

Annual Meeting of the Great Lakes Dredging Team

Meeting Summary

May 18-19, 2016

U.S Environmental Protection Agency, Chicago, IL

Day 1 (May 18)

Opening remarks and introductions

Chris Korleski (Director, USEPA-GLNPO) mentioned that navigation dredging is very important. He commended the group to talk about issues, solutions, share experience, etc. He said he is counting on the team to find solutions and would rather take advice from the group.

Tom Crane (Deputy Director, Great Lakes Commission) welcomed participants and asked them to introduce themselves. He mentioned that six of the eight states are attending the meeting and that this is great because the history of the GLDT involves states. He told representatives of ports, industry and consulting firms that they are also an important part and this sector is growing in the participation in the activities of the team. He finally thanked the sponsors.

Great Lakes Dredging Team update

Crane presented an update on the work of the GLDT. He summarized the mission statement and mentioned that we will try to reconnect with other dredging teams and the National Dredging Team. The legislative committee was part of the original charter, but a discussion about it will be conducted during the meeting to make sure it provides the service needed. Crane described progress made on actions from the 2015 fall webinar, presented new members and encouraged participants to be part of a committee between meetings.

Great Lakes Dredging Program Update for 2016

Marie Strum (Chief, Engineering & Technical Services, USACE) presented the update for the dredging program for 2016. She talked about the 2015 and the 2016 Great Lakes Inspection Tours for which the objectives are for leadership to have a better understanding of the value of the Great Lakes navigation system and understand challenges. About WRRDA 2014, she said that it is an authorization bill and it doesn't provide funding. It makes the Great Lakes Navigation System a single system, recognizing the interdependency of ports.

Strum summarized the navigation funding history, as well as the FY16 funding status. She also presented the FY16 dredging requirements and funding, as well as the FY17 Great Lakes Navigation President's Budget and projects. She also described the dredging funding trends between 2007-2017.

Strum presented some recreational harbor success stories (Port Washington, Portage Lake, Barcelona Harbor, City of Buffalo) and use of Hurricane Sandy funds. She also discussed a proposed multi-project/multi-year contributed funds memorandum of agreement with the State of Michigan. She

presented the status of water levels in the region and described the impact on dredging. She also summarized the status of dredged material management and presented successful initiatives.

Finally, Strum briefly described outreach efforts by announcing two stakeholder meetings to be held and referring the audience to the website.

Special session: Building Partnerships for Beneficial Use Projects

Jim Sharrow (Director of Port Planning & Resiliency, Duluth Seaway Port Authority) introduced the special session and described how it works in Minnesota. He mentioned that solutions can be found through partnerships.

Report on May 11 Beneficial Use Workshop in Ohio

Pam Allen (Director's Office, Dredged Material Program, Ohio EPA) presented a summary of the May 11 event, called "Ohio's Digging Up Ideas Workshop" that was held at the Lorain County Community College. The two goals of the event were to create a "buzz" about dredged material and get businesses and communities actively engaged. The morning session was dedicated to presentations and the afternoon was a brainstorming session. Nearly 150 experts attended the workshop. The preliminary results indicate that there is a need for more marketing and education, and that dredged material should be exempt as a waste. The next steps will be to review all the results and host additional workshops to keep the momentum going.

Role of Ports and Communities in Advancing Beneficial Use Projects

Joe Cappel (Vice-President of Business Development, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority) discussed how ports rely on partnerships to implement priority projects. In Toledo, there is a lease agreement between the Port Authority and terminal operators and if one does well, the other will benefit from it. Teamwork is essential and it is better to select projects that have a lot of initial funding. It's also a good idea to add a component for the public to show them the win-win situation and get social acceptance. Ports and communities bring a lot to the table. Cappel also presented and described the Toledo Dredged Material Center of Innovation project, a project funded by the State of Ohio, Ohio EPA, Ohio DNR and the port.

