

Annual Meeting of the Great Lakes Dredging Team

June 3-4, 2015

The District Event Center, Green Bay, WI

Meeting Summary

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Welcome and introductions

Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission welcomed the group to Green Bay, provided an overview of the meeting and introduced Steve Galarneau from the Wisconsin DNR currently serving at the Non-federal Co-chair of the Great Lakes Dredging Team (GLDT).

Issues Surrounding Dredged Material Management and Disposal

Galarneau provided the opening presentation to the GLDT. He discussed issues related to dredge material management in the basin and mentioned the following:

- It can be considered an important challenge; trying to find consistency throughout the basin is important, but it doesn't mean that things have to be done the same way everywhere.
- We should try to have people from Departments of Transportation (DOTs) interested in using dredged material in their projects.
- Cat Island is a great opportunity for creative engineering work that uses dredged material and should be considered a good example of the way we need to think about projects
- When talking about dredged material, we should change the mentalities that consider this as spoils and put forward the opportunities to use it by identifying potential material and work on solutions through partnerships.

GLDT Staff report – Update on 2014-2015 activities

Tom Crane presented the GLDT structure and function. He highlighted the following:

- Steering Committee: There are 8-9 people in the committee, including at least one co-chair from each committee. The committee helps guide the work of the team between meetings.
- Technical Committee: This committee works leads work in several different priority areas of the team. This committee oversees much of the product development, such as reports that are produced by the GLDT.
- Outreach Committee: This committee is responsible for general outreach to the public and for internal outreach. It is connected with other committees and helps guide the development of material like posters and fact sheets.
- Legislative Committee: This committee is still being established. It was created under the original GLDT charter, but has been inactive for a while. It is now becoming active again.

There are mostly non-federal members in this committee. It works on providing information to the GLDT on regulatory issues, programs and legislative priorities.

- Staff support structure: The Great Lakes Commission (GLC) staff is coordinating the work of the team and is responsible for general coordination and outreach. Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E&E) provides assistance with technical support and product development.

Tom Crane then discussed some of the progress from the team in the past year.

- Actions from the fall webinar: The semiannual meeting of the team was held as a webinar in November. During that webinar, the team approved the new GLDT charter. A committee was formed to nominate and complete the co-chairs elections. The team also started to work on planning the 2015 Annual Meeting.
- Election results: The process for elections of the team and committees co-chairs is described in the charter. This year, the results were:
 - Federal co-chair: Marc Tuchman, U.S. EPA
 - Non-federal co-chair: Steve Galarneau, Wisconsin DNR
 - Technical Committee: Karen Keil, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Jim Sharrow, Duluth Seaway Port Authority
 - Outreach Committee: Ernie Drott, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Joe Cappel, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority
 - Legislative Committee: Danielle Chesky, Northeast-Midwest Institute
- New members: New members were introduced.
 - Joe Cappel, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority (alternate for Lake Carriers Association)
 - Danielle Chesky, Northeast-Midwest Institute
 - Dan Everson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - Dan Breneman, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
 - Damianos Skaros, New York Department of Environmental Control
 - Doug Sharp, U.S. Coast Guard, Ninth District
 - Roy Deda, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District
 - Dave Romano, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District
 - Scott Thieme, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Buffalo District
- Products and accomplishments
 - Poster on beneficial use of dredged material management presented at IAGLR where it received a lot of interest
 - Webinar on Cat Island, a good success and a model we might want to follow in the future (the analogy of “read the book and then go see the movie”)
 - Newsletter: The newsletter *Great Lakes Dredging Dispatch* will be prepared twice a year, in conjuncture of each meeting. It includes thematic articles and members update
 - Website: website launched in May 2014 and continually being updated
 - Other products in preparation: Beneficial Use Testing Manual, Beneficial Use Pilot Project, Beneficial Use Policies Briefing Paper, Open Water Placement Briefing Paper, Open Water Placement Scientific Literature Review, Updated Dredged Material Management Plan

2014-2015 USACE Great Lakes Dredging Program

Marie Strum from USACE-LRE (Detroit District) presented an update on the Corps' Great Lakes Dredging Program. The highlights are:

