7. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDED PLAN

Implementation of the recommended plan would require a commitment by the State of Maryland to adhere to an accelerated schedule for bringing the site online by early 2009. This section outlines the process for implementing the recommended plan, the parties involved, and the schedule for implementation.

7.1 IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The construction of the proposed dredged material containment facility (DMCF) at Masonville requires significant site preparation and requires tight scheduling for the preparation of the site. The following is a list of the major schedule items necessary for the implementation of the recommended plan. Some of these items are going to be permitted separately from the DMCF.

- Site Preparation Activities
  - Pre-dredging (removal of overburden) (November 2006 to July 2007)
  - Phase I of Baltimore City Storm Drain Relocation (July 2006 to April 2007)
  - Phase II, Baltimore City Storm Drain Relocation and MMT Phase 2/KIM Stormwater Outfall Relocation (October 2006 to February 2007)
  - Remediation and Relocation of Derelict Vessels (April 2006 to September 2006)
  - Demolition of Piers 1, 2, and 3 (July 2006 to November 2006)
  - Relocation of Baltimore City Waterline (August 2007 to January 2008)
- Masonville DMCF Construction (January 2008 to January 2009)
- Mitigation and Community Enhancement Projects (December 2006 to April 2009)

Implementation for each of these schedule items requires the following four major phases:

1. Engineering
2. Permitting
3. Procurement, Bid, and Award of Construction Projects
4. Construction

These steps often overlap as different items within the overall project move from phase to phase at different times, but the following is a general description of the process for implementing the recommended plan. To meet the accelerated schedule, site engineering is being performed as the permit application is reviewed. This would allow procurement of the funding for the projects to occur immediately following the joint permit (Section 404 permit, Section 10 permit, tidal wetlands license, non-tidal wetlands permit, water quality certification, Federal consistency determination) application decision, if the decision is favorable.

If the joint permit application permits and certification are awarded, funding procurement would begin and the engineering plans would be put out to bid. The contract would be awarded following a bidding period, and construction would begin. Prior to construction the project would also require approval from the Critical Area Commission for the Chesapeake and Atlantic Coastal Bays, approval from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) for stormwater management and erosion and sediment control, a water construction permit, a storm drain modification permit, and an national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) Permit.

7.1.1 Engineering

The engineering phase involves the planning, design, and scheduling for each of the schedule items. The duration of this phase is dependent upon the complexity of the schedule item and planning and design decisions.

7.1.2 Permitting and Coordination

Federal and state governments regulate construction and dredging within tidal waters. Tidal wetlands in the State of Maryland are protected by the following regulations:

- Section 10 of the River and Harbor Act of 1899 – Federal
- Clean Water Act, Section 404 – Federal
- Maryland Tidal Wetlands Act – State
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification – State

The work to be performed would be done under several permits. The majority of the work would be included under the joint permit application. The following list identifies the major line items included under the DMCF project permit application and those with individual permits.

- Schedule Items Under the DMCF Permit Application
  - Pre-dredging
  - Phase II of the Relocation of Baltimore City Storm Drain Relocation and Masonville Marine Terminal (MMT) Phase 2/ Kurt Iron and Metal (KIM) Stormwater Outfall Relocation
  - Relocation of Baltimore City Waterline
  - Construction of the DMCF
  - Relocation of Derelict Vessels

  Onsite Mitigation and Community Enhancement Projects (in the vicinity of Masonville Cove)
- Schedule Items Under Separate Permits/Agreements
  - Remediation of Derelict Vessels (agreement with the MDE)
  - Off-site Mitigation Projects

The permits that must be obtained and coordination that must occur prior to construction of the DMCF are listed below. The agency issuing each permit or involved in the coordination is shown in parentheses. The overall project schedule in Appendix N provides a timetable for obtaining these permits and completing necessary coordination. An NPDES permit and a Water Appropriations Permit issued by MDE would be required prior to construction.

