

Meeting Notes

Great Lakes Dredging Team 2018 Annual Meeting

May 22-23, 2018

Park Inn by Radisson

Toledo, OH

Day One

Call to Order: Co-chairs Karen Keil, USACE Buffalo District, and Tom Rayburn, Lake Carriers Association, called the meeting to order. Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission Deputy Director of the Great Lakes Commission (GLC), welcomed GLDT members and observers, introduced other members of the GLC staff support team, and expressed appreciation to the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority for helping to plan the event. A list of attendees is included as Appendix A. Crane then introduced Paul Toth, CEO, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority and invited him to give welcoming remarks.

Welcome: Paul Toth, CEO, Toledo Lucas County Port Authority

Toth welcomed the group by describing the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority's business in transportation and development. That business is shaped by its mission to move people and cargo through the region while employing innovative programs to stimulate development in our region.

Founded in 1955, The Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority was the first port authority in Ohio. Today, the Port Authority focuses on three initiatives - Maritime, Aviation and Development. Toth noted that the broader Toledo community is "in the midst of a renaissance" noting companies like Promedica, the Renaissance Hotel, and the Hilton Garden Inn are making multi-million-dollar investments in the community. Toth talked about some additional investments which will generate some 1200 construction jobs and new developments related to the Cleveland Coffs HBI Plant, a Walgreens distribution center, and the Port Authority's purchase and redevelopment of the former Jeep plant.

He concluded by saying that the health of Lake Erie is critical to the sustainability of these economic investments. He applauded the work of the Great Lakes Dredging Team and challenged the Team to continue to explore and develop more beneficial use opportunities for the 800,000 cubic yards of material dredged annually to maintain navigation for the port of Toledo.

Great Lakes Dredging Team business

Tom Crane, Deputy Director, Great Lakes Commission

GLDT membership vacancies were reported for the states of Illinois, Minnesota, Pennsylvania and New York with the recent retirements of Dan Injerd (IL), Jim Sharrow (MN) and Jennifer Street and Doug Pomorski (PA). Crane suggested a potential new member agency; the Coastal States Organization. Actions on new members will be taken at a full meeting of the GLDT, either in the Fall of 2018 or the Spring of 2019.

Membership Roundtable updates

Federal Co-Chair: Karen Keil, USACE-LRB said that staff from the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division and the three USACE Districts represented, Chicago, Detroit and Buffalo, would provide updates on their work in a few minutes. She reported that USACE continues to benefit from and supports the work of the GLDT as a forum for discussing the important dredging-related issues facing the Great Lakes.

Non-federal Co-chair: Tom Rayburn, LCA reported that the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) being discussed in the House of Representatives featured a proposed \$1.6 billion budget, which was \$200 million more than last year, and included all Great Lakes navigation that had been requested. The WRDA bill also included authorization of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) but did not include a proposal from the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA) for special consideration for high volume “donor ports” that generate the most Harbor Maintenance Tax revenue.

Illinois: Diane Tecic reported on a pilot project for beneficial use of material dredged from the Waukegan harbor in which four communities will have access to lower cost sand for beach nourishment.

Michigan: Larry Karnes reported that, in response to a U.S. Department of Transportation requirement, the Michigan Department of Transportation is developing an overarching transportation plan, a freight plan and a rail plan, which will all be integrated into one product. Within that, he noted, will be an emphasis on the importance of dredging to support waterborne freight movement in Michigan. He also reported that Michigan Governor Rick Snyder has indicated strong support for the Soo Locks replacement project and is working with the Michigan Congressional delegation and the Mid America Freight Coalition to build momentum for the project.

Minnesota: Dan Brenneman reported that the state continues to work with USACE and the State of Wisconsin on long term estuary planning for the Duluth-Superior harbor, as well as three near shore projects totaling 700 acres. He noted that emphasis is shifting from remediation to restoration using dredged material, and funding support from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF).

Ohio: David Emerman reported that, in partnership with USACE Buffalo District, progress is being made on identifying more beneficial use opportunities for material dredged from Lake Erie navigation projects, in order to meet the state-imposed deadline to end open water placement in Lake Erie by 2020. He noted that activity is now moving from planning to implementation. Scudder Mackey mentioned that meetings with USACE are being held monthly, and that five in-water wetland restoration projects are planned and will use dredged material, including two in Sandusky that will involve 500,000 cubic yards of material each. Other partners include the ports of Toledo and Cleveland.