- Water Resources Reform & Development Act (WRRDA) 2014:
 - Includes important statements that affect the dredging program: The Corps must manage all the individually authorized projects in the Great Lakes Navigation System as components of a single, comprehensive system, recognizing the interdependency of ports.
 - The Corps shall not allocate funds solely on tonnage.
 - Emerging harbors receive no less than 10% of 2012 appropriate funds (this was met in the Corps 2015 budget).
 - This is an authorization bill but it does not provide funding.
 - The implementation guidance prepared by headquarters is available on the website:
www.usace.army.mil/Missions/CivilWorks/ProjectPlanning/LegislativeLinks/wrrda2014/wrrda2014_impguide.aspx
- Great Lakes form a system with 140 harbors: 60 commercial harbors and 80 recreational/shallow draft harbors.
- FY15: \$118.8M (\$46.2M in dredging – 21 projects and 3.1M cubic yards, \$10.3M in dredged material management, \$8.65M in Soo Asset renewal, \$3.1M in Emergency Finding following the October 31, 2014 storm)
- FY16 Great Lakes Navigation Operations and Maintenance: \$111.6M (\$49M in dredging – 25 projects and 3.4M cubic yards, \$8.4M in dredged material management, \$3.7M in Soo Asset renewal)
 - This president's budget is the highest seen in a long time, the first one that is at or higher than the minimum needed
 - Will be able to dredge in Lake Ontario, which is not done normally
 - One of the benefits of WRRDA is that it allows to dredge in small harbors
- Dredging funding trends: in FY15, they couldn't get to the 3.3M cubic yards required, but they have a great start for FY16
- Dredged Material Management Strategic Plan:
 - The draft is available on the Great Lakes Navigation website:
www.lre.usace.army.mil/greatlakes/navigation
 - Comments are welcome by the end of June
- Dredged material PCB concentrations: There is a decreasing concentration of PCBs. Generally, the material has to be sampled every 5 years. This is not a NEPA requirement, but a practical manner. This is for continuing dredged harbors and if the material is placed in a new location, we need to go through the NEPA process.
- Current Dredged Material Management Conditions: there are still three locations where it is critical: Calumet, Toledo, and Cleveland. In Duluth, there is a lot of great work happening and it went from critical to pressing and is on its way to no pressing issues.
- Cat Island: This project is an example of what the Corps is looking for as dredging efficiency. In FY14, the material was placed in the bay using the infrastructure, but for FY15 they will have to use the CDF because the material dredge is too contaminated. The use of Cat Island helped to clear the backlog in FY14.

- Dredged material management initiatives:
 - Maximize the use of fill management and facility adaptation, such as routine rising of perimeter dikes and reworking the material within the facility to create additional capacity, like in Erie Pier.
 - Aggressively pursue opportunities for beneficially using dredged material to preserve or create CDF capacity, like in Cleveland and Erie Pier. They are talking about initiatives in Detroit: using material to fill basements of demolished homes.
 - Collaborate with partner agencies leveraging local and federal programs to reduce the amount of material entering federal navigation channels. For example, there is a partnership with NRCS in Maumee, Saginaw and Fox rivers to reduce phosphorus but also sediments entering the water.
 - Engage state agencies and other partners and stakeholders in developing innovative long-term solutions to dredged material management challenges
 - Foster partnership with U.S. EPA with its GLLA and GLRI programs to leverage funding for projects supporting both environmental goals and navigation benefits
- Outreach:
 - Website: www.lre.usace.army.mil/greatlakes/navigation
 - Fact sheets: Harbor, Updated CDF
 - Updated Dredged Material Management Strategic Plan
 - Mailing lists: send information to glnavigation@usace.army.mil

Great Lakes Regional Infrastructure and Public-Private Partnerships

Pauline Thorndike, USACE-LRD (Great Lakes and Ohio River Division) (presenting remotely) provided an overview of the Army Corps of Engineers' new infrastructure strategy: public-private partnerships (P3).

- The investment in infrastructure is a global challenge. The demands for dredging are increasing, but the budget is not.
- There are two national problems:
 - For existing infrastructure: sustained performance, extend the service life, buy down the risk for the nation
 - For new infrastructure: accelerate the delivery, reduce the life cycle costs, achieve earlier accrual or project benefits for the nation
- The Sabine-Neches Demonstration project shows the advantage for P3 because partnerships already exist in ports. It lowers the cost-benefits ratio. This project includes mitigation.
- A Great Lakes Demonstration Project will be selected that will explore the P3 approach. The Corps will identify the problem to be solved and will ask industry to contribute to the solutions. The Corps has held a public forum and it has been gathering ideas for the pilot. This project will be managed by Great Lakes-Ohio River division.
- A big challenge for the Corps is the fact that they can't generate revenues and they have to find a way to get the authority for specific projects.