Duluth Case Study: Overview of the Duluth Harbor Habitat Restoration Program and Beneficial Use of Dredged Material

Dan Breneman (Project Manager, Lake Superior Unit, Minnesota MPCA) presented the Duluth Harbor project. There were two big types of projects: remediation projects and habitat restoration projects. For remediation, there were 13 projects and some are already completed. Of the six habitat restoration projects, three are considered "remediation to restoration" projects. The target is to restore 1,700 acres of habitat, but it seems that they will be exceeding their target. Breneman described some of the projects and presented a summary table of the 21st Avenue West restoration materials, as well as the St. Louis River AOC program material.

Creative funding for Beneficial Use Projects – some case studies

Brian Hinrichs (Client Team Leader, Foth Engineering) presented projects where there is leveraging of state, federal and in-kind funding sources. He underlined the importance of first talking to funding agencies to be aware of criteria. The second step would be to hold a funding summit with all agencies to have people talk to each other. Hinrichs then presented a series of case studies in Wisconsin (Two Rivers, Washington Island, Kewaunee, and Port Washington) and Ohio (Conneaut Port Authority and Port of Cleveland). Please refer to the presentations for details on these projects.

Opportunities and Challenges for Beneficial Use of Dredged Material

This facilitated discussion session was moderated by Gene Clark (Coastal Engineering Specialist, UW Sea Grant Institute) and was based on presentations from the previous session. There were discussions about the St. Louis project and how the group has been working with DNR to review the mitigation requirements. There might be opportunities for private funding, but with current mitigation rules, this is not possible. Another idea that was discussed was the possibility to create islands with dredged material, similar to the Cat Islands project. It's too early to say if it's a viable option, but nothing in statute would prohibit.

There was a discussion about the distinction between open water placement of dredged material and beneficial use. The distinction can be found in the working definition: it is disposal when the intent is to make it go away while beneficial use is with the intent of creating habitats. The distinction between nearshore and shoreline is often subjective.

Another topic of discussion was the potential for inter-Corps district movement of dredged material. There are permitting issues to move material from one state to the other one. This could be possible it's looked at up front in the process. There have been examples of similar collaboration, like when the Rock Island Corps contacted Pennsylvania to see if they could intermingle and provide suitable material. The cost and challenges of moving sediments by rail were also discussed, including appropriate facilities, availability of backhaul and dewatering.

Update on Regional Maritime Transportation System Strategy

Mike Piskur (Program Manager, Conference of Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Governors and Premiers) presented the update on the Regional Maritime Strategy. Work began at the 2013 Leadership Summit. In 2015, there was an inventory of ports, terminal tonnage and location of assets in the system. A Regional Maritime Entity has been created in June 2015 to develop the strategy around the Governors' and Premiers' priorities. The main themes are increasing efficiency and reducing costs, building new markets, growing economic activity around the maritime system, and delivering results and managing for the future. Piskur also discussed dredging actions to eliminate \$200M in backlog, and promote P3/P4 (public-private-projects) that the Corps is interested in.

Adjournment for the day

A reception was held at the Chicago Architecture Foundation Building.

Day 2 (May 19)

The day began with committee breakout sessions.

GLDT Products and Projects Updates

Karen Keil (Environmental Toxicologist, USACE) provided an update on some products the team is working on. The first one is the Beneficial Use Policy and Projects white paper. Comments were received and are now being reviewed to be integrated. It will be provided to the GLDT for review and posted on the website. This document goes through policies for the eight Great Lakes states and federal agencies. Hopefully, it will make it easier to implement projects.

The second document Keil presented was the Beneficial Use Testing Manual that was started two years ago. It's a companion document with the policy white paper. There were additional rounds of review and comments between November 2015 and May 2016 and the document is now being reviewed by the legal department. A webinar will be held to gather comments at the appropriate time.

State Role in Dredging Shallow Draft Recreational Harbors

Dave Knight (Great Lakes Commission) moderated this session. Two states were featured: Michigan and Wisconsin.