Wisconsin: Jim Killian reported on progress being made in cleaning up five Areas of Concern (AOCs) in Wisconsin. He said that the state is actively working to help clean up harbors in Milwaukee and Menominee and has two “fledgling” habitat projects in development for Kenosha and the St. Louis River in Duluth-Superior. Gene Clark reported on a beneficial use project involving up to 50,000 cubic yards of dredged sand to restore piping plover habitat on the city of Superior’s Wisconsin Point. He also reported on modifications to the western cell of the Cat Island restoration project using dredged material from Green Bay, and on the addition of Indiana and Michigan to a Regional Sediment Management plan for southern Lake Michigan being developed by Wisconsin Sea Grant and the Illinois Coastal Management Program. The initiative has so far drafted a scope for the plan, which will include the use of dredged sand for beach nourishment and has received approval for a study by the National Sea Grant Law Center.

USACE-LRB (Buffalo District): Ron Kozlowski reported progress on Section 204 work in Buffalo and noted that the USACE cooperation with the State of Ohio on phasing out dredged material open water placement in Lake Erie has resulted in over 40 potential beneficial use projects in Ohio.

USACE-LRC (Chicago District): Jennifer Miller reported a trend developing toward more “polarization” in the quality of dredged material to be managed in and around Chicago, which includes either “really good” sediment eligible for beneficial use, or “really toxic” material requiring confined disposal. She noted that efforts are underway to site a new confined disposal facility (CDF) for the Calumet Harbor.

USACE-LRE (Detroit District): Jim Luke reported that multiple projects are underway, including work at the mouth of the Clinton River. He noted that Section 204 authorities are not yet being utilized enough.

USACE-LRD (Great Lakes and Ohio River Division): Carl Platz noted that the Division remains “totally committed” to beneficial use of dredged material but will continue to need the support of the states and other GLDT members to promote and implement beneficial use projects.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO): Marc Tuchman reported that GLRI funding is being used for several dredged material beneficial use projects. Remediation projects incorporating dredging include Calumet Harbor, Howard Bay, Spirit Lake and Black River.

U.S. DOT Maritime Administration (MARAD): Floyd Miras cited MARAD’s involvement in the development of the Marine Highways program, ballast regulatory policy, and maritime security. He noted MARAD’s long relationship with GLDT, starting with the agency’s role in the creation of the National Dredging Team in 1993.

Project and Product Updates

Assessing the Physical Effects of Dredge Plumes on Aquatic Organisms – A Need for Science-based Solutions: Burton Suedel, PhD, USACE ERDC

Suedel reported on research work at the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) and encourage the GLDT to make use of the data and science produced by ERDC in the development of environmental dredging windows policy. Joe Kreitinger, USACE-ERDC noted the importance of dealing with turbidity issues in beneficial use projects, such as the 21st Avenue in-water project in Duluth-Superior Harbor. There may be a trade-off of short term risks involved with the placement of the dredged material vs. the long-term benefits of habitat restoration associated with beneficial use of dredged material.

(See link to the presentation below)

<https://cdn.cloud1.cemah.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2018/07/B.-Suedel.pdf>

Section 1122 WRDA of 2016 – Pilot Projects for Beneficial Use: Kareem El Nagar, USACE-LRD reported that five proposals were submitted to the Division office for review, one each from the State of Illinois, Toledo, Cleveland, Indiana/Portage, and Duluth. He noted that ten projects will be selected for funding nationally – although there is currently not yet any funding appropriated – and that implementation would be in FY 21.

USACE efforts to promote beneficial use of dredged material in the Great Lakes region: Karen Keil, USACE Buffalo District

Keil reported on research work on the fate and effects of microcystin from harmful algal blooms (HABs). She also reported on a USACE leadership development program involving all three Great Lakes USACE districts. The program involved the assignment of group projects to the participants, which focused on three issues: Harvesting material from CDFs; Harbor-specific dredged material management committee success recipes; and Toledo's challenge to send up to 800,000 cubic yards of dredged material to the upland environment instead of placing it in Lake Erie.

(See the link to the presentation below)

https://cdn.cloud1.cemah.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2018/07/GLDT_USACE-efforts_keil_2018.pdf

Environmental evaluation and management of dredged material for beneficial use: A regional manual for the Great Lakes: Karen Keil

Keil reported that USACE (including personnel from ERDC, and the Buffalo and Chicago offices) has responded to all comments received on the draft beneficial use testing manual except for Section 5, and that those will be addressed later in the year with the assistance of the Technical Committee.