Council of Great Lakes Governors Maritime Initiative

Discussion of this initiative was led by Dave Knight, contractor with the Great Lakes Commission. Knight mentioned that the Council of Great Lakes Governors Maritime Initiative focused on recommendations issued by the Council's appointed Maritime Task Force in April, 2014 dealing specifically with dredging.

Those included recommendations to:

- Improve the return on Marine Transportation System investments by taking a holistic approach to addressing the U.S. dredging crisis and encouraging sustainability.
- Request that the U.S. federal government waive or otherwise allocate small business dredging requirements in such a way to improve regional flexibility and expand opportunities for lower cost service providers. This effort could better leverage dedicated maintenance funding and expand opportunities for regional companies.
- Continue and expand on strategies to promote beneficial reuse of dredged materials thereby reducing the cost of management and disposal.
- Explore opportunities to further reduce sediment loading and reduce the need for dredging.

Additional state-based activity related to the Governors' Maritime Initiative was mentioned by GLDT attendees Larry Karnes from Michigan, Mike Friis and Sheri Walz from Wisconsin.

CFIRE Project: Integrated Strategy for Beneficial Use of Dredged Materials in Great Lakes Commercial Ports

Status of the project was presented by Co-P.I.s Gene Clark and Dave Knight, who described its three specific task areas:

- Laboratory and Field Characterization of Material in Representative Great Lakes CDFs (Bill Likos, University of Wisconsin, lead): determining the best ways to characterize CDF material, comparing CDF samples to WDOT specs, construction material, etc.; and suggesting methods to amend material if necessary
 - Three case study CDFs: Milwaukee (standard "Box"), Green Bay CDF (cell design), Duluth/Superior Erie Pier CDF (converted to a processing and reuse facility)
- Enhancement and update of the existing web tool "Recycling Dredged Material in the Great Lakes," hosted by the Great Lakes Commission
- Outreach strategy to promote beneficial use of dredged material and support conversion of confined disposal facilities (CDFs) to processing and reuse facilities (PRFs).

Also presented was a video produced by D. Knight on actual project field work conducted in 2014 at the Milwaukee and Green Bay CDF sites.

Field trip to Cat Island, Bayport CDF, and Renard Island

Dean Haen, Director of the Brown County-Port of Green Bay provided an overview presentation on Cat Island and the Bayport confined disposal facility (CDF) to the participants and the group then visited the locations. On site, Dean Haen provided additional background information.

Adjournment for the day

Following the field trip, the meeting adjourned for the day,

Thursday, June 4, 2015

The day began with committee breakout sessions at 7:30 a.m. See Appendix for committee summaries.

The meeting participants returned to the plenary session at 9:30 a.m. Tom Crane introduced Jan Miller, USACE-LRD to talk about opportunities to promote strategic dredging under the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI).

Great Lakes Restoration Initiative: Opportunities for Strategic Dredging Collaborations

Jan Miller discussed the impacts of the Great Lakes Legacy Act and the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative on dredging activities.

- The sediments in navigation channels is becoming clean enough that confined disposal is no longer required. The Corps, EPA, States and local authorities have to rethink long-term disposal options for dredged material in many harbors. Future success relies on shared responsibilities for dredged material management.
- The bad news:
 - Competition for federal funding for navigation dredging is more intense than 20 years ago
 - CDFs in the Great Lakes are at capacity or approaching it rapidly; new ones have to be cost-shared, and increasing capacity to the existing ones is often considered a new CDF
- The good news:
 - Sediments are much cleaner than 20 years ago. Most can be suitable for unconfined upland placement or beneficial use, even for open water placement
 - Funding for strategic dredging and beneficial use is available through GLRI for projects within AOCs
- Historical perspective:
 - Great Lakes CDFs: 1970
 - AOCs defined in Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement: 1987
 - GLLA authorized: 2002
 - GLRI authorized: 2010
- Drivers for change: Over 120M cubic yards of contaminated sediments are confined in the Great Lakes CDFs. Restrictions on dredging activities are a critical beneficial use impairment at most of the AOCs. AOC funding was very limited in the first 15 years, GLLA and GLRI helped.
- Actions required:
 - For AOC delisting and elimination of dredging restriction beneficial use impairments: consistent interpretation of what it means to remove dredging restrictions, comprehensive plan for removal of contaminated sediments from AOCs, long-term plans for managing dredged material from former AOCs.