In Michigan, the responsibility within the state is divided between three departments: commercial considerations are under DOT, recreational under DNR and environmental regulation efforts under DEQ. In 2012-13, low water levels led the state legislature to come up with \$30M to maintain harbors and do critical dredging, without that recreational harbors would close. Within DNR, there is a waterways program funded in part by fuel taxes. Funds are used for development of marinas, i.e. for dredging marinas but typically not outside marinas. There are partnerships with local government and DNR to construct piers and with the Corps to construct break walls. Legislature provided a pot of funding to DNR; most was passed to community to contract dredging through grants, but some was passed to Corps to do dredging. That was a onetime emergency project, but future conditions might change that. Normal funding that comes to DNR is not typically used for maintenance dredging.

In Wisconsin, there is a harbor assistance program funded through WIDOT, which is \$12.4 M biannually. Ranking for dredging projects is made through prioritization; high priority is for job retention, immediate response (ex: seawall repair) and emergency response dredging. Applicants are often municipalities, small cities, county or private entity. Consideration is given to measurable benefits, including economic and environmental, associated with the project.

In New York State, the state itself plays little to no role in recreational harbors. EPA provides funding to municipalities who want to do dredging and beneficially use the material. In coastal areas, Long Island is tricky because all lands are owned by municipalities and they have to maintain their navigation channels. In Ohio, there is a formal process and there can be funding granted.

Regional Dredging Management concept for small harbors

Dr. Frank Sciremamanno (Professor, Rochester Institute of Technology) presented the concept of a Regional Dredging Management Plan (RDMP) that he developed in 2014 for New York State to provide a comprehensive approach to the on-going dredging needs for recreational harbor access channels along

the south shore of Lake Ontario. Potential RDMP components could range from operations under an existing county or town to the formation of a new public authority to the incorporation of a new not-for-profit corporation. Sciremamanno's evaluation included consideration of the ability of any management structure to provide focus and responsibility for the dredging operations, the economies of scale that could be achieved with respect to the sharing of management functions, personnel and equipment, and the flexibility of any structure to allow for private contract dredging where feasible to help offset operating expenses.

While all forms of organization are feasible, he recommended that a new, not-for-profit local development corporation (LDC) be formed to implement and operate the RDMP. One of the purposes of LDC's is to conduct public or quasi-public functions on behalf of multiple government jurisdictions, an organizational approach well-suited to address the dredging crisis facing New York State's small Lake Ontario harbors that have historically been maintained by the Corps of Engineers, but have now been left out of the USACE dredging program due to budget constraints.

Committee updates

Legislative Committee: Thomas Rayburn (Director, Environmental & Regulatory Affairs, Lake Carriers' Association) presented the report

Outreach Committee: Joe Cappel presented the report

Technical Committee: Karen Keil presented the report

*See appendix for the committee reports

Establishment of overall GLDT priorities for 2016-2017 and Review of Action Items

The meeting summary will be available on the GLDT website once completed.

The action items that were discussed were:

- Products
 - o Beneficial Use Testing Manual:
 - Will be out for review within 30 days
 - A webinar will be planned for comments and inputs
 - The goal is to complete by September 30
 - o Beneficial Use Policy paper:
 - Should be completed soon
- Committees:
 - o Update workplan within 60 days and post on the website
- Review and report out on federal programs to support small harbors
- Prepare a one pager document with Great Lakes priorities for the upcoming year
- Reconnect with the National Dredging Team and investigate and report on what other regional teams are doing (what are their priorities)

Closing thoughts

Tom Crane, Steve Galarneau (WI DNR) and Marc Tuchman (USEPA) thanked the participants and insisted on the importance of having the states engaged and involved.

The GLDT meeting was adjourned

Great Lakes Dredging Team Special Session on Science and Policy Summary

May 19, 2016

U.S Environmental Protection Agency, Chicago, IL

This session was planned to establish communication between members, begin framing the most important questions surrounding science and policy and create a process for information sharing and dialogue with the goal of strengthening relationships and learning from each other. Here are the main topics that were discussed.