(See the link to the presentation below)

https://cdn.cloud1.cemah.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2018/07/GLDT_RegBenUseTestMan_keil_2018.pdf

Great Lakes Dredging Program Update for 2018: Marie Strum, USACE Detroit District, Great Lakes Navigation Team

Strum provided an encouraging status report of the Great Lakes dredging program. She talked about the benefits that the Great Lakes has accrued from changes in the HMTF distribution. She also pointed out that there has been consistent growth in annual appropriations to support Great Lakes navigation dredging. She commented that this has reflected a better understanding and recognition of the Great Lakes as a system. She noted that the USACE program continues to have four main areas of focus: dredging, dredged material management, navigation structures, and locks.

The President's FY 18 budget featured \$106.23 million for operations and maintenance (O&M); \$37.85M in Dredging (16 projects; 2.95M cubic yards [cy]); \$10.9M in Dredged Material Management and \$8.9M in Soo Locks Maintenance.

Strum then provided an overview of some of the successful partnerships using dredge material beneficially. She talked about the important habitat restoration that has occurred at the Cat Island project in Green Bay. She commented that the Cat Island project has represented a "tremendous win for dredging efficiency and environmental improvement." But it still faces some challenges, including more rapid than expected vegetation growth and a rapid fill rate. She also mentioned the presence of endangered species, such as the snowy owl and piping plover that create some challenges to the restoration work that is ongoing.

She also mentioned Duluth's in-water habitat restoration project at the 21st Street and 40th Avenue restoration sites which have also been successful story for the Great Lakes.

She mentioned that 886,000 tons placed since 2013; 505,000 tons remaining capacity remaining in the CDF to 2021. She commented that there are several other potential sites: MN Point, Superior Bay Habitat, and the WI Piping Plover Site.

She completed her talk by updating the group on the Soo Locks project and the opportunity to potentially move forward with this project once the revised benefit-cost study results come out later in the summer.

(See the link to the presentation below)

<https://cdn.cloud1.cemah.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2018/07/GL-Nav-Brief-for-GLDT-May-2018.pdf>

Introduction to the River Cruise on the Maumee River: Joe Cappel, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority

Cappel provided a brief overview of the river cruise that occurred immediately following the day 1 adjournment. Cappel provided a brief history of the port and described some of the surrounding attractions that the GLDT members will see.

Day One Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m. for the Maumee River cruise.

Day Two

The Great Lakes Dredging Team Technical and Outreach Committees were convened over a light breakfast. The Committee provided reports on progress and discussed their draft work plans. The Committee co-chairs facilitated the discussion. Notes from the Committee meetings are included as Appendix B (Technical) and Appendix C (Outreach) to the meeting notes.

Reconvene:

Crane called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. and provided a brief recap of the previous day's presentations and events.

Regional/Systemic Approach for Beneficial Use of Dredged Material: Dave Knight, GLC Contract Staff

Knight moderated a session on developing a regional/systemic approach for beneficial use of dredged material. The presenters were tasked with providing their thoughts and perspectives on building the relationships necessary to pursue beneficial use on a broader scale across the Great Lakes.

Alternatives to open lake disposal in Lake Erie: David Emerman, Ohio EPA

Emerman's presentation first discussed the current state of dredging operations in Ohio including dredging needs and economic stats for the state's marinas, harbors and recreational uses. He also noted the upcoming regulatory change to be fully enacted in 2020 prohibiting open-lake disposal of dredged material. His presentation then highlighted alternative methods for dispersing dredged material including wetlands creation; turning dredge into marketable soil; and farm-field application. The presentation concluded with an overview of identified potential funding sources.

(See the link to the presentation below)

<https://cdn.cloud1.cemah.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2018/07/GLDT-Emerman.pdf>

Healthy Port Futures Program: Sean Burkholder, University of Buffalo

Burkholder's presentation focused on the Healthy Port Futures project. Sean discussed the project's organization, the background/impetus for the project, and described examples of sediment management practices around the world. He concluded by describing the design/experiment process his team is undertaking to develop innovative sediment management practices in the Great Lakes region.