- For removal of contaminated sediments at AOC harbors: exhaust all superfund and enforcement options to remove hot spots, GLLA removal of residual contaminated sediments outside navigation channel, removal of contaminated sediments inside navigation channel through a combination of O&M dredging and strategic navigation dredging.
- For use and closure of existing CDFs: use existing CDFs to manage residual contaminated sediments from AOCs, plan for CDFs closure and ultimate use, plan for satisfying maintenance and monitoring requirements.
 - This is a big challenge for the Corps. CDFs could become a staging or dewatering device for sediments that are not contaminated
- For maximizing beneficial use: clarity and consistency in state policies on upland disposal of dredged material, understanding and developing local markets (mostly local port authorities), building partnerships to deliver the necessary real estate and money.
- The biggest challenge is changing misperceptions and mentalities:
 - Sediments are a pollutant created by dredging
 - All sediments will be contaminated forever and need to be placed in CDFs, which have unlimited capacity
 - Dredged material management is entirely a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers responsibility
- There are eight strategic dredging projects on the way, the Buffalo River is the biggest

Evaluating the Suitability of Dredged Material for Placement and Beneficial Use Alternatives - Testing Manual for Beneficial Use Determination

Karen Keil, USACE-LRB (Buffalo District) presented an update on the preparation of the new beneficial use testing manual being worked on by the USACE-ERDC (Engineering Research and Design Center).

- The goal for this manual is to have a one stop web-based guidance document with standardized risk-based testing methods and consistency in interpretation of results. There should be updated regulatory guidance applicable to Great Lakes states, a regional cost-effective approach to unique sediment management needs.
- The Corps needs to reengage other partners to complete the manual.
- Key components for this new manual:
 - It incorporates the previous manual that focused on aquatic placement, but this one is focused on Great Lakes and it expanding to include all types of placement, including unconfined aquatic and upland placements
 - It expands sections providing treatment options for beneficial use placements.
 - It incorporates engineering with nature principles
 - It uses the risk assessment framework
- For upland placement, the states decide suitability. Since every state uses the EPA criteria but with different interpretation, the Corps needs states to help in identifying their own criteria.

GLDT Products and Projects Update

Karen Keil presented some products and projects from the team

- Open Water Placement Briefing paper:
 - It's still under review by the Technical Committee
 - The Corps is reviewing the latest draft and will provide the GLC staff with their edits. The paper is undergoing legal review.
 - Because the paper has gone through significant edits, it will be sent out to the entire GLDT for a 30 day review period and then finalized.
- Beneficial Use Pilot Project: the pilot project will be an outreach plan for the Toledo project:
 - It's an old CDF where several beneficial use projects can be done there using soil blending. Four agricultural plots will be used to test how crops grow and how can we bring farmers and convince them that using dredged material can be beneficial.
 - The communications will be taking place through E&E.
- Beneficial Use Policies Briefing Paper: this paper looks at different policies from federal and states perspective and looks at lessons learned from experiences.
 - The latest draft by E&E will be sent out for review. Members are asked to provide comments.
 - The Outreach Committee will be looking at preparing a shorter version for general communications.

Burton Suedel, USACE-ERDC, presented the update on the Open Water Placement Scientific Literature Review.

- It is taking longer than anticipated, especially because reaching an internal agreement on the structure takes longer.
- The document is being written and the Corps will be working with the GLDT for outreach.
- It will be a very technical document and will be submitted to the Journal of Great Lakes Research for publication.

Marie Strum discussed the Updated Dredged Material Management Plan

- The plan covers CDF, beneficial use, specific management initiatives, harbor initiatives.
- It will be sent out to everyone for review. They are asking for end of June for feedback, but are opened in providing an extension if needed.

Environmental Windows: Update on Current Research

Burton presented the update on the environmental windows research.

- There are numerous challenges in addressing environmental windows
 - The environmental windows in multiple Great Lakes harbors are restricting dredging operations. Some species and life states are of particular concern.
 - Suspended sediments threshold data are lacking for smallmouth bass relevant to dredging, and having data is essential for conducting risk assessments to manage dredging risks.