- Section 404 Permit [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)]
- Section 10 Permit (USACE)
- Federal Conformity Decision (MDE/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- Water Quality Certification (MDE)
- Erosion and Sediment Control (MDE)
- Non-tidal Wetlands Permit (MDE)
- Critical Area Commission Coordination (Critical Areas Commission for the Chesapeake and Atlantic Coastal Bays)

- Federal Consistency Determination (MDE)
- Storm Water Management (MDE)
- General Permit for Construction Activity (MDE)
- Industrial Wastewater/Stormwater General Discharge Permit (MDE)
- Storm Drainage Modifications (City)
- Water/Sanitary Hookup (City)
- Relocation of Baltimore City Waterline Developer's Agreement (City)
- Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species Consultation (Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

7.1.3 Procurement, Bidding, and Award

This phase includes time for the state to procure the funding necessary to complete each construction task, prepare the contract documents, execute the bidding and review period, and award the contract. This phase is estimated to last approximately five months from the beginning of procurement to the award of the construction job. Generally, this phase immediately follows completion of the engineering phase and issuance of a permit. Some flexibility in the scheduling of this phase exists, as procurement may begin prior to finalizing the engineering plans and/or issuance of the necessary permits.

7.1.4 Construction

Construction of the site is dependent upon obtaining the necessary permits and the award of the bid. A detailed construction schedule is presented in Appendix N. Construction includes any work done at the site, excluding work performed for site investigations. The first schedule items to begin the construction phase would be the site preparation activities, followed by the construction of the DMCF. Construction of the compensatory mitigation projects would be ongoing during the site preparation and DMCF construction activities.

7.2 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

An overall schedule for the Masonville project is presented in Appendix N. This schedule shows the relationships between the schedule items and their implementation steps. This section evaluates each schedule item and the factors critical for their timely completion.

7.2.1 Site Preparation Activities

7.2.1.1 Pre-dredging

The removal of materials geotechnically unsuitable for construction (pre-dredging) is currently in the latter stages of the engineering phase. The pre-dredging would be included under the permit(s) for the DMCF. A permit decision is anticipated in October 2006. Procurement for pre-dredging is expected to begin in July 2006. This would allow the bidding phase for a pre-dredging contract to begin immediately after issuance of the DMCF permit, and the construction phase to begin as early as November 2006. The timing of this is critical to the project, as the pre-

dredging must fit around environmental dredging windows, which are the portions of the year where time of year restrictions do not prevent dredging actives. Pre-dredging would be completed using a clamshell mechanical dredge and scow, and material would be barged to the Hart-Miller Island (HMI) DMCF.

7.2.1.2 Phase I, Baltimore City Storm Drain Relocation

The engineering for this item began in early 2005 and is anticipated to be completed in early 2006. Procurement would begin immediately following the engineering phase, and construction would follow once the bid has been awarded. This work requires approval from the Critical Areas Commission and a general permit for construction activity from the MDE. No wetlands or open water would be affected by this Phase. This portion of the project should be finished in April 2007.

7.2.1.3 Phase II, Baltimore City Storm Drain Relocation and MMT Phase 2/KIM Stormwater Outfall Relocation

The engineering for this item is currently underway, and should be completed by Summer 2006. The procurement, bidding, and award phase would immediately follow engineering, and construction could begin following a favorable joint permit application decision. This would also require a storm drain modification permit from Baltimore City. Construction should be completed in February 2007.

7.2.1.4 Remediation and Relocation of Derelict Vessels

MPA performed in-depth investigation and testing of various samples of the total of 25 vessels and structures including the floating drydock, and sediments beneath the drydock and debris piles. Based upon these studies and penetration dives conducted on these vessels, MPA would remediate the vessels by removing hazardous and regulated waste, by a marine operation. The remediation plan has been developed in coordination with MDE and is being permitted independently of the proposed Masonville DMCF.

All vessels are currently sunk or not salvageable. Some of these would be abandoned in place and others would be relocated to other locations within the proposed DMCF footprint, after they have been cleaned of hazardous and regulated waste as approved by a certified industrial hygienist or similarly certified individual. The DMCF would have to be permitted before any of the vessels could be relocated. Barges 1, 2 and 3 are currently located in areas where they would impede construction of the DMCF. These barges would require relocation to the KIM Channel.

All vessels would then be buried by dredged material during placement operations. It is anticipated that the vessel remediation and management would occur during the Summer of 2006 and the relocation would occur as needed.

7.2.1.5 Demolition of Piers 1, 2, and 3

Engineering for the demolition of Piers 2 and 3 and the removal of the Pier 1 deck should be available in spring 2006. The procurement for this item would begin immediately following the engineering phase, and construction would immediately follow award of the contract. Demolition should be complete by Fall 2006.