(See the link to the presentation below)

<https://cdn.cloud1.cemah.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2018/07/Sean.pdf>

Regional Sediment Management & Nearshore Placement Techniques in Southern Lake Michigan:

Katherine Brutsché, Ph.D.

Brutsché's presentation focused on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' regional sediment management programs strategies and goals. She briefly reviewed the funding process for the program and provided in-depth discussion of nearshore placement techniques, tools used for shoreline analysis, and the status of ongoing and future research initiatives.

(See the link to the presentation below)

https://cdn.cloud1.cemah.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2018/07/Brutsche_Lake-Michigan_Great-Lakes-Dredging-Meeting.pdf

Session on Regional/Systemic Approach for Beneficial Use of Dredged Material: Dave Knight, GLC Contract Staff and John Hull, Hull and Associates

Knight and Hull moderated a discussion session on opportunities for a more regional/systematic approach for managing dredged material for beneficial use.

The following questions were presented to the state GLDT members participating in the discussion on a regional/systemic approach to beneficial use of dredged material.

How, and through which agencies and disciplines, has your state approached regulation of dredged material management for navigation dredging projects? And, when was the last time your state reviewed its guidance policies for beneficial use of clean dredged material, and the metrics for defining “how clean is clean?”

IL: Jim Casey reported that IL relies on U.S. EPA and other federal agencies, and does not have specific regulations for dredging, but uses general water quality regulations. Illinois EPA and Department of Natural Resources (DNR) issue joint permits for all dredging on Lake Michigan, except for federal dredging, for which only Illinois EPA has purview.

MI: Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Policies have been reviewed within the last two years. For in-water placement, material must be > 90% sand.

OH: OH EPA, OH DNR. Policies are currently in development.

MN: MN Pollution Control Agency. Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is the process, which triggers water quality regulations. Approval is also needed from City of Duluth flood plain office. For upland placement, terrestrial soil reference values are currently under revision (2015 draft). In-water placement sediment quality targets were developed in 2014.

WI: WI DNR covers all aspects of dredged material management. Office of Great Waters, solid waste agencies, waterways and wetlands permitting offices, Coastal Zone Management (Department of Administration) and internal sediment management groups are all involved. DOT is concerned with long-term liability for dredge material placement. Statutory policies were in review last year, with sediment treated the same as soil.

From USACE perspective, Buffalo, Chicago, and Detroit districts work closely together and with ERDC to ensure consistency in their sediment evaluations.

What do you see as the most formidable challenges to increased beneficial use of dredged material in your state?

IL: The majority of clean dredged material being handled is from small harbors, and most of that goes onto the near shore as beach nourishment. The Calumet and Illinois International Port District harbors have toxic legacy sediments.

OH: Biggest challenges are sheer volume, the low cost of open water placement in Ohio (especially relative to those costs in other states), and public perception. Need beneficial use options that are cost neutral (relative to the federal standard), or to find other agencies (state or federal) to cover the cost.

MN: Overcoming the federal requirement for lowest cost alternative, and transportation. Will run out of places to do restoration in the next 10 years or so. Will need alternate placement sites, such as mine land, which is ~ 70 miles away. Railroads that service the mines and dockside operations don't want to transport dredged material away from the harbor because they don't want to contaminate the cars.

WI: With three major ports – Milwaukee, Green Bay and Superior - requiring dredging, still need more beneficial use opportunities. Need to make sure the projects/opportunities are ready when the material is. Regarding recreational harbors: recent high water levels have taken pressure off need to dredge but the need will return as water levels drop.

USACE: Money, liability and timing are important; beneficial use projects must be ready to go when the material is dredged. Operations and maintenance (e.g., dredging) projects need to run efficiently every year, sometimes the beneficial use projects take longer. There is a need to develop policy to make it easier to allow harvesting of material from CDFs. The identification of beneficial use sites, and accompanying National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) pre-coordination, need to be performed in time. Note that in Michigan, MI Act 451 indicates that dredged material can't be placed in water less than 30 meters deep. Also, Flint appeared to have made Michigan DEQ wary of taking risks with projects.

How much priority would be given in your state to efforts to explore new strategies and opportunities for beneficial use of dredged material?

IL: Not much thought has been given to this, so the issue would need a push. There has, however, been interest in clean sand for beaches. Need to get all affected parties together to coordinate this.

MI: There is definitely interest at the staff level. Upper management levels at MDEQ remain under staffed. MI DOT has been more involved than MDEQ on the GLDT.