- The objective of this research project is to develop suspended sediment effects data for smallmouth bass early life stages to reduce uncertainty about adverse dredging impacts.
- Overview:
 - The main concern is the effect of suspended sediments on smallmouth bass. They are studying the turbidity impacts to early life stages in spawning grounds on shoals along waterway margins.
 - Sediments were collected at Grand Haven Harbor (Lake Michigan, MI) and Fairport Harbor (Lake Erie, OH), to be as relevant as possible and to be able to extrapolate the information.
 - They used fishes from East Texas and Illinois.
 - Because they want to study the impact on spawning, they studied early life stages: eggs and swim-up fry.
- Materials and methods:
 - The biggest challenge was to understand which concentrations were the best to use.
 - For eggs, they looked at survival immediately post-hatch.
 - For fry, they looked at survival, growth, swimming performance.
 - They focused on spawning activities and looked at survival and behavior.
- Results
 - The survival was excellent in the control group for the eggs but there was lots of mortality when exposed to sediments.
 - The survival of fry was excellent, but there was a significant reduction of dry weight and total length.
 - They didn't see a significant impact of sediments on behavior.
- Findings
 - Exposed eggs hatched normally but newly hatched larvae are more vulnerable to the effects of suspended sediment.
 - Egg experiments indicated reduced survival of larvae when exposed to suspended sediments.
 - Swim-up fry survival was not reduced even at the highest exposure concentration.
 - Sublethal effects were observed in growth of fish in swim-up fry experiments,
 - Swimming behavior of fry was not affected.
 - Swim-up fry were found to be more tolerant of high sediment concentrations in the silty sediment than the sandy sediment.
 - Sublethal growth effects were observed in fish in grow-out fry experiments.
 - Worst case exposure scenario that can be conservatively extrapolated to the field for protecting the smallmouth bass fishery in Great Lakes harbors.

Committee Reports – priorities for 2015-2016

Legislative Committee: Danielle Chesky presented the report for the Legislative Committee

Outreach Committee: Joe Cappel presented the report for the Outreach Committee

Technical Committee: Karen Keil presented the report for the Technical Committee

*See appendix for the committee reports

The group also discussed the plans to host a “state of the science and policy” symposium

- A small group should be formed with representatives from each committee to develop the agenda for the symposium.
- Funding will be sought to support the planning and convening of the symposium.

Review of action items from the meeting

Tom Crane reviewed the actions items from the meeting

- The entire GLDT is asked to review the documents discussed during the meeting. An email will be sent with the contact information for comments.
- GLC staff: work with committee co-chairs to review the workplans and post them on the website
- GLC staff: will work with the Steering Committee to organize the fall webinar
- The staff and Steering Committee will seek funding support for the State of Science and Policy Symposium
- The Steering Committee will create a planning team for the symposium once funding has been secured.

Closing remarks

Steve Galarneau thanked the GLC staff for organizing the meeting. He also thanked the committee co-chairs for their work. He asked the attendees to send feedback about the meeting to help planning the next one.

Jan Miller mentioned that this meeting has set a high bar for the other meetings. He appreciated the engagement of states and port authorities in the team and recognized that this makes the team more attractive and makes people wanting to come back.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm on June 4.

Legislative Committee Breakout Summary **June 4, 2015, 7:30-9:00 a.m.**

*This is a summary of the discussion that took place during the committee breakout session

Attendees

Danielle Chesky, Northeast-Midwest Institute (chair)
Sheri Walz, WI Department of Natural Resources
Tom Rayburn, Lake Carriers Association
Larry Karnes, MI Department of Transportation
Marie Strum, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Detroit District
Elisha DeFrain, MI Department of Transportation
Jan Miller, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Great Lakes and Ohio River Division
Ron Kozlowski, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Buffalo District
Kristy Meyer, Ohio Environmental Council
Karl Gebhardt, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Kurt Princic, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Jim Sartucci, K&L Gates
Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission (staff support)

Welcome and Introductions

Danielle Chesky welcomed the group. She introduced Jim Sartucci, lobbyist with the Lake Carriers Association, who was participating remotely. Chesky reviewed the agenda and asked Jan Miller to review the draft committee work plan. Miller introduced the workplan and reviewed the workplan elements with the group. He covered the items in the following order:

Workplan update

Legislative Priorities

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) was signed into law in 2014. The Corps is still waiting on guidance for implementation. The budget for dredging will be assembled differently based on the new provisions of the Act. There are new funding guidelines for commercial, low use and emerging ports.