Issues and areas to be considered:

- Tom Rayburn suggested the dredging backlog
- John Hull noted that dredging policy continues to undergo changes, and that we should recognize that we are still reacting to old policies that may have since changed. We have to articulate to legislators and general public that we are dealing with a dynamic system.

Beneficial use

- Scudder Mackey asked how we strategize for beneficial use tools, use more innovation on coastal management work with dredged material.
- Jennifer Miller noted that one of the policy impediments was the fact that dredging issues involve such a diverse group of people and interests
- A nationwide permit process was suggested
- Sean Burkholder noted that we have to quantify our definition of "beneficial use"
- Joe Cappel suggested a need for more collaboration among agencies and interested groups
- Scudder Mackey noted the difference types of beneficial use available including habitat restoration, enhanced coastal protection, and public access projects
- On beneficial use for road construction, Gene Clark noted the liability issues that have been confronted in WI surrounding invasive species transported in dredged material
- Joe Cappel: Does science support beneficial use projects going through the NEPA process?
- Stan Ekren noted that is there is no habitat there in the first place, why should the project be subjected to limits

Wetland creation

- Joe Cappel noted the challenge of supplying good metrics for success of restoration projects
- Scudder Mackey added that there is a huge gap in monitoring
- John Hull suggested an adaptive management approach including social metrics such as economic impact and tourism
- Sean Burkholder noted the importance of doing scientific studies pre-emptively with non-biased data collected before project starts

Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)

- Steve Galarneau suggested that, from his agency's perspective PAHs would have value as a topic area for the science/policy discussion
- Jen Miller noted that, on PAHs, there are orders of magnitude of difference in background levels
- Joe Krietinger said that the chemistry for PAHs is inadequate for characterizing risk

Environmental windows

- Steve Galarneau: We want the science robust but also maximum policy flexibility; the capability to balance ecological needs with project needs
- John Hull noted that Ohio has predictive model for HABs, so could there also be developed a predictive model for dredging windows
- Jennifer Street noted that USACE in New England has done investigative work in this area, and Massachusetts has a good model

Legislative Committee Breakout Summary

May 19, 2016, 7:30-9:00 a.m.

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

Attendees

Elisha DeFrain, Michigan DOT
Larry Karnes, Michigan DOT
Ron Kozlowski, USACE-LRB
Floyd Miras, Great Lakes Maritime Administration-USDOT
Carl Platz. USACE-LRD
Kurt Princic, Ohio EPA
Jim Sartucci, K&L Gates
Tom Rayburn, Lake Carriers Association
Tom Crane. Great Lakes Commission

Welcome and Introductions

Tom Crane welcomed the participants who then introduced themselves.

General Discussion about the purpose, mission and work of the Legislative Committee

Crane mentioned that the Legislative Committee is still without a chair. He also said that the Legislative Committee has yet to find its legs and that much of its work overlaps with the work of the other two standing committees. Therefore, the Legislative Committee needs to examine its workplan in light of the other two committees. The Legislative Committee should also link its work more closely with the work of the National Dredging Team. Crane offered the following:

- Its role is informational; not for developing recommendations or establishing policy positions
- The greatest benefit to the GLDT members may be to develop a mechanism for reporting out on state and federal legislative and policy developments at each meeting.

Crane mentioned that he will investigate the status of the National Dredging Team

Legislative Update

Jim Sartucci, Government Affairs Coordinator with K&L Gates provided a legislative update.

He began by providing an overview of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016.

