of experience in marine construction permitting for regulatory matters such as dredging. Having read your study, one thing I noticed was a lack of alternatives that were, you know, presented for cost-effectiveness and also lessen the environmental impact. I hope that during the comment period, some of these might be included for further review.

And in addition, $I$ wish to note that by my estimation, the project seems to benefit greatly several private corporations who have terminals in the New Haven Harbor, and I'd like to know further the commitment on their part to remain in the Harbor after this project is completed so that the benefits in transit that we've seen on your slides are realized as opposed to not being realized. Thank you.

MR. HABEL: Thank you.
That was it for the people who signed a card wishing to speak. Is there anyone else in the

|  | 43 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | audience who did not fill out a card, but wishes to |
| 2 | speak? Could you please come down to the podium -- |
| 3 | or down to the microphone, state your name and town |
| 4 | of residence for the record. |
| 5 | MR. GILBERTSON: Good evening. Terry |
| 6 | Gilbertson, New Haven, Connecticut, 61 East Grand |
| 7 | Avenue in New Haven. |
| 8 | And I've had a chance to review your |
| 9 | rather remarkable and comprehensive report, and I |
| 10 | thank you all and the Corps for its very good work. |
| 11 | I can't help but notice and wish to bring |
| 12 | to your attention the Cross-Island Cable issue. On |
| 13 | page ES-6 of your report, you have a final -- first |
| 14 | cost construction cost of 65, $\$ 66$ million. |
| 15 | However, the cable enforcement action cost is |
| 16 | \$32 million. |
| 17 | And there may be those of us in this |
| 18 | room, I believe in 2000 might have even been in |
| 19 | this room, where we talked about the Cross-Island |
| 20 | Cable and how it was not supposed to have this |
| 21 | effect on this particular project. |
| 22 | Further, in your report, on other pages |
| 23 | in your report, you do identify the Cross-Island |
| 24 | Cable is responsible for the cost of relocation |
| 25 | down to 48 feet. It did not achieve -- for several |

reasons, it did not achieve that. And I encourage you to continue your efforts to enforce that earlier 2002 permit.

I am concerned that we've added to the construction cost of this project rather remarkably, presuming that Cross-Island will not perform in its duty. Cross-Island does not provide any benefit whatsoever to the state of Connecticut. And I encourage you to persist in our enforcement efforts. Thank you.

MR. HABEL: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak tonight?

Okay. John, the floor is yours.
MR. KENNELLY: Thanks, Mark. We have heard many thoughtful statements this evening.

All of the comments received tonight as well as the written comments we receive during the review period will be considered in the development of the final integrated feasibility report and EIS.

Written statements may be submitted to the Corps of Engineers until November 15th, 2018. They will receive equal consideration with those presented today.

We at the Corps of Engineers extend our appreciation to all who took the time to involve

0
themselves in this public review process and the City of New Haven for the use of this fine facility tonight.

I'd like to thank you all for taking time to provide us with your thoughts, your comments, and your concerns. Goodnight.
(Whereupon, this public hearing was concluded at 7:29 p.m.)
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| explain | federal | foot |
| 4:23 | 5:21 11:9,23,25 12:2 17:11 | 15:23 16:24,25 19:13 35:25 |
| export | 18:20 20:21,24 21:6 30:22 | 39:24,25 40:10 |
| 14:7,10 | 36:12 | footprint |
| exported | federally-authorized | 22:13 25:8 27:21 28:5,14,25 |
| 14:13 | 12:8 | 32:20 |
| exposed | feel | foregoing |
| 23:17 | 8:21 | 46:9 |
| express | feet | form |
| 33:24 34:1 37:6 | 5:23 12:16,17 15:21,23,24,25 | 24:25 |
| extend | 16:19,25 17:2 19:13,14,20 | forward |
| 44:24 | 29:22 39:18,21 40:1,2,12,19 | 6:12,24 7:20 15:16 20:11 |
| external | 40:22,24,24 41:8 43:25 | 29:16 35:6,10 37:19,22 |
| 11:5 | fill | 38:11 |
|  | 29:10,21 38:14,23 43:1 | found |
| F | filling | 19:18 24:3,13 25:6 26:8 |
| F | 29:12 | four |
| 46:1 | final | 11:4 |
| facilitator | 8:19 9:3 10:9 20:14 33:14,15 | fourth |
| 3:9 | 34:16 43:13 44:19 | 18:13 |
| facilities | finalized | free |
| 14:18 40:2 | 7:24 | 8:21 |
| facility | Finally | freight |
| 18:25 39:8 45:2 | 33:7 | 13:4 |
| fact | find | front |
| 10:19,20 18:3 24:6 34:3 | 29:9 | 31:4 |
| failed | findings | fulfill |
| 27:3 | 6:9 | 8:11 |
| fails | fine | full |
| 25:1 | 45:2 | 15:12 |
| failure | first | fund |
| 26:21 | 10:23 26:14 35:18 43:13 | 6:22 |
| failures | fish | further |
| 28:11 | 32:15,16 | 15:7 42:13,17 43:22 46:6,11 |
| far $15: 11$ | fit | G |
| 15:11 | 32:3 | G |