The Great Lakes Ecological and Economic Protection Act (GLEEPA) was not passed by Congress in 2014. Bills have been reintroduced in this congress. GLEEPA will authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative among other things.

Bundling of Dredging Projects for Cost Efficiency

Bundling of dredging projects has been discussed as a way to extend dredging dollars and allow more projects to be funded. The concept is related to and supported by the Corps' P3 initiative. The Corps has bundled dredging contracts in the past. Small business set asides are required.

Mining of dredge material from CDFs

There are potentially conflicting Corps policies between districts. There are also areas of uncertainty regarding policies and authority. Erie Pier is a good example. Material is washed – sand settles out and is used beneficially.

There are issues to be understood surrounding CDF capacity. The Corps manages material within CDF. Dyke rising can be considered part of dredge material management but more than 1 to 2 years capacity addition is considered building a new CDF. Any new CDF requires 35% non-federal cost share.

Shore protection

The issue of Corps authority for beneficial use was discussed. Up to 65% of the cost delta (extra cost) over the least cost alternative can be paid by the Corps. The Corps has studied a lot of shore protection and habitat restoration options. Feasibility studies are conducted to help determine the cost differential. Beach nourishment (111 authority) does not have to involve dredge material.

Brownfields redevelopment

Legal liability is an issue with regard to brownfields redevelopment using dredge material. The policy (not the regulatory issues) need to be better understood. We know it can be done but obstacles may need to be overcome.

Federal Standard

Understanding the role and application of the federal standard is essential. The Federal Standard, under which the Corps operates, is the dredged material disposal alternative or alternatives identified by the Corps which represent the least costly alternatives consistent with sound engineering practices and meeting the environmental standards established by the 404(b)(1) evaluation process under the Clean Water Act. Both legislation and policy elements need to be understood. Flexibility in the application of the Federal Standard needs to be defined and understood. Sensitivity analysis requires numerous alternatives and ranges. There may be flexibility on the cost side. One area where there may be flexibility is under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Action: The workplan was accepted as presented with minor modifications and the inclusion of examining legislation that addresses what types of funds can be used for federal cost share.

Legislation and Appropriations

Chesky then directed discussion toward legislation and legislative developments. Jim Sartucci, Government Affairs Councilor with K&L Gates, was asked to provide an update on appropriations for the WRRDA. Sartucci mentioned that we haven't seen implementation guidance but need it for FY 2017 request. The harbor maintenance trust fund is suggested for a 10% increase for FY 2015.

Sartucci recapped FY 2015 \$1.166 billion on harbor maintenance fell short of this target but the overall trend is good. WRRDA will increase each year as a percentage of income.

Chesky talked about policy provisions especially related to open water placement (OWP) policy. There is a house bill introduced by Representative Latta that prohibits OWP in Lake Erie. The

House language is directly in the bill. The Senate language is included in report language. Report language (highly suggested recommendations) implies Congressional intent.

Chesky talked about cost-savings language. Corps has to maintain its long-standing role in dredge material management. If a State says no to OWP does the Corps have to continue managing dredge material? The bill language is vague.

Under WRRDA, Congress might add money above the President's request that increase could be generally used for Great Lakes navigation purposes. Not likely going to have one big number for Great Lakes navigation. \$50 million is to be provided for donor ports in FY 15 under the Senate appropriations bill. No donor ports are part of the Great Lakes system. Discussion occurred regarding using these funds for rebating harbor maintenance taxes. How much going into Corps O&M budget? No donor ports (or energy transfer ports) in the Great Lakes. Senate has not passed its bill yet.

State Updates

Sheri Walz, Wisc. DNR, talked about the work of the Wisc. Commercial Ports Association. The group is working on assets inventory. Second phase looking at commodities that can be efficiently moved by water. There is recognition that state and federal dollars are decreasing.

She mentioned the State harbor assistance program for maintenance, dredging and infrastructure. Funding is typically \$12 million every two years and has been a line item in the state budget. The funding is used primarily for commercial ports but threshold is low (1,000 tons of cargo moved). Governor Walker zeroed out the program recently. There is currently \$1.3 million available in grants. There seems to be bi-partisan support for trying to bring the program back. The transportation portion of the state budget is still being worked on. Wisconsin is also part of several regional discussions including Governors' Maritime Initiative.