7.2.1.6 Relocation of Baltimore City Waterline

This schedule item requires careful integration with the construction of the DMCF's structure. Coordination between Baltimore City and the Maryland Port Administration (MPA) is crucial for this task. The MPA and their consultants have been meeting regularly with the City, and would continue to do so throughout the project. The 90 percent design documents regarding the waterline relocation into the containment structure are available. However, decisions and planning are ongoing. The new Baltimore City waterline would be built into the sand portion of the dike and would be accessible for maintenance without disturbing dredged material after the site is operational. The portion of the new waterline outside of the alignment would be placed and then the existing waterline would be connected to the new waterline. The disconnected portion of the existing waterline, where the dike would be placed, would be removed and the remainder of the waterline would be abandoned. During placement of the waterline, there would be a gap in the sand dike around the existing waterline. This gap would be filled after the new waterline is connected and prior to the placement of the clay portion of the dike.

The relocation of the waterline will be included on permit applications for the proposed DMCF. This action would also require an industrial wastewater/stormwater general discharge permit for the hydrostatic testing of the waterline. The procurement for this item would begin immediately following the engineering phase. Construction is currently slated to begin in Spring 2007, but may be shifted pending decisions on integrating the waterline relocation into the construction schedule for the DMCF. The waterline would be relocated prior to the construction of the clay portion of the dike.

7.2.2 Masonville DMCF

The engineering of the DMCF is currently underway, with completion anticipated in September 2006.

The permitting process for the site is also currently underway. The process centers on the Federal Section 404 Permit for which MPA is preparing this environmental impact statement (EIS). The general schedule for the Federal permit is as follows:

- Publish Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register – 26 May 2005 (completed)
- Conduct Scoping Process (completed)
    - Public meeting – 15 June 2005
    - Public Comments Due 15 July 2005
- Prepare draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) – Underway

- Submit DEIS , Publish Notice of Availability (NOA), and Apply for Federal Permit – May 2006
- Public and Agency Review of DEIS – May 2006 to July 2006
- Finalize and Submit FEIS, Publish NOA – July 2006 to September 2006
- Permit Decision – October 2006

A more detailed schedule is available in Appendix N. The permit decision for the joint permit application in October 2006 includes the following:

- Section 404 Permit
- Section 10 Permit
- Tidal Wetlands License
- Non-tidal Wetlands Permit
- Water Quality Certification
- Federal Consistency Determination

All permits necessary for the construction of the site are listed in Section 7.1.2. It is anticipated by the MPA that these would be awarded by October 2006.

Procurement would begin immediately following the completion of the engineering phase. The bidding would begin immediately following procurement. The construction of the DMCF includes construction of the four containment structure sections detailed in Section 4.4. These containment structure sections are the cofferdam, armored dike, beach dike, and onshore dike. All of these items would be bid as one contract. Award of the contract for construction of the DMCF is anticipated in October 2006.

Pre-dredging and other site preparation must occur before construction of the containment structure. Pre-dredging requires the removal of overburden from overtop of the onsite borrow areas and under the containment structure footprint. This dredging would be done mechanically using clamshell dredges and hopper barges to transport the material to the HMI DMCF.

Construction for the majority of the site preparation schedule items would occur during portions of DMCF construction. The sunken barges (Figure 4-1) located under the western portion of the alignment would be dragged west of the western portion of the dike and beach area. The sunken barges currently serve as reef structures and would remain as such. The movement of these sunken barges would fill approximately 1 acre of open water. This requires a Tidal Wetland License. With multiple schedule items occurring simultaneously during the construction of the DMCF, detailed planning and scheduling and strict project oversight would be required. The current construction schedule is displayed in Appendix N.

The two most complicated site preparation items to fit into the DMCF construction schedule are the waterline relocation and the derelict vessel remediation and relocation. The containment structure (Figure 4-1) of the main portion of the alignment would be constructed in the following order:

1) Cofferdam
2) Beach Dike
3) Armored Sand Dike

4) On-shore Dike

Construction of the cofferdam sections would be the first construction activity for the containment structure, and would have a duration of approximately six months. The cofferdam cells would be filled using off-site material from a licensed upland source (Section 4.4.1.1), The berm behind the cofferdams would be hydraulically placed following construction and filling of the cofferdams. After the cofferdams are completed and material is placed behind the cells, the new Baltimore City waterline would be placed within the fill behind the cofferdams. The new section of waterline would then be tied to into the existing waterline. Mobilization of equipment for construction of the sand dike portions of the site would occur once the new waterline has been tied into the existing waterline. Cofferdam construction is described in greater detail in Section 4.5.2.2.