| gallons | Habel | 9:11,20,25 10:3 33:23 34:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26:2 | 2:4 3:2,5 6:13 8:1 10:11 | 34:9,22 45:7 |
| Gateway | 33:21 37:23 39:4 41:10 42:2 | hearings |
| 14:16 | 42:23 44:11 | 7:21 38:3 |
| general | habitat | heavily |
| 21:4 29:8 | 30:7,13 32:15 | 13:10 |
| gentlemen | half | held |
| 5:8 6:14 8:2 10:12 | 14:13 | 35:22 38:9 46:7 |
| getting | HALL | help |
| 3:11 40:7 | 1:9 | 43:11 |
| Gilbertson | hand | helped |
| 43:5,6 | 46:16 | 3:24 |
| give | harbor | hierarchy |
| 4:7 30:17 | 1:3 3:3, 12, 14 4:17 6:6 8:5,13 | 26:23 27:3 |
| given | 8:16 11:24 12:5,9,14,18 | high |
| 33:25 | 14:19 15:1 16:23,24 18:1 | 15:16 16:1 |
| go | 19:11 23:2,3 24:2 25:8,10 | highest |
| 15:12 17:2 20:6,11 22:5,6 | 25:18 27:6 29:25 30:19 | 36:16 |
| 26:5 28:13 29:14 38:14 41:7 | 31:15 32:13 36:9,13,19 | highlighted |
| goals | 39:17 42:1,17,19 | 21:1 |
| 7:6 | hard | highly |
| goes | 15:12 | 39:10 |
| 41:16 | Haven | highway |
| going | 1:3,9,11 2:6 3:3,12,14,16 4:8 | 14:9 |
| 11:22 17:16 20:1 21:19 22:8 | 4:16 5:11,16,21 6:2,4,6,22 | Hilts |
| 30:8 38:11,20 40:22 41:7 | 7:11,15,22 8:5,13,16 11:22 | 42:3,4,5 |
| good | 11:24 12:3,9 13:18 14:14 | historic |
| 3:2 8:3 10:13 20:14 36:2 | 21:22 24:2 25:8 26:8,13 | 31:17 |
| 37:25 38:16,22 39:1,2,6 | 30:19,25 31:2 32:13 33:18 | historical |
| 41:25,25 42:4 43:5,10 | 36:9,12,13,14,19 37:20 | 32:21 |
| Goodnight | 39:17 42:1,17 43:6,7 45:2 | historically |
| 45:6 | Haven's | 13:23 |
| government | 39:1 | history |
| 21:6 | head | 23:2 |
| gradual | 12:13 27:9 | hit |
| 41:2 | headquartered | 15:13 |
| Grand | 6:19 | hope |
| 43:6 | headquarters | 42:11 |
| graphic | 34:25 | hoping |
| 25:22 | health | 41:17 |
| greater | 22:23,23 23:22 24:1,14 | hour |
| 15:25 19:12 | hear | 39:25 |
| greatly | 5:18 7:12 | huge |
| 42:15 | heard | 14:9 38:19 |
| green | 9:5 40:6 44:15 | human |
| 25:20 28:16 33:5 | hearing | 22:22 23:22 24:1,14 |
| H | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 13: 1,3,194: 3,12,13,245: 2 \\ & 5: 176: 12,247: 208: 4,109: 9 \end{aligned}$ | hundred $16: 24,25$ 19:14 21:7 40:24 |