Larry Karnes, Michigan DOT, provided an update. The overall transportation budget is an issue for Michigan. Currently, the state can't meet federal match requirements for road improvements without going into general fund. Ports are looking to develop some type of marine program funding, similar to Wisconsin's.

Michigan took one time action three years ago for emergency funding for dredging due to low waters. No continuation of this program is expected. The Line item in the budget for work at the Wayne Co Port authority is about \$400 K.

There are O&M funds used for ferry funding and services to and from islands with year round populations. Service has to be provided by public entity.

Karl Gephardt, Ohio EPA gave an update for Ohio. He mentioned two budgets; the capital budget and operations budget which is passed every two years. Several dredging-related demonstration projects are underway; one in Toledo looking at agricultural demonstrations using dredge material as a beneficial use. The goal is to ultimately find ways to get the material back on the farmsteads. The project has combined nutrient reduction and sediment management goals.

Another demonstration is in Cleveland; material is used different based on its quality. Senate Bill 1 (SB1) passed this year. Among other things, it prohibits OWP in 2020. There are some off ramps that provide discretion to the ODNR and OEPA directors to work with ports and the Corps if the OWP ban cannot be met. SB1 is also a driver for beneficial use. The state is serious about coming up with beneficial use initiatives. Budget has to be completed by June 30. Senator Gardiner interested in holding a ports conference to look at alternative funding opportunities for Ohio ports.

Kurt Princic, Ohio EPA, provided an additional Cleveland update. Cleveland is implementing two projects; the first is a bedload interceptor that will be located upstream from the channel. The project began last week right before big weekend storms. The heaviest sediment falls out first. The second project is looking at beneficial uses for materials stored in CDFs – including soil washing and sediment separation. The plan is to remove the material for beneficial uses such as road construction projects using dredge material.

Chesky concluded the session by talking about the Corps policy related to advancing beneficial use. Opportunities exist under WRRDA in the P3 and DMMP (dredge material management plan) provisions. Discussion ensued regarding opportunities under the GLRI and looking outside the boundaries of the federal channel. Can green infrastructure be looked at as a model? Have to show cost savings in order to make it work. May need to look beyond the authority and work of the Corps? How can EPA (FWS) be involved under the GLRI.

Outreach Committee breakout session notes

June 4, 2015, 7:30-9:00 a.m.

*This is a summary of the discussion that took place during the committee breakout session

Chair: Joe Cappel, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority
Shannon Nabors, Ohio EPA, Northwest District
Jim Killian, WI Department of Natural Resources
Todd Breiby, WI Coastal Management Program
Kristin Gardner, Hull & Associates
Staff: Michele Leduc-Lapierre

Workplan structure

The participants approved the structure proposed. There will be a membership section added to the workplan and we will use the technical committee workplan as an example. In the objectives section, the last sentence will be replaced by “The OC will serve as a resource for the other committees to communicate information within the team and to external stakeholders”.

Workplan components

E-News

The e-news will be published once a month. The goal is to keep it short so people will be interested in reading it. It will be sent in an email, with an attractive header, and include news from around the basin and links to longer articles.

Michele Leduc-Lapierre will send an email through the GLDT listserv on the 1st of each month and ask for news. One week will be allowed to send the information, and another week will be accorded to prepare the email. It will be sent through the GLDT listserv.

Committee calls

The participants decided to hold committee calls every other month instead of every month. If a project requires more discussion, committee calls can be convened more often. Michele Leduc-Lapierre will use the Outreach Committee listserv to schedule the calls.

Website

Participants discussed possible improvements to the website, and whether a slider on the home page would be necessary. After discussions, the committee decided to put a media gallery page instead of a slider.

The purpose of the media gallery will be to improve the outreach on different projects. Pictures submitted will have to minimally identify the location and the project. Ideally, all pictures displayed on the page would be available to GLDT members to use in presentations, posters, reports, or any other outreach activity. The media gallery will also include links to videos produced by states, ports, federal agencies, or any other stakeholder. If funding becomes available, the committee could look into producing videos.

GLDT Newsletter

Participants discussed strategies to have stories and updates for the newsletter. The committee members suggested that committee chairs could be responsible for at least one article in the newsletter. For members update, Michele Leduc-Lapierre will keep contacting representatives from each member organization or agency to have the updates. This process will be used for the next few newsletters and the committee will reassess after. If necessary, adjustments to the process will be made.