Sartucci stated that the WRDA bill recently passed the Senate and is awaiting House action. Some of the highlights of the Senate Bill include:

- Provides for additional investment in the nation's ports including Great Lakes.
- Provides for additional Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) spending and clarifies funding opportunities for donor and energy transfer ports and emerging harbors.
- Improves coastal infrastructure, flood protection and safety for communities

- Addresses high priority and regional water use issues including Great Lakes.
- Provides additional investment in drinking water and wastewater infrastructure

Sartucci continued with several specific provisions in the bill regarding the Great Lakes:

- Making sure that the Great Lakes Navigation system provisions include the 10% set aside for priority funding under the HMTF with opportunities to increase the funding to 12-13%.
- Section 2004 of the bill requires dredged material disposal to meet state water quality standards.
- Section 2006 authorizes the Corps to maintain all federally authorized harbors of refuge.
- For beneficial use projects, the bill clarifies that dredged material disposal is not a project that requires O&M and therefore can be a single application of sediment.

The WRDA bill also (if passed) will authorize other pieces of federal legislation including: The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) (House version); Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration (GLFER) (lifting the spending cap in place since 2000); Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act (Senate version); Waterfront Community Revitalization and Resiliency Act (Senate version).

Finally, the Senate version of the bill calls for modernization of the St. Lawrence Seaway, calls for the establishment of a Great Lakes Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) coordinator, calls for additional assistance for small and disadvantaged communities and has provisions to promote green infrastructure.

After a brief period of Q&A, the participants provided brief updates on the following issues:

- Plans for implementing the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River regional maritime strategy to be finalized in June 2016.
- Phosphorus and HABs reduction activities in Ohio and western Lake Erie.
- State efforts to promote dredging and development of small harbors.

The participants spent time discussing the draft workplan looking at issues related to mining of dredged material, CDF capacity, brownfields redevelopment and the federal standard. It was clear to those present, that there is a lot of overlap regarding this issues with the work of the Technical Committee and that some of these issues might better be addressed by that committee.

A decision was made to defer updating the Committee work plan until the Great Lakes Dredging Team Steering Committee has an opportunity to discuss the role and future work of the Legislative Committee.

Tom Crane ended the meeting stating that he plans to discuss the future of the Legislative Committee with the GLDT Steering Committee within next few months to assess whether the Legislative Committee should be retained as a standing committee of the GLDT.

Outreach Committee Breakout Summary

May 19, 2016, 7:30-9:00 a.m.

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

Joe Cappel, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority (non-federal co-chair)

Jim Killian, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Pam Allen, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Marie Strum, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Sean Burkholder, University at Buffalo

Brian Davis, Cornell University

Frank O'Connor, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Jason Ziss, Kurtz Bros, Inc.

Michele Leduc-Lapierre, Great Lakes Commission

Welcome and Introductions

Joe Cappel welcomed the participants who then introduced themselves.

Great Lakes Dredging Team products

Newsletter

The latest issue of the newsletter was finalized right before the meeting. A copy is provided in the meeting attendees' folder. The PDF will also be posted on the website. On the website, there should be an interactive way to read the newsletter without having to download the PDF and with the possibility to add more links. Michele Leduc-Lapierre will investigate and see what the options are.

The group discussed the purpose of the newsletter. Originally, it was intended as a GLDT internal communication tool to keep people informed between meetings. The members update was also added to the newsletter to save some time during meetings by skipping the roundtable at the meeting. But the newsletter contains great information and participants to the breakout session thought it should be widely distributed. M. Leduc-Lapierre will see about using GLIN to distribute the document.

The group also discussed the process to get topics for the newsletter. Up to now, the topics have been discussed during the outreach committee bimonthly calls, but we should try to get input from more people to make sure we cover everything. We should also push states to provide their update to make sure they are all discussed. Finally, there should be a way for people to submit stories on the website.

Participants had two suggestions for the next issue:

- State funding in Michigan for state harbors: how the funding occurred and how the money was used.
- In-depth funding article: how the harbor system program in Minnesota and Wisconsin is used in general.

Website

Part of the discussion was about how to present the information and characterize innovations so people could easily have access to it. We could work on a system for information management with each harbor having its own page with links to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers catalog documents.

Information could be searchable by state, by topic, etc.

Some participants noted that the “Resources” page is a little thin and should have more content. We will work with the technical committee to increase the amount of information found on the page.