OH: This is a top priority for the state.

MN: Both state agencies involved are all on board.

WI: Our program is medium-range priority. Had a couple opportunities to work on a bed load interceptor but could not identify the right location. Wisconsin is receptive to exploring new strategies.

What do you see as potential advantages and disadvantages of a regional regulatory standard for beneficial use of dredged material, as opposed to the current state-by-state approach? Would your state be open to further discussion and exploration of a regional/systemic approach to beneficial use of dredged material?

IL: It would be a question for Illinois EPA.

MN: We would support regional standards as long as they are as protective as ours.

OH: It depends on what that means. It would be hard to go back and change anything after we have just revisited our standards. There are opportunities for interstate transport worth exploring, but it would be a heavy lift right now.

WI: It would potentially make some things easier and would possibly encourage more competitive bidding. From a regulatory perspective, there would be many more boxes to check, so there would have to be a real purpose involved.

Hull: Note that eliminating a regional regulatory standard also eliminates opportunities to use dredged material upland between states. For example, material could have been transported by barge from Toledo to Monroe County, MI for use upland.

Is there interest in standing up an effort similar to the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council or ASTM international?

Burton Suedel pointed out that PIANC (World Association for Waterborne Transport Infrastructure) will be standing up a committee to develop guidance towards beneficial use of dredged material.

Mississippi bought sediment from Alabama (USACE Mobile district).

Establishment of overall GLDT priorities for 2018-2019, review of action items: Tom Crane, GLC

1. Create attendance list
2. Update membership list, and fill in state vacancies.
3. Review project abstracts on beneficial use and environmental window with the Steering Committee and provide to potential funders in the summer/fall
4. Consider developing a Regional Statement on Beneficial Use of Dredged Material to be endorsed by the GLDT
5. Complete meeting summary in 60-90 days
6. Start planning for the fall GLDT webinar

Wrap Up and Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m. by the GLDT Co-chairs.

Respectfully submitted

Tom Crane, GLDT Secretariat

rm/tc

Appendix A

**2018 GLDT Annual Meeting Attendees
May 22-23
Toledo, Ohio**

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Phone number	Email
Ashley	Binion-Zuccaro	USACE-Buffalo District	419-726-9121	ashley.r.binion-zuccaro@usace.army.mil
Tom	Boom	Barr Engineering	734-922-4442	tboom@barr.com
Melissa	Bosman	USACE - Detroit District	313-226-7855	melissa.d.bosman@usace.army.mil
Dan	Breneman	MN Pollution Control Agency	218-302-6624	dan.breneman@state.mn.us
Katherine	Brutsché	USACE ERDC	601-634-4174	Katherine.e.brutsche@erdc.dren.mil
Sean	Burkholder	University at Buffalo	216-280-8045	seanburk@buffalo.edu
Joe	Cappel	Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	419-243-8251	jcappel@toledoport.org
Gene	Clark	UW Sea Grant Institute	715-399-4083	linda@aqua.wisc.edu
Tom	Crane	Great Lakes Commission	734-396-6062	tcrane@glc.org
Daniel	D'Agnese	Bio Rem USA, Inc.	440-230-9542	dan@biorem.com
Elisha	DeFrain	Michigan Department of Transportation	810-931-7462	defraine@michigan.gov
Walter	Dinicola	Anchor QEA	410-794-7783	wdinicola@anchorqea.com
Stanley	Ekren	Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Company, LLC	630-574-3000	sekren@gldd.com
Kareem	El-Naggar	Corps of Engineers	5134792775	kareem.s.el-naggar@usace.army.mil
David	Emerman	Ohio EPA	6143694055	david.emerman@epa.ohio.gov
Josh	Feldmann	Buffalo District, US Army Corps of Engineers	716-879-4393	joshua.j.feldmann@usace.army.mil
Chad	Ferguson	Ohio EPA	330-963-1175	chad.ferguson@epa.ohio.gov

