

Table 10.5.2-2
 Summary Comparison of Dredge Material Disposal Options
 AES Sparrows Point LNG

Selected Dredge Material Disposal Method and Site ¹	Available Capacity ²	Regulatory Approvals and/or Agency(s) Necessary ³	Consistency of Dredged Material Quality with Materials Normally Placed at Facility ⁴	Relative Cost of Dredge/Transport/Disposition Method ⁵			
				Dredging and Associated Water Transportation Cost	Processing Cost	Transportation and Disposal/Beneficial Use Cost	Total
Offshore Disposal (e.g. open ocean facility, such as Dam Neck Ocean Disposal Site)	example: Dam Neck Ocean Disposal Site - 65 MCY ²	COE, USEPA	Appears consistent, but may be limited to cleaner sediment from deeper in section to be dredged	0.5X	NA	NA	0.5X
Upland Disposal at mine reclamation site (Western MD or PA)	Bark Camp, PA capacity is 6 to 10 MCY; Other PA and MD mine sites requiring similar reclamation comprise in excess of 9500 acres with unknown capacity.	PADEP (for Bark Camp or other PA site); MDE, MDNR for similar site in MD Possibly USEPA	Consistent - material of similar to worse chemical quality from other ports currently is treated and placed at the Bark Camp reclamation site (example site).	0.75X	2.25X (at mine site)	3.5X to 4.5X	6.5X to 7.5X
Disposal at Existing Fill Site (e.g. Hart Miller Island or Poplar Island)	Available capacity at Hart Miller is reported as 18 MCY (2001 USCOE), however its capacity is subscribed through 2009 and it is projected for a 2010 closure date.	MDE	Consistent - Dredge material from the Port of Baltimore, including the shipping channel for the Sparrows Point area has been disposed at Hart-Miller.	X	NA	NA	X
Innovative reuse of amended dredged material at local site	Capacity limited only by storage room relative to market take-away.	MDE, MDNR, COE	Consistent - material of similar chemical quality has been similarly treated and reused in other states/agency jurisdictions.	0.75X	2.75X	X to 2X	4.5X to 5.5X
Innovative reuse of sand/gravel dredged material	Capacity limited only by storage room relative to market take-away.	MDE, MDNR, COE	Appears consistent, but may be limited to cleaner sediment from greater depths in section to be dredged	0.5X to 0.75X	0.5X to 1.5X	-X to 0.5X	0 to 2.75X

- Notes:
1. See Resource Report 10 text for more complete description of each alternative option.
 2. Capacity is based on reported information available from public sources. Where total capacity is currently unknown, relative capacity or factors that may affect capacity are provided. Estimate for Dam Neck is based on USCOE update in 1990 (*Long Term Management Strategy for Dredged Material Disposal for the Naval Weapons Station*). The July 2001 USCOE Baltimore Harbor and Channels Dredged Material Management Plan indicates the Dam Neck and three related ocean placement sites have "adequate capacity for the Virginia Channels" for which they were originally established "for the next 20 years."
 3. Final list of agencies that may need to approve an action is dependant on specific site locations. List not intended to be exhaustive.
 4. See Resource Report 2 *Water Use and Quality* for results of chemical analysis of sediments subject to dredging and comparison to other Port of Baltimore data.
 5. Costs are presented on relative basis. Example value range for "X" may be approximately \$3 to \$4/CY for disposal at Hart-Miller Island (USCOE 2001 Dredge Material Management Plan estimates disposal cost at Hart Miller to be \$3.76/CY), and \$6 to \$10/CY for dredge and transport (again to Hart-Miller, as example). This total range of \$9 to \$14/CY is provided for example purposes only. Actual costs may be greater.