The sand portion of the dike construction would begin at the western end of the site, which has a beach shoreline. The beach sand dike may be constructed from on-site or off-site material. It is anticipated that there would be a training dike constructed with sand material and the discharge from the dredge would be guided by the training dikes to a limited area that is enclosed by turbidity curtains (Section 4.5.2.4). Having completed the eastern cofferdam and western beach dike, turbidity impacts from borrow activities and construction of the northern sand dike would be minimized. The armored sand dike would also be constructed using on-site construction materials, training dikes and turbidity curtains (Section 4.5.2.3). Construction of the dike would continue, as the dikes are shaped and rock armament is mechanically placed by a crane on the northern section of the dike. The onshore dike would be constructed from on-site construction material, if possible. Conventional earthwork construction methods would be used (Section 4.5.2.5).

Construction of the clay portion of the containment dike (see sections 4.4.1.2 and 4.4.1.3) would begin once the sand portion has been completed. This would prevent the introduction of any potential turbidity from suspended clay particles to the Patapsco River waters. The clay would be excavated and placed with a 30-inch hydraulic dredge.

After dike construction is finished, an exit channel would be excavated through the dike and the dredging equipment would exit the site. To facilitate the dredge exiting the dike, that portion of the dike would be constructed to the minimum elevation to contain sediments within the site. It would be the same as the other portions of the dike, but lower in elevation. The exit channel would be excavated using equipment already located on-site. Turbidity curtains would likely be used to minimize impacts, particularly a turbidity plume, within the Patapsco River. The exit channel would be filled in mechanically and the dike would be constructed to match the rest of the containment facility. During dike construction, relocation of some of the derelict vessels would be occurring. This would require close coordination of the contractors onsite.

Ancillary items such as spillways and site facilities would be constructed following completion of the containment structure. Also, following completion of the containment structure, the newly constructed dike would be planted to re-establish a portion of the critical area buffer covered by the DMCF construction. The 100 ft critical area buffer would be reestablished following future

dike raisings at the site. The total duration of construction is anticipated to be one and one half years, allowing site operations in the 2008-2009 dredging season.

After the amount of dredged material in the facility reaches the height of land of the MMT Phase 2 (Figure 2-1), an onshore berm along the periphery of MMT Phase 2 connecting the beach sand dike and the onshore dike would be constructed to the final height of the DMCF to contain the dredged material. MMT Phase 2 is anticipated to have a final, graded height of +32 ft MLLW, the onshore berm would be constructed to a temporary height of +42 ft MLLW and graded to a final height of +36 ft MLLW at the appropriate time following filling operations.

7.2.3 Integrated Compensatory Mitigation Projects

Proposed mitigation projects are discussed in Chapter 6.

The exact projects and their scope have not yet been determined. However, they are anticipated to be decided upon during the permit review process. A schedule for their completion has not yet been developed, but the projects should be reaching their construction phases between late 2006 and 2009, with the majority completed by 2009.

7.3 KIM DERELICT VESSEL MANAGEMENT

The 25 derelict vessels currently located in KIM Channel would have the solid and hazardous waste removed and then would be buried under dredged material. All material and debris management resulting from demolition and all removal work would be conducted according to current state and federal regulations in order to ensure that no additional contamination or environmental hazards would occur. No debris would be permitted to fall into adjacent bodies of water and all waste would be transported from the site and disposed of in permitted locations.

The work would include but not limited to:

1) Demolition and removal of the timber dry dock to below deck level.
2) Demolition and removal of a 3,000 gallon fuel tank on top of the Gantry crane frame on the crane barge, including approximately 6 inches of residual fuel. Demolition and removal of the Gantry Crane frame.
3) Demolition and removal of sufficient portions of the Beverly to allow waterside access for the removal and disposal of the creosoted timbers from Barge No. 3, or the relocation of Barge No. 3, if necessary .
4) Demolition and removal of steel drydock decking to access removal of regulated and solid waste materials in the hull interior.
5) Incidental demolition and removal of steel plating, decking, superstructure, hull, tanks, and machinery on all vessels to allow access for the subsequent removal of regulated hazardous and solid wastes.