| keep | 35:16 | looked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32:6 | Leptocheirus | 16:19,21 17:1 18:15 |
| keeping | 26:20 | looking |
| 41:23 | lessen | 20:8 23:2 25:13 38:15 40:24 |
| keeps | 42:11 | lot |
| 40:13 | letters | 30:25 40:12 41:16 |
| Kennelly | 33:6 | loud |
| 2:9 3:20 4:12 8:2,3 44:14 | level | 35:25 |
| key | 24:17 | low |
| 36:20 | life | 12:16,16 15:21 24:21 39:18 |
| kick | 38:20 | 39:21 |
| 26:23 | lighter | lower |
| kind | 16:2 18:4 36:24 | 12:16 15:21 |
| 24:16 26:22 27:8 | limit |  |
| know | 40:17,19 | M |
| 19:21 31:2 41:7 42:10,17 | limited | ma'am |
|  | 16:8 | 42:2 |
| L | limits | Magellan |
| lack | 39:12 40:15 41:7 | 14:16 |
| 42:9 | line | main |
| ladies | 31:1 | 14:23 |
| 5:8 6:14 8:2 10:12 | link | maintain |
| lagoon | 10:21 | 21:9 |
| 32:7 | Lisa | maintains |
| land | 3:25 30:12 31:11 | 13:9 |
| 13:19 | list | maintenance |
| landside | 22:1 39:16 40:21 | 21:8 |
| 13:17 | listen | major |
| large | 9:5 | 5:23 |
| 13:9 15:6 | little | majority |
| larger | 16:22 20:2,6 30:18 32:7 | 13:17 |
| 7:13 14:17 16:10,12,22 18:6 | live | making |
| 18:7 20:19 | 23:15 38:1 40:23 41:12 | 35:9 40:6 41:1 |
| largest | located | mammals |
| 13:3,3 22:12 36:17 | 12:3 31:9 35:8 | 32:16 |
| layer | location | manage |
| 29:12 | 13:13 14:18 19:18 27:19,20 | 28:20 31:8 |
| leads | long | managed |
| 7:2 | 7:16 12:4,13 18:4 22:15 | 24:15 |
| leave | 30:16 31:16 36:17 37:18 | manager |
| 24:5 | 41:23,24 | 2:10 3:23 35:7 |
| leaving | long-term | maneuver |
| 16:9 | 13:19 | 12:10 |
| left | longer | maneuverability |
| 40:8 | 18:4 | 20:18 |
| length | look | manner |
| 40:18 | 6:12 7:20 31:13 37:19 41:8 | 33:24 |
| lengthy | 41:13 | map |



