

MEMORANDUM

DATE July 27, 2020

JOB NO. 2015-0121-03

TO Attendees of Nauset Estuary Stakeholders Group (NESG) ZOOM Meeting on July 9, 2020
for Nauset Estuary Dredging Project

FROM Leslie Fields
Direct Phone: (508) 495-6225
lfields@woodsholegroup.com

Meeting Minutes from NESG July 9, 2020 ZOOM Meeting

Attendees

Orleans NESG Voting Members: John Kelly, Nate Sears, Mark Mathison, Kevin Galligan, Charlie Carlson, Steve Smith, Bill Amaru

Eastham NESG Voting Members: Jacqueline Beebe, Shana Brogan, Silvio Genao, Jon Granlund, Harry Swift
Betsy Furtney – Public Resident, Orleans

Leslie Fields, Beth Gurney – Woods Hole Group

Ed Maroney - Cape Cod Chronicle

Missing: Alex Cestaro - Eastham NESG Voting Member

Missing: Trent Sullivan - Eastham NESG Voting Member

Introduction:

Leslie introduced the project. All participants introduced themselves. The ZOOM meeting was broadcast on Orleans Channel 18.

NESG Goals and Objectives:

Leslie presented the following:

Goal: Decide future of Nauset Estuary Dredging Project

Objectives:

- Ensure stakeholder interests are represented equally
- Review project alternatives and environmental impacts
- Make recommendations on next steps and preferred alternative(s)
- Meet with regulatory agencies to review project
- Oversee permitting process
- Participate in public outreach process



NESG Business Procedures:

Now that the NESG meetings are open to the public and following the open meeting law, they must be posted/advertised at least 48 hours before in both Towns.

If a sub-committee meets, which can be as little as two people, the meeting would also have to be posted 48 hours in advance in both Towns.

All meetings must follow open meeting law and need to be made available for the general public to view via ZOOM.

At the next meeting, the NESG will be voting and electing a Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Clerk. Co-Chairmen, one from each Town, could also be considered. John Kelly and Jacqui Beebe will assist with agenda language for election of officers.

NESG cannot deliberate outside of meeting on Chairman options.

At the next meeting, the NESG will review the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and discuss whether a revised MOU needs to be signed.

Need to keep the Cape Cod National Seashore in the loop.

At the next meeting, the NESG will review a list of regulatory and advisory agencies and discuss inviting them to participate in future NESG meetings. The regulatory and advisory agencies will not be voting members of the NESG.

The draft Special Review Procedure letter to MEPA was discussed. It was decided that the NESG should not wait to file the letter with MEPA until a final decision has made on the preferred alternative. The letter will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Leslie said she would look at revising the schedule for permitting and construction. The revised schedule will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Review of Recent Studies:

Red Tide Cyst Pilot Project (RTCPP):

Leslie gave a PowerPoint Presentation on the RTCPP.

Leslie stated that we will need to dry out the dewatered sediments and work them over with fresh water before using them, and we will need to test the material before using it for a nourishment project. Leslie said she will work with the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute (WHOI) to put together a Technical Memorandum for recommendations on reuse of the dewatered sediments.

Commentary:

- Bill Amaru asked when talking about freezing temperatures, was it for fresh water or salt water?

Response: Leslie said it was fresh water.



- John Kelly asked: In listening to the process of the dewatering, do we need a dewatering space that would be big enough and handle the equipment needed to process the dredged material?

Response: Leslie said yes.

- Mark Mathison asked: Do we need to process the dredged material if it is staying within Nauset Estuary?

Response: Leslie said no.

- Mark Mathison talked about possibly using a thermal barrier to keep the sediment colder.
- Jon Granlund asked about changing the PH level.

Response: Attendee said we would need another study to look at that.

- Steve Smith said we could truck the material offsite for dewatering.

Response: Leslie said we would need to dewater the material before trucking it away for upland disposal.

- Charlie Carlson asked what the timetable was for dewatering.

Response: Leslie said it would take 1-2 weeks depending on the amount.

- Shana Brogan stated we will need to develop a Dredged Spoil Management Plan detailing the protocol, including dewatering, options for placement, and which spoils can be moved/used and when.

Response: Leslie agreed.

- Nate Sears asked: Do we need to check on storms that could put material into the Atlantic Ocean?

Response: Leslie said it would be okay if the material went into the Atlantic Ocean. She may have people from WHOI come and talk to the group about working with red tide cysts.

Nate Sears asked: can we remove the dewatered spoils from the site within a certain amount of time or do we wait a year?

Response: Leslie said it would probably take a year because of the time-of-year restrictions that will be in place for the shorebirds, which is from March 31 to September 1.

- Steve Smith mentioned the dredged material from Rock Harbor was placed in the parking lot and a private company took it away to Brewster.



Response: John Kelly said it was only 10,000 cubic yards and some also went to a landfill. He also said the magnitude of the Nauset Estuary dredging project would be much bigger and the cost to truck it away would be very high.

- Charlie Carlson stated we cannot wait a year for the sand to be moved and agreed with Steve that we need to build in a plan to be able to keep dredging.

Response: Leslie said we will have to dredge in phases.

- Charlie Carlson asked how much can be dredged in one year?

Response: Leslie said we can look at production rates for the NESG.

- Bill Amaru stated the value of the sand could help with the cost if it were sold.
- Steve Smith stated the sand is worth something and it could be sold to a private company.
- Someone asked Jacqui Beebe how much the sand was sold for.

Response: Jacqui said the sand was not sold, at least that she knew of.

- Shana Brogan stated we need to put all these thoughts in the management plan. She then asked if the red tide cyst pilot program went as deep as the dewatering area will be?

Response: Leslie said yes.

- Leslie stated again that testing of the dewatered material prior to re-use needs to be included in the management plan.