Review of the 2016-2017 Workplan

- Social media:
 - o Not the best way to use our time and resources for now, maybe in the future
 - o Not appropriate for now
 - o Maybe Instagram because no need for text, just pictures
 - o States can't really do it, too much constraints
 - o Let's link to other social media
- Videos
 - o Link to others and not produced ours
- Create template to solicit content
- E-news:
 - o Summary of work from each committee and report out

Technical Committee Breakout Summary

May 19, 2016, 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 (federal co-chair)

Jim Sharrow, Duluth Seaway Port Authority (non-federal co-chair)

James Casey, Indiana Department of Natural Resources

Steve Galarneau, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Gene Clark, University of Wisconsin – Sea Grant

Kathy Kowal, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Liz Pelloso, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Josh Feldman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Brian Hinrichs, Foth Engineering

Marc Tuchman, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Scudder Mackey, Ohio Department of Natural Resources

John Hull, Hull & Associates, Inc.

Jason Ziss, Kurtz Brothers Inc.

Jennifer Street, New York Department of State

Stan Ekren, Great Lakes Dredge & Dock

Guy Partch, Barr Engineering

Pam Horner, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Jennifer Miller, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Dan Breneman, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Joe Kreitinger, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Mollie Mahoney, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

- Karen Keil reported on the progress on the Beneficial Use Testing Manual, the majority of which was authored by Richard Price, USACE-Engineer Research and Development Center, prior to his retirement. The document is currently being reviewed by USACE attorneys. John Hull suggested more emphasis on multi-year planning of beneficial use projects which could increase the potential for more public-private partnerships. Scudder Mackey noted that the Ohio coastal management program is now considering 2 ½ year grant programs. At least one reviewer of the manual, Todd Bridges of USACE, suggested that it needs a risk management component. Joe Kreitinger added that some projects have short term risk (i.e. turbidity during in-water placement) for long term gain. Brian Hinrichs had two comments: that nutrients should be addressed, and sampling frequency.
- Dave Knight reported on completion of the Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education (CFIRE) Phase Two project focusing on recovery and beneficial use of dredged material from

confined disposal facilities (CDFs). Deliverables included a final report by Principal Investigator William Likos PhD from the University of Wisconsin, with special detail on amendment of dredged material from a Milwaukee CDF with fly ash; a video of the project; a print project on the conversion of CDFs to “processing and reuse facilities;” and the update by Great Lakes Commission staff of the website tool “Recycling Dredged Material in the Great Lakes.” Gene Clark also noted that CFIRE had applied for ongoing monetary support, thus potentially enabling future, follow-on dredging-related projects in partnership with the GLDT.

- Joe Kreitinger reported on the in-water habitat restoration project using and sampling dredged material in the Duluth/Superior harbor (see presentation posted with meeting presentations).
- Jim Sharrow inquired about other states’ policies guiding open water mitigation and suggested that a survey questionnaire be distributed to identify respective state policies, if they have them.
- Karen Keil noted the proposed addition to the work plan of discussion on how delisting of Areas of Concern and subsequent delisting of dredging restrictions impact dredged material management.

Work Plan review and actions

Beneficial Use

1. Beneficial Use Policy White Paper: still in review
2. Outreach pilot project: Marc Tuchman suggested keeping this on the plan, and adding Duluth
3. CFIRE projects: Remove completed projects from plan, but keep future opportunities open
4. Beneficial use testing manual: Keep this as a priority and plan a webinar when ready

Open Water Placement

5. White paper: Jim Sharrow reported that Congress is working on legislation to develop a federal standard. J. Hull noted that open water placement should be kept as an available alternative. Keep this on the plan.

Environmental dredging windows

6. Turbidity research still underway; keep in the plan.

Mitigation of open water habitat

7. A survey will be conducted on state policies. Keep in the plan.

Delisting of Areas of Concerns

8. States should address this. Remove from plan.

State of Science and Policy Symposium

9. To be discussed by full GLDT.