| 5:10 11:7,10 20:21,25 21:3 | 7:22 | overview |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21:14 | open | 4:18 |
| nontoxic | 4:25 24:22 34:10 37:12 41:23 | oyster |
| 24:21 | opportunity | 30:7 |
| north | 9:7 33:25 37:4 | P |
| 12:4 19:16,20 25:15 27:17 | opposed | P |
| Northeast | 42:21 | p.m |
| 13:9,15 | optimum | 1:7 3:1 45:8 |
| Notary | 19:18 | page |
| 46:3,16,22 | options | 43:13 |
| note | 22:19 24:18 | pages |
| 42:14 | oral | 43:22 |
| noted | 9:1 34:14,15 | panel |
| 23:8 28:24 30:8 31:5 33:8 | ORANGE | 5:7 11:5 |
| notice | 1:10 | parameters |
| 4:3 43:11 | order | 20:12 26:2 |
| noticed | 13:11 17:9 | part |
| 14:9 42:9 | ordering | 38:24 42:18 |
| November | 19:23 | participation |
| 8:24 11:1 33:11 34:12 44:21 | organisms | 34:19 |
| 46:17 | 23:15,17,25 | particular |
| numbers | organization | 11:9 43:21 |
| 20:8,11,13,24 | 35:12 | particularly $7: 15$ |
| 0 | 19:16 | parties |
| oaths | outcome | 46:12 |
| 46:5 | 46:15 | partnering |
| obtained | outer | 6:21 |
| 25:23 | 15:5,8 16:24 19:11 25:18 | partnership |
| Obviously | 27:6 29:25 | 3:16 |
| 7:11 | outlined | party |
| October | 7:6 | 46:13 |
| 1:6 46:24 | Outreach | passed |
| office | 36:3 | 26:19 |
| 35:8 | outside | passes |
| officer | 16:2 40:11 | 25:4 |
| 3:19 4:12 | overall | pay |
| Okay | 7:6 37:6 40:18 | 21:3 |
| 33:21 44:13 | overdue | people |
| old | 7:16 | 35:13 42:24 |
| 6:20 12:21 29:2 | overlaps | percent |
| once | 27:22 | 11:9,10 13:6,7,23 20:25,25 |
| 16:15 21:2 32:11 | overlay | 21:4,7 |
| one-way | 28:14 | perform |
| $39: 23$ | overlook | 44:7 |
| ongoing | $41: 14$ | performed |
| $32: 23$ | overlooking | $25: 432: 17$ |
| online | $38: 2$ | performing |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:12,14,19 } \\ & \text { period } \end{aligned}$ | 7:19,24 9:17 10:16 17:11,12 18:23 19:10,17 20:4,4 21:15 | preparing $10: 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:2,8 17:20 23:18 33:9 | 22:11 29:17,21 30:21,22 | presence |
| 41:24 42:12 44:18 | 31:13 32:1 37:8,11 38:16 | 46:8 |
| permit | planned | present |
| 44:3 | 31:7 | 10:14 |
| permitting | planning | presentations |
| 42:7 | 2:4,9,11,11,13 3:20 10:15,24 | 9:19 |
| persist | plant | presented |
| 44:9 | 31:4 | 42:10 44:23 |
| person | please | presenting |
| 7:21 | 8:21 17:15 22:5,17 28:12 | 6:8 |
| perspective | 31:12 35:5,9,12,21,23 43:2 | preserve |
| 7:4 32:4,21 41:18 | pleased | 34:1 |
| pertinent | 37:9 | presuming |
| 4:3 | podium | 44:6 |
| petroleum | 43:2 | pretty |
| 13:11,14,22,25 14:2 | point | 35:25 |
| Phillips | 24:17 26:14 30:25 31:3,10 | previously |
| 46:22 | 32:6 33:14 41:24 | 22:10 |
| physical | pointed | primary |
| 23:5,6 26:1 | 24:6 31:11 | 9:9 |
| picture | populate | priority |
| 25:16 | 36:15 | 36:13 |
| pie | port | pristine |
| 13:25 | 2:6,7 3:17,17 4:8,11 5:11,16 | 41:19 |
| pile | 6:1,4,16,19,22 7:4,6 11:16 | private |
| 14:10 | 13:3,4,13,18 14:4,14,15 | 42:16 |
| pilots | 16:6,9,11 17:22 19:3 20:17 | probably |
| 15:10 19:4 28:1 39:7,22 | 36:13,15,17,18,24 37:20,21 | 14:8 |
| 40:20 | portion | problem |
| pipelines | 15:5 | 14:24 16:16,17 40:6 |
| 36:22 | ports | problems |
| pit | 7:11,12,13 | 9:15 14:21 15:17 |
| 22:1 29:19 38:2,8,17 41:14 | poses | procedures |
| 41:17 | 24:13 | 4:3,24 34:4 |
| pits | position | proceedings |
| 29:18,22 | 35:11 | 46:7,10 |
| place | positive | process |
| 29:20 | 18:19 20:15 | 3:11 4:23 7:1 9:1,4,22 10:4 |
| placed | posted | 10:15,24,25 22:20,25 24:25 |
| 24:22 29:25 30:11,16 31:14 | 10:18,22 34:25 | 29:8 32:12 33:4 34:20 41:16 |
| 31:16,18,22,24 | potential | 45:1 |
| placement | 7:10 22:3 23:21 31:7 | processes |
| 9:18 17:12,13 21:17,20 22:6 | prepare | 22:21 |
| 22:19 24:18 28:22 29:15 | 26:3 | produced |
| 31:13,25 | prepared | 14:12 |
| plan | 25:5 | production/demand |