Events publicity

The participants discussed strategies to increase the publicity for events hosted by the GLDT. For the next annual meeting, there will be a press release prepared that will include key topics covered during the meeting.

The team will work with local authorities to try to invite dignitaries (governor, mayor, elected officials for example) to the meeting. The team will also work with local agency communication people to prepare videos or other media products that could increase the interest for the meeting.

Social media

There are several challenges related to developing a social media strategy. To be efficient, it needs a lot of work: at least two Facebook posts every week, one “tweet” every day, responding to questions, keeping discussions alive. Additionally, there might be some restrictions on the content and the process to have a post approved can be heavy.

Michele Leduc-Lapierre will create a Twitter account to follow relevant people and agencies, and only use it to stay in touch with information. When there is an event that would deserve social media coverage (like the annual meeting), a hashtag will be created and participants will be encouraged to use the hashtag on their personal Twitter account.

Other elements of the workplan

The other elements of the workplan will be kept as they appear in the draft version.

Technical Committee Breakout Summary

June 4, 2015, 7:30-9:00 a.m.

*This is a summary of the discussion that took place during the committee breakout session

Attendees

Karen Keil, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Buffalo District (federal co-chair)
Jim Sharrow, Duluth Seaway Port Authority (non-federal co-chair)
Steve Galarneau, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Gene Clark, University of Wisconsin Sea Grant
Scudder Mackey, Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Jennifer Miller, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Chicago District
Russ Short, EA Engineering, Science & Technology
Dan Breneman, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Duluth
Burton Suedel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Engineer Research and Development Center
Guy Partch, Barr Engineering
Hannah Wolfman-Jones, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Chicago District
Dan Everson, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service – Ohio
Mollie Mahoney, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Detroit District
Larry Sullivan, Port of Milwaukee
Josh Feldmann, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Buffalo District

Beneficial use

Beneficial Use Policy White Paper

K. Keil reported that the draft submitted by E&E is still in the review process, and indicated that it will be critical that each state weigh in on the document. Preferred deadline for comments is July 1.

Beneficial Use Outreach Pilot Project

J. Cappel and S. Mackey reported on selected project, Toledo's Center of Innovation for Beneficial Use of Dredged Material, which is funded by State of Ohio Healthy Lake Erie program at a level of \$2.5 M (which will hopefully leverage additional dollars). The general objective is currently to study placement of appropriate dredged sediment back on agricultural fields from which it originated. E&E role in the outreach component will likely involve print materials, such as a brochure, website development, and possible signage and a webinar.

CFIRE project support and connectivity

- CDF characterization: G. Clark reported on status of work by W. Likos, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Enhancement of beneficial use web tool with more detailed description of material placed in CDFs: D. Knight reported on status of work planned using data from Likos' field work, and updated USACE information on CDFs. Current objective will be to have data ready to present for the GLDT fall webinar meeting, and the project completed by 1st Q of 2016.

Testing manual: Beneficial use of dredged material in the Great Lakes

K. Keil reported on status of work left incomplete with retirement of PI Richard Price.

Open water placement

White paper on federal and state policies regarding open water placement of dredged material: K. Keil reported that the document is currently under review by USACE legal staff.

Environmental dredging windows

Research at the USACE ERDC facility on turbidity impact as it relates to windows policy: (Following committee meetints, B. Suedel presented a detailed summary of the project to the full GLDT.)

Mitigation for loss of open water habitat

J. Sharrow introduced this issue area as a new item for the Technical Committee work plan. The concept stems from frustration at the port of Duluth-Superior on the part of commercial dock operators who want to invest in development/expansion projects, and are required to provide mitigation for loss of open water placement, but have difficulty with lack of guidance or direction on how to accomplish that. He proposed exploring a white paper document reviewing policies on this practice, where they exist, among all Great Lakes states.

S. Mackey noted that available data is limited, but work is being done in OH on detailed nearshore assessments of shoreline vegetation, nearshore habitat conditions and other shoreline characteristics to incorporate into a regulatory guideline.

Proposed was a literature review of what data is available, and where are the gaps. D. Everson, US F&W, noted that there can be value in un-engineered landscape, as well as engineered mitigation strategies.

Delisting Areas of Concern

This is a new issue area for the Tech Committee work plan. Time constraints prevented further discussion.

Symposium: State of the Science and Policy Issues

Discussion on this proposed event was forwarded to the full GLDT plenary session.