During the demolition work, adjacent waterways would be protected from debris and other material falling into the water. Cleanup of all debris would be completed by the contractor. As part of the minimization of impacts during the demolition and cleanup activities, a waterside

containment boom and turbidity curtain would be employed. These would completely enclose the waterside work area to contain floating debris. In addition, water misting, temporary enclosures, and other suitable methods would be employed, as necessary, to limit the spread of dust and dirt, since environmentally sensitive materials are known to be associated with some of these vessels. All work would be conducted to avoid free fall and to prevent materials from falling into the water. All demolished items and materials would be segregated and stockpiled promptly. On-site storage or sale of removed items would be prohibited.

Demolished materials would be disposed of daily, and no materials would be burned. All demolished materials would be transported off the property and legally disposed of in accordance state and federal regulations. All debris from the decks, within the superstructure, on equipment, and in the hulls would be mechanically and manual removed and segregated into separate stockpiles of suspect unregulated, solid, and hazardous materials. These would then be characterized according to the nature of the specific materials, i.e., tires, floor tiles, metal, wood, cable, hoses, gaskets, blasting grit, etc. All work would be subject to a site specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP). Personal protective equipment would be required for material segregation in accordance with this HASP. To the extent possible, upon removal of waste, the materials would be mechanically segregated into readily identifiable units such as tires, concrete rubble, sonar dome, creosoted timber, scrap metal, etc. These materials would be immediately stockpiled or field tested for immediate loading and appropriate disposal. Mixed debris stockpiles would then be manually segregated into units such as splintered wood and blasting grit that are intermixed with cable, pipe, scrap metal, gaskets, hoses, insulation, etc.

Sediment and Debris Control

A containment boom and turbidity curtain would be utilized to encompass the immediate area of remediation and construction. The removal and disposal of uncontaminated material, which may be characterized as solid waste, would be in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.04. Facilities accepting such wastes in the State of Maryland must be licensed and are required to maintain a current permit. Disposal certification, quantities, description, and date of all solid waste loads would be provided on a daily basis. Transporters and disposal facilities would be those approved by the MDE. All regulated waste would be properly manifested and all receiving facilities would be only those approved by state and federal regulatory agencies.

7.4 MINIMIZATION OF IMPACTS

Several techniques to minimize impacts to water quality have been included in the recommended plan for the proposed Masonville DMCF. The construction sequence has been designed to minimize turbidity impacts to the Patapsco River. By constructing the cofferdam cells and the beach sand dike prior to building the armored sand dike, any turbidity generated from mining available on-site sand for construction would be partially contained. This would decrease the cross-sectional area of the Patapsco River affected by the turbidity plume, which would decrease the potential for adverse impacts of construction activities to aquatic life in the River. To prevent turbidity plumes resulting from the mining of on-site clay for construction, this material would not be mined until after the containment structure has enclosed the site. Any mining of

on-site construction (borrow) materials that occurs after the containment structure has enclosed the site should have no impact on aquatic life in the Patapsco River.

Turbidity curtains would be used in conjunction with training dikes to confine turbidity plumes during the construction of the armored sand dike. The training dikes are mounded initially and then moved out as the main dike is constructed. Discharge would be released behind the training dikes and into an area enclosed by a silt curtain. The turbidity plume would be partially contained by the silt curtain. The training dikes and the outfall pipe are extended as construction continues. The turbidity curtains would be placed in a horseshoe arrangement at the training dikes and would move with the dike as it is extended. Though studies have shown that turbidity curtains can reduce turbidity concentrations by up to 90 percent (JBF Scientific 1978), turbidity curtains are generally not that efficient. The 90 percent means that the turbidity levels outside the silt curtains would be up to 90 percent lower than the turbidity levels contained by the turbidity curtains. For Masonville, an assumption of a 50 to 60 percent reduction in turbidity has been anticipated.