| $13: 10$ <br> products | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:1,7 46:3,16,22 } \\ & \text { public's } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:19 } \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13:11,14,22,25 | 7:20 9:10 38:11 | 18:19 |
| progressed | published | reach |
| 27:25 | 7:19 | 5:5 10:15 |
| project | pulled | read |
| 1:3 2:10 3:4,12,16,23 4:6 | 28:7 29:2 | 34:7 42:8 |
| 5:20 6:11,24 7:5 8:6,17 9:11 | purple | real |
| 10:18,19,21 11:24 12:2,9,11 | 12:14 | 23:18 |
| 12:19 16:7 17:23 18:9,11,13 | purpose | realized |
| 18:15,17,18,20,23 20:15,22 | 9:9 11:18 | 17:19 42:21,21 |
| 21:8 22:13 24:2 27:25 32:18 | purposes | really |
| 32:24 33:2,19 35:6 36:10 | 41:21 | 23:10 39:12,12 |
| 37:15,21 38:23 39:1 42:15 | pushes | reason |
| 42:19 43:21 44:5 | 15:8 | 27:24 28:8 |
| project's | put | reasons |
| 32:19 37:7 | 9:7 | 44:1 |
| projected | puts | rebar |
| 32:11 33:8 | 7:9 | 14:6 |
| promise | pyramid | receive |
| 38:17 | 23:1 | 5:4 8:23 10:7 18:6 34:5,13 |
| proposal | $\mathbf{Q}$ | 44:17,22 |
| 38:5 | Q | received |
| proposals | qualified | 44:16 |
| 38:12 | $46: 5$ | recommend |
| proposed | quantities | 38:13 |
| 24:25 25:25 31:9 | 17:3,4 19:21 | record |
| proposing | quantity | 5:7 8:22 9:2,8 34:8,9 35:19 |
| 38:7 | 19:23,24 | 43:4 46:6 |
| protect | questions | RECORDS |
| 14:25 32:12 | 5:6 30:25 | 1:9 |
| protected | quick | recreational |
| 32:20 | 25:22 | 41:20 |
| protocol | R | reduce |
| 5:2 | R | 24:17 |
| provide <br> 4•14.18 8.21 9•7.25 11.19 | 46:1 | reduced |
| 4:14,18 8:21 9:7,25 11:19 | rail | 28:6,14,15,25 46:8 reduction |
| provided | 14:6 36:22 | 17:21 |
| 11:13 | raise $30 \cdot 4$ | reef |
| provides | 30:4 | 30:13 |
| 11:13 15:22 | ramp | refer |
| providing | 31:3 $32: 5$ | 24:9 |
| 8:9 9:12,24 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { ran } \\ 21: 24 \end{array}$ | refined |
| public | 21:24 | 13:14 |
| 1:1 3:3 4:2 5:1 7:2,23 8:4,10 | 2:12 3:24 4:18 17:13 21:18 | refinement |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 12 \text { 9:4,20,20,23,25,25 } \\ & 10: 1,4,8 \quad 11: 1 \text { 33:1,3,4 38:9 } \end{aligned}$ | range | 18:24 19:21 <br> refinements |


| 19:10 20:5 | 34:17 36:8 37:5 43:9,13,22 | 34:25 37:4 42:13 43:8 44:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| refinery | 43:23 44:19 | 45:1 |
| 13:9 | repositioning | reviewers |
| refining | 37:14 | 9:21 11:4,6 |
| 20:10 | representative | reviews |
| regarding | 5:9 26:18 | 10:25 11:3 |
| 8:5 | represented | right |
| region | 25:11,19 30:1 | 10:25 11:1 12:5 15:11 27:5 |
| 13:16 27:8 | representing | 27:18,21,23 34:1 38:19 |
| regional | 13:5 35:11,20 | 39:18 40:10,11 |
| 36:20 | represents | rising |
| registration | 13:19 36:20 | 40:4 |
| 4:4 34:6 | requested | risk |
| regulatory | 33:11 40:20 | 22:22 23:20,22,22 24:13,21 |
| 42:7 | required | 25:6 |
| relative | 21:3 27:1 29:7 31:20 | River |
| 8:13 | requirement | 22:1 29:18 |
| released | 8:12 | road |
| 7:8 | requirements | 36:22 41:13 |
| relevant | 31:19 | rock |
| 28:8 | requires | 19:24 30:9,12 |
| reliable | 15:23 | room |
| 11:20 23:9 | resample | 4:5 43:18,19 |
| relocation | 28:13 | Rosa |
| 43:24 | research | 35:20 36:4 |
| rely | 39:8 | running |
| 13:10 | residence | 28:2 |
| remain | 43:4 | runs |
| 34:9 42:18 | resource | 15:7 |
| remainder | 12:6 32:18 | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| 30:14 31:16 | resources | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| remarkable | 2:10,12 6:25 32:12,16 | safe |
| 43:9 | responsibilities | 11:19 |
| remarkably | 4:23 | safely |
| 44:6 | responsible | 40:14 |
| remarks | 21:7 43:24 | safety |
| 4:7 | restoring | 5:25 20:18 |
| remember | 38:20 | sail |
| 38:6 | restricted | 12:18 |
| reminder | 16:1 | salt |
| 5:3 | result | 14:5 21:11 30:23 32:1 |
| removed | 18:3 19:9 20:16 28:5 | sample |
| 17:8 | results | 22:10,15 26:7 |
| Renate | 7:3 16:4 19:20 22:16 24:3,8 | sampled |
| 41:11,12 | 26:12 | 22:14 26:1 |
| report | review | samples |
| 1:2 4:15 5:18 8:19 9:3,13,23 | 3:11 4:22 9:23 10:1, 4, $811: 1$ | 25:9,23 |
| 10:5,9 20:14 33:10,14,15 | 11:3,5 33:4,9,12,19 34:23 | sampling |