Karl	Gebhardt	Ohio Lake Erie Commission	614-369-4055	jessica.johnson@epa.ohio.gov
Mikie	Habberfield	US Army Corps of Engineers	716-698-5069	michael.w.habberfield@usace.army.mil
Hal	Harrington	US Army Corps of Engineers	313-226-5043	Hal.F.Harrington@usace.army.mil
Wil	Hemker	The University of Akron Research Foundation	330-208-6104	hemker@uakron.edu
Phil	Hicks	Hull & Associates, Inc.	419-385-2018	phicks@hullinc.com
Kimberly	Hill	University of Minnesota	651-788-1963	kmhill@umn.edu
Pam	Horner	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	313-226-6748	pam.horner@usace.army.mil
Phil	Horstman	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	312-846-5501	philip.horstman@usace.army.mil
John	Hull	Hull & Associates, Inc.	419-385-2018	jhull@hullinc.com
Donald	Johantges	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		
Larry	Karnes	Michigan Dept of Transportation	517-373-9058	karnesl@michigan.gov
Karen	Keil	USACE - Buffalo District	716-879-4227	karen.g.keil@usace.army.mil
James	Killian	Wisconsin DNR	608-264-6123	james.killian@wi.gov
David	Knight	Great Lakes Commission	734-709-6168	dknight@glc.org
Andrew	Kornacki	USACE - Buffalo District	716-352-8669	andrew.a.kornacki@usace.army.mil
Ronald	Kozlowski	USACE - Buffalo District	716-879-4348	ronald.j.kozlowski@usace.army.mil
Joe	Kreitinger	USACE-ERDC	607-266-0217	Joseph.P.Kreitinger@usace.army.mil
James	Luke	USACE – Detroit District	313-226-3387	james.d.luke@usace.army.mil
Scudder	Mackey	Office of Coastal Management	419-626-7980	scudder.mackey@dnr.state.oh.us
Reilly	Manz	Great Lakes Commission	734-396-6073	rmanz@glc.org
Jeffrey	Marr	St. Anthony Falls Lab - University of Minnesota	612-624-4427	marrx003@umn.edu
Jim	Miles-Polka	Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC	567-998-7545	jim.milespolka@foth.com

Jennifer	Miller	USACE - Chicago District	312-846-5505	jennifer.miller@usace.army.mil
Floyd	Miras	USDOT- Maritime Administration	312-353-1032	Floyd.Miras@dot.gov
Shannon	Nabors	Ohio EPA	419-373-3142	shannon.nabors@epa.ohio.gov
Sarah	Orlando	Ohio Sea Grant	419-609-4120	orlando.42@osu.edu
Liz	Pelloso	USEPA Region 5	312-886-7425	pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov
Carl	Platz	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	616-402-8110	carl.a.platz@usace.army.mil
Tom	Rayburn	Lake Carriers' Association	440-333-9994	rayburn@lcaships.com
Michelle	Rioux	Infrastructure Alternatives	616-302-1678	mrioux@iaiwater.com
Richard	Saichek	USACE - Chicago District	312-846-5507	richard.e.saichek@usace.army.mil
Marie	Strum	USACE – Detroit District	313-226-6444	marie.t.strum@usace.army.mil
Burton	Suedel	USACE - ERDC	601-634-4578	burton.suedel@usace.army.mil
Diane	Tecic	Illinois DNR	312-814-0665	Diane.Tecic@illinois.gov
Marc	Tuchman	U.S. EPA--Great Lakes Program Office	312-353-1369	tuchman.marc@epa.gov
Lisa	Young	Canadian Coast Guard	519-383-1834	Lisa.Young@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Appendix B

Great Lakes Dredging Team Technical Committee Meeting

8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

May 23, 2018

Toledo, OH

Federal Co-chair Jennifer Miller and Non-federal Co-Chair Scudder Mackey called the committee to order.

Overview of beneficial use projects and initiatives in several states: Where are we, and what issues have come up: The good, the bad and the ugly.

OHIO: Mackey reported that several beneficial use projects are underway in Ohio as part of the effort to phase out open water placement in Lake Erie, including many involving in-water wetlands creation and a focus on nature-based shoreline enhancement. Some are “pretty expensive.” He noted that project planners are starting to think differently on implementation and funding and are incorporating landscape and design in the planning for better functionality. As a result, there not as many “random acts of restoration.”

Mackey noted that there is still much work to do on public perception and the general resistance to change. While there has been much improvement, there are still some coordination issues with Ohio state personnel and USACE; sometimes state and USACE interests don’t perfectly align.

More market development is still needed for beneficial use of dredged material, the material must be perceived as a commodity, and it has to be priced competitively. There needs to be better communication between and among all the entities involved in multi-jurisdictional projects. One example involves the Burke Lakefront Airport in downtown Cleveland and the nearby CDF 12; complications emerged when the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) learned that contractors were accessing the CDF without its having been consulted.