A leachate barrier with a permeability of $5x10^{-6}$ cm per second would be used to line the dikes. Though migration of contaminants through the dike is not anticipated to be an issue, based on experience at the HMI DMCF (URS 2004), this geomembrane barrier would further minimize movement of any contaminants through the dike to the Patapsco River or Patapsco aquifer.

7.5 CONCEPTUAL TURBIDITY MONITORING PLAN

The objective of the monitoring plan is to determine the extent of the sediment plume resulting from dredging operations at the Masonville site relative to Maryland water quality regulations.

- While there are no mixing zone regulations for turbidity, the allowed mixing zone is typically the same as that for conventional pollutant (i.e. total suspended solids). For conventional pollutants, the allowed mixing zone (focusing on the mean water level and average tidal velocity) in Maryland estuarine waters is defined as 10-percent of the cross-sectional area of the receiving water body.
- Turbidity in the surface water resulting from any discharge may not exceed 150 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs) at any time or 50 NTUs as a monthly average.

The interpretation of the 10 percent cross-sectional area would be redefined as the shoreline changes during the life of the project.

Several monitoring stations would be established at the prescribed perimeter, plus at least one Middle Branch "control" monitoring station to assess ambient background values for turbidity (in NTUs). Initially, monitoring at each of these stations would be conducted once daily to characterize the plume under various tidal conditions, and then possibly reduced if the plume can be accurately described. At each monitoring station, the plume within the water column would be characterized using a minimum of five points within the water column. For example with five or six vertical water column measurements, the three highest values would be averaged.

The monitoring would take place at locations corresponding to approximately 10 percent of the cross-sectional area, and data would be collected over the depth of the water column and averaged. Assuming that the dredge point is the centerline of the plume, the monitoring would take place on either side from the dredge point during construction of the western dike. The field monitoring procedures would include locating the downstream distance corresponding to the maximum plume width of concentrations of concern.

Once construction of the dike along the northern perimeter is underway, cutterhead dredging and placement along the dike line would be taking place simultaneously. The monitoring would take place offshore of the sediment discharge location associated with construction, and data would be collected over the depth of the water column and averaged.

7.6 IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

Currently the site is being designed using both sand and clay dredged from onsite and materials from licensed upland facilities for construction. If insufficient volumes are found onsite, upland mined material may be utilized. There is some concern about the ability to use on-site borrow material for the construction of the dikes. The 2001 Dredged Material Management Act prohibits the unconfined placement of Harbor dredged material. This may include the construction of the proposed Masonville DMCF dikes using on-site borrow; MPA and MDE are working together to ensure that all legal requirements would be met.

Dredging portions of the construction phases may cause near-field turbidity, which could affect fish spawning and migration patterns. To minimize impacts due to turbidity, contractors would adhere to Time of Year (TOY) restrictions on dredging spanning. These typically occur from February 15th to June 15th of each year, but may be shortened for this project to February 15th to June 1st since there are no striped bass spawning in the area. Further, the minimization of impacts during construction would be pursued, as discussed in section 7.4

7.7 SUMMARY OF RESPONSIBILITIES

This section lists the parties responsible for funding the projects described in this DEIS and the parties responsible for maintaining the projects following their construction.

7.7.1 Project Funding

The MPA would provide funding for construction and management of the DMCF throughout its life as a placement site. The MPA would also provide funding for the mitigation projects and certain portions (to be determined at a later date) of the community enhancement projects associated with the DMCF. MPA would assist the community with finding funding sources for the enhancements. The funding required to complete an operational site, complete the mitigation and support MPA's portion of the community enhancement projects is estimated to be $83 million.

Typically, a DMCF necessary for supporting a federally maintained navigation project is cost shared between the federal government and the project's local sponsor. However, in this case,

the USACE is not able to provide capital funding for construction of the DMCF. The MPA would seek reimbursement of funding under Section 217 of the 1996 Water Resources Development Act.

7.7.2 Project Ownership

The MPA currently owns the land abutting the DMCF project, would own the DMCF during operations as a placement facility, and would own the land created by the project following closure of the DMCF. The MPA currently owns the land surrounding the Masonville Cove, which is the site for the majority of the mitigation and community enhancement projects. MPA would retain ownership of this land, but intends to enter into a conservation easement with an environmental trust concerning the portion of the property that includes the nature center. Other projects outside of Masonville Cove are being considered, but have not yet been selected, and thus ownership is not addressed.