| 22:20 23:5 28:16,25 | 8:12 | 12:17 15:1,6,25 16:11,12,20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sanctuary | seen | 16:21 17:21 19:3,5 20:19 |
| 32:9 | 42:20 | 37:1 39:20,24 40:3,16,18 |
| sand | selected | shore |
| 14:5 23:6 29:24 | 9:16 10:15 18:22,23 20:4 | 12:4 |
| sandier | 21:15 37:7 | short |
| 30:6 | self-employed | 29:5 |
| sandy | 42:5 | show |
| 30:24 31:3,10 32:5,6 | send | 25:15 29:1 |
| savings | 35:5 | showing |
| 17:19 | sense | 14:18 |
| Saybrook | 22:16 | shown |
| 6:20 | sent | 12:14 13:24 30:17 |
| scale | 34:11 | shows |
| 16:10 18:7 | separate | 12:1 14:15 17:3 18:20 20:20 |
| scenarios | 37:16 | 24:24 27:18 29:8 |
| 19:6 | sequester | shrimp |
| schedule | 29:6 | 26:22 |
| 33:8 | series | side |
| schematic | 32:17 | 15:11 16:25 17:16,18 |
| 29:7 | set | signed |
| scoping | 15:6,15 40:5,7 | 35:14 42:24 |
| 33:2 | sewage | significant |
| scrap | 31:4 | 24:13 25:5 |
| 14:8,10,11 | shallow | silt |
| sea | 37:1 | 23:7 30:15 32:3 |
| 17:8 | share | silty |
| seal | 10:17 20:21,21,24 | 29:21,24 30:22 |
| 46:16 | shared | similar |
| seawall | 20:23 21:13 | 19:24 38:12 |
| 38:2 41:13 | sharp | simple |
| second | 41:3 | 24:7 |
| 13:3 25:16 26:16,20 28:23 | Sheet | simply |
| Section | 10:19,20 24:6 34:4 | 36:25 |
| 2:4,11,13 3:6 | Sheiffele | simulate |
| sediment | 2:6 4:7 5:10,13,14 | 19:3 |
| 22:7,12,17,18,24 23:6 24:25 | shellfish | simulation |
| 25:24 26:3,15 31:6,18 38:23 | 32:15 | 18:24 28:2 |
| sediment's | ship | simulator |
| 23:10,24 | 12:22 15:14,25 18:6,7,24 | 39:11 |
| sediments | 28:2 39:18 40:9,13,18 | site |
| 23:13,16,17 28:17 | shipmaking | 10:22 20:22 21:12,12 30:17 |
| see | 37:2 | 32:1 |
| 10:20 12:4 14:1 18:13 20:1 | shippers | sites |
| 20:13,23 22:15 23:1 25:9,20 | 16:7 | 9:18 22:6 31:13,15 |
| 26:16,19 27:14,18 36:1 37:9 | shipping | six |
| $41: 18,24$ | $36: 16$ | $25: 10,19$ |
| seek | ships | size |