MINNESOTA: Brenneman reported on restoration work underway in the St. Louis River at Duluth-Superior involving beneficial use of dredged material, including some 12,000 acres of estuary. He identified one of the challenges as how to assess and approve sediments for in-water placement. Assessment must include physical and biological conditions of the site, as well as the sediment, and use of scientific data to determine precisely where material is placed. The data used in the Duluth-Superior harbor projects dovetailed nicely with the Minnesota state approval process. He noted that over 1 million cubic yards of material have been moved to date.

Kreitinger added that this work involved a pilot project, with science-driven, data-based information, that was key to partnering with the state through the approval process. On some projects, he noted, there are “pretty designs,” but no data behind them. On the bad side, however, the work was so data-heavy – including such factors as sediment chemistry, physical characteristics, invertebrates, and aquatic micro-organisms - it was hard to incorporate into the design. In the end, tools used from the St. Louis River work will be valuable to projects elsewhere.

WISCONSIN: Clark, reporting from his system-wide perspective as part of the Sea Grant network, that such projects as the conversion of the Erie Pier CDF in Duluth-Superior to a processing and reuse facility (PRF) has led to other similar dredged material beneficial use projects. The Cat Island restoration project in Green Bay, he noted, continues to be an excellent example. One challenge, however, is that Wisconsin still classifies dredged material as solid waste, thus creating a longer process toward beneficial use. Killian noted that one aspect of the Cat Island project that was not adequately considered was public access to the site during construction, pointing up the need to evaluate all the specific goals for any given restoration project. Invasive species have also emerged as an issue.

Dan D’Agnese noted that the University of Akron has designed a system to identify and walk through such issues and developed a demonstration project at the university’s research facility.

ILLINOIS: Diane Tecic cited the “Mud to Parks” project involving the beneficial use of material dredged from the Illinois River in Peoria to restore a brownfield site at the former U.S. Steel plant in Chicago.

Work plan updates

1. Lessons learned in Duluth-Superior: Brenneman reported that the document is being drafted and should be ready for peer review by this time next year.
2. National Center for Freight & Infrastructure Research & Education (CFIRE)/Conversion of CDFs to Processing and Rehandling facilities. While the CFIRE office is not active, Keil supported a statement of need to recover CDF capacity, and tie in other related concerns.
3. Beneficial use testing manual: Keil reported that the push is on to complete the document by Oct. 1 when funding ends.
4. Lessons learned from direct receipt by contractors of dredged material: Effort should be made to make contractors aware of regulations BEFORE they bid on projects.
5. Potential beneficial use site database: Should include metrics on when sites will be ready for implementation.
6. Environmental dredging windows: Efforts should continue using the Duluth-Superior research and model.
7. Mitigation of open water habitat: Suggest removal of this from work plan.
8. Delisting of AOCs: Suggest removal of this from work plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

Appendix C

Great Lakes Dredging Team Outreach Committee Meeting

9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

May 23, 2018

Toledo, OH

The Outreach Committee convened to review the 2018 workplan and discuss proposed amendments. Reilly Manz started the discussion; he reviewed the 2017-2018 workplan in its current form and provided recommendations for amending key items in the workplan including utilizing an additional method for distributing the semiannual newsletter. Manz noted that this method would enable GLC staff to track newsletter-specific analytics to better assess impact and effectiveness of the newsletter. Platz noted that USACE personnel are unable to receive email correspondence via the online service, MailChimp. To address this issue, Manz recommended distributing the next edition of the newsletter to USACE personnel via existing listserv services and use a combination of existing and MailChimp services for the remainder of the GLDT audience.

Additional discussion resulted in the identification of a few gaps in Outreach Committee activities. The group signaled interest in optimizing the GLDT website for search terms to improve web traffic; conducting a brief audience analysis; and an amended newsletter format.

The Committee adjourned after establishing the following action items and additions to the 2018 workplan to be approved at the next Outreach Committee conference call:

1. Look into MailChimp options and send demo newsletter
2. Send newsletter distribution lists for review by members
3. Announce products on GLIN-Announce
4. Conduct audience analysis
5. Solicit specific information from members for updates to newsletter
6. Establish new title for Member Updates section
7. Conduct preliminary search term optimization of website
8. Establish media lists for GLDT communications

The meeting was adjourned at 10 a.m.