Mill Pond Channel Dredging:

Leslie explained that the Town of Orleans asked her to investigate the possibility of adding the Mill Pond channel to the dredging project. It is currently not included in the Nauset Estuary dredge footprint. She stated that the folks from WHOI have determined that more red tide cysts would not go into the estuary if it was dredged. A model study was done and showed this.

Commentary:

- Someone talked about only dredging from the old Mill structure to the pond and not going through the old Mill.

Response: Leslie asked what was the point of only dredging that area?

Response: Steve Smith said they really need the area from the Mill Race to Pricilla Landing dredged.

- Steve Smith stated dredging the Mill Pond channel would improve water quality and push more water into the pond.

Response: Leslie stated the water quality will not change because we are not dredging the inlet so there will not be an increase of water.



Response: Bill Amaru did not agree.

- Steve Smith stated that dams are being taken down all over to help water quality. The Mill dam need to be removed because it is restricting water flow.
- Leslie stated the Group will need to decide if Mill Pond will be included but Charlie Carlson noted this really is an Orleans decision because Orleans will be funding the work.
- Charlie Carlson stated the Town of Orleans has a proposal from Woods Hole Group to perform field investigations to collect samples and determine the characteristics of the sediments in Mill Pond, as well as a bathymetric survey.
- Shana Brogan stated the Mill Pond dredging might have regulatory impacts and she does not want that to slow down the primary project.

Response: Several people agreed.

- Leslie stated Woods Hole Group will stay tuned on Orleans signing the proposal to perform the work in Mill Pond.

Review of Nauset Estuary Dredging Project:

Dredging Alternatives:

Leslie reminded everyone that parts of the dredging project are located in the Cape Cod National Seashore, the Town of Eastham, and the Town of Orleans. She reviewed all the alternatives that had been previously discussed, and stated Alternatives 1A and 1C were deemed viable. She showed the group a graphic of all the alternatives and the type and volumes of sand from each one. She stated any areas with fine material could go to the upland, and the clean, silty material to the landfills.

Commentary:

- Someone asked if we had the red tide cyst count for each alternative.
- Response: Leslie said yes.
- Kevin Galligan asked if the material from behind the barrier beach has little red tide cysts, will the dewatering be shorter?
- Response: Leslie said yes, and that we should prioritize the dredge areas in the management plan.
- Bill Amaru asked to talk about the width of the proposed channel and said he regretted reducing the width from 100' to 50'. He said it will fill back in very quickly if only 50'.
- Response: Charlie Carlson seconded Bill's comment.
- Response: Nate Sears and Jon Granlund also agree with Bill's comment.
-



- Response: Shana Brogan disagreed with Bill's comment and stated the need to start the project somewhere (at 50') and see what the impacts are to the intertidal area and shellfish habitat. She stated that starting incrementally is better.
- Leslie stated she could look at a model of 100' versus 50' for shoaling to see what the difference is.
- Charlie Carlson asked if we could start at the 100' width and see how it goes with the permitting.
- Steve Smith stated navigation near the marsh causes slumping of marsh.
-
- Jacqui Beebe asked for a reminder of why the group decided to narrow the channel from 100' to 50'.
-
- Response: Leslie said it was because of the volume of sand and the impacts to the resource areas.
-
- Response: Jacqui then stated that the 50' plan incorporated the feedback received from the regulatory agencies.
- Mark Mathison stated the group had talked about getting the Comprehensive Permits to allow what needed to be addressed in the next 10 years, and that the Permits would allow dredging in a "zone". He said the Town of Orleans has looked into buying a dredge to maintain the project forever. He then asked if it made sense to go for the 100' now and see what is really needed once they start doing the work.
- Response: Kevin said he remembered at the DEP meeting the dredge "zone" was talked about, and he supports the 100' channel.
- Response: Leslie asked what the group thought about a 100' channel behind the barrier beach and 50' elsewhere.
- Response: Nate said he agreed with Leslie's approach because it suffices the needs of the fisherman.
- Steve Smith said he would send photographs that show the Town Cove channel near Hopkins Island was bigger before and that this area should also be 100'.
- Response: Leslie said then it could be 100' behind the barrier beach, 50' to Pricilla, and maybe 100' where Steve said in Town Cove.
-

Disposal Alternatives:

Leslie showed the group a slide of the potential dredge dewatering area, which is north of the Nauset Beach parking area, and said that NHESP wants to stay involved while the group is reviewing this potential area. She explained the project will need a MESA filing and what the 3 possible outcomes could be. NHESP wants to continue to discuss the following: disposal alternatives, minimize the size of basin, frequency of use, details on the dredge pipe, and overall area of impact.

Commentary:

- Nate stated that 80,000 cy of dredged material can fit in the potential dewatering area at a time, and the group needs to prioritize dredge sites with the least amount of red tide cysts to make room for the next phase of dredging.
- Steve asked how a small amount of dredge material would be handled.
- Response: Leslie said even a small amount would need to go to the dewatering site.



Resource Area Impacts:

Leslie submitted the additional shellfish survey results to MA DMF. DMF may require a shellfish relay prior to any dredging.

Commentary:

- Shana asked if Leslie had looked at shellfish habitat and mitigation other than the relay.
- Response: Leslie stated we would also look at a reseeded program.
- Shana stated we would need to address mitigation in a plan.
- Response: Leslie said we will also follow any Time-of-Year restrictions for fish or shorebirds.

Next Steps and Responsibilities:

Leslie said Woods Hole Group would do the minutes for this meeting and the agenda for the next meeting. She will circulate a draft agenda for review before it is finalized.

The group decided to meet every two weeks, and that Thursday from 5-7pm seemed to work best.

Orleans and Eastham will work together on which Town can host the Zoom meetings.