| talk | think | 23:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17:13 21:16,20 22:4 | 28:10 38:6,25 | top |
| talked | third | 27:9 |
| 22:10 25:2 43:19 | 26:16,21 | total |
| talking | thoughtful | 12:25 13:2,4 18:12,14 20:21 |
| 32:2 | 37:10 44:15 | 37:15 |
| talks | thoughts | town |
| 12:24 | 9:7 34:21 45:5 | 43:3 |
| tape | thousand | Townsend |
| 35:22 | 19:25 | 38:1 |
| team | three | toxic |
| 9:11 11:4 33:18 | 6:37:10 | 24:13 38:7 |
| technical | three-minute | toxicity |
| 11:3 24:4 26:9 | 35:15 | 23:10,14,19 24:8 25:1,4 26:4 |
| technologies | Thursday | 26:15 |
| 37:2 | 10:18 | traffic |
| Tentatively | tidal | 13:5 |
| 9:16 10:15 18:22 20:4 21:15 | 30:24 | transcript |
| 37:7 | tide | 34:21,23 46:10 |
| terminals | 12:17 16:2 18:5 39:19,25 | transect |
| 12:13 14:16,17 42:16 | 40:4,8,16 | 15:1 27:6,8 |
| terms | tier | transects |
| 13:2 33:1 | 23:1,4,10,11,12 25:2 | 25:10,12,20 26:19 27:2,3,7 |
| Terry | tiered | 27:11,14 |
| 43:5 | 22:20,25 23:23 26:6,13 28:17 | transit |
| test | time | 42:20 |
| 19:5,6,7,7 25:1 26:15,17 | 10:1 11:2 22:15 23:18 41:24 | transits |
| tested | 44:25 45:4 | 39:23 |
| 19:17 25:1 39:12 | today | transportation |
| testing | 21:8 27:5 28:19 35:4 36:23 | 11:21 16:3,5 17:19 20:17 |
| 22:20 23:2,5,13,14,16 24:3 | 44:23 | 36:21 |
| 25:2 26:11,13,14,25 27:3 | Todd | traversing |
| 28:18 31:18 | 2:12 3:24 4:17 10:14 17:13 | 41:23 |
| tests | 21:16 33:22 | treated |
| 23:20 24:8 25:3 26:4,4 | told | 9:2 |
| thank | 5:15 | treatment |
| 3:10 6:10,13,17,23 7:24 8:1,7 | tonight | 24:16 31:4 |
| 10:10,11 33:21,22 34:20 | 3:9,19 5:4 6:8 8:4,15,24 10:7 | triangle |
| 37:22,23 39:3,4 41:9,10,22 | 10:13,17 11:8 21:19 33:23 | 30:2 |
| 41:22 42:1,2,22,23 43:10 | 34:11,21 35:9,14,19 44:12 | true |
| 44:10,11 45:4 | 44:16 45:3 | 46:10 |
| thanks | tonight's | try |
| 5:13 21:18,18 33:18,19 36:6 | 5:17 | 7:1 35:23 |
| 44:14 | tonnage | trying |
| thing | 13:1,2,24 | 15:18 40:13 |
| 35:21 38:22 41:1 42:8 | tons | TSP |
| things | 13:5 14:11 | 20:16 |
| 14:3 18:9 | tool | turn |


| 15:13 33:20 40:6,7,13 41:1 | 27:12,14 28:20 29:6,11 31:8 | wasn't |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41:2,3 | 31:23 | 28:3 |
| turned | upgrade | waste |
| 19:16 | 37:19 | 38:7 |
| turning | use | water |
| 12:10 14:23 15:16 19:7,15 | 13:19 17:12 20:22 21:12 | 2:10 12:16,17 15:22,24 17:10 |
| 22:13 25:15,17 27:16,20 | 30:21 31:25 32:12 35:1 | 23:12,13 24:22 26:3,25 |
| 28:3,6,15 35:24 | 37:11 45:2 | 36:21 37:12 39:21 41:19 |
| turns | useful | waterborne |
| 41:2 | 41:19 | 11:21 13:6,7 |
| two | uses | way |
| 7:21 14:25 15:17 18:8 19:4 | 13:19 24:18 26:17 | 27:9 29:6 |
| 21:25 25:20 26:17 27:13 | utilizing | we'll |
| 29:17,19 36:1 40:1 41:2 | 5:1 | 21:16 22:4 24:5 25:16 36:1 |
| type | V | 40:22 |
| 12:24 | V | we're |
| typewriting | various | 9:5 10:24 11:22 15:17 28:16 |
| 46:9 | 19:8 36:15 | 33:8 40:7,14,16,16,22,24 |
| U | verifie 19:10 | 41:6,7 we've |
| U.S | vessels | 28:21 42:20 44:4 |
| 2:4,9,11,13 | 6:1 16:9,11 36:23 | website |
| unable | vibrated | 7:8 10:18,19,21 24:4,11 $33: 5$ |
| 16:9 | 25:24 | 35:1 |
| unconfined | vicinity | weeks |
| 24:22 | 30:24 31:10 | 6:25 |
| uncover | Vicksburg | welcome |
| 32:19 | 18:25 39:9 | 3:2 8:4,16 21:16 |
| undergo | views | went |
| 24:16 | 8:9 33:25 34:1 | 19:24 20:5,7 39:20 |
| underkeel | voice | west |
| 15:23 39:19 | 9:5 | 7:21 15:6,7,7,14 22:1 27:17 |
| understand | volume | 29:18 30:11,25 31:2,9 |
| 9:6 | 36:16 | westerly |
| understanding | volumes | 40:5 |
| 9:21 | 13:11 35:24 | whatsoever |
| undertaken | W | 44:8 |
| Unit | wait | 19:13 |
| 4:1 | 18:4 | widen |
| United | want | 19:19 |
| 3:7 | 6:23 10:5 24:7 25:25 | widened |
| unload | wanted | 27:19 |
| 16:13 | 16:16 37:6 | widening |
| unrestricted | wanting | 5:21 16:21 19:14 25:13 |
| 15:22 | 41:18 | wider |
| unsuitable | warranted | $40: 24,25$ |
| 24:14,23 25:3,6 26:24 27:4 | 6:8 11:24 | width |


| 16:22,23,24 17:2 19:6 39:22 | 35:24 | 11:17 13:4,24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41:8 | zone | 2017 |
| widths | 38:19 | 33:3 |
| 17:10 19:11 39:13 | zoom | 2018 |
| windows | 27:13 | 1:6 8:24 12:20 33:3 34:12 |
| 32:13 |  | 44:21 46:17 |
| Winter | 0 | 2021 |
| 3:25 | 1 | 46:24 |
| wish | $1$ | 22 |
| 39:16 40:21 42:14 43:11 | 1 | 40:12 |
| wishes | 14:11 23:1 24:4 26:9 27:6 | 235 |
| 35:5 43:1 44:12 | 29:22 | 38:1 |
| wishing | 1.6 | 24 |
| 42:25 | 20:7 | 1:613:6 |
| Witness | 1.9 | 25 |
| 46:16 | 18:18 | 20:25 |
| work | 10 |  |
| 36:7 43:10 | 21:4,9 | 3 |
| worked | 15th | 3 |
| 6:5 | 8:24 11:1 33:11 34:12 44:21 | 23:10,12 25:2 27:7 |
| working | 16-foot | 30 |
| 37:19 | 27:22 28:7,9 29:2 | 42:6 |
| works | 17 | 30-something |
| 36:1 | 25:11 | 19:25 |
| wouldn't | 1946 | 300 |
| 30:3 | 12:19 | 40:23 |
| write | 1950 | 31 |
| 3:24 | 12:20 | 15:23,25 39:21,25 46:24 |
| writing | 1950s | 32 |
| 35:17 | 28:10 | 43:16 |
| written | 2 |  |
| 8:23,25 9:25 34:10,13,15 | 2 | 5:23 12:16,17 15:4,21 39:18 |
| 35:5 44:17,20 | 23:4 27:6 29:22 | $40: 7$ |
| X | 2-foot | 37 |
|  | 39:19,20 | 16:19 40:1,2 |
| Y | 200 |  |
| yards | 1:10 19:20 | 4 |
| 19:25 20:1 21:21 31:14 32:2 | 2000 | 4 |
| 38:22 | 43:18 | 15:23,24 23:11 27:7 |
| year | 2002 | 4.2 |
| 14:1 21:24 38:10 | 44:3 | 21:21 |
| years | 2007 | 40 |
| 6:3 12:21,23 21:10 42:6 | 11:14 | 5:23 40:22 41:7 |
| yellow | 2010 | 40-foot |
| 21:1 | 38:5 | 18:18,23 20:4 |
|  | 2015 |  |
| Z | 11:15 | 16:19 |
| zero | 2016 |  |



