SUMMARY

Great Lakes Dredging Team 2017 Annual Meeting
May 22-23, 2017
Pier B Resort
Duluth, MN

Day One

Great Lakes Dredging Team (GLDT) business meeting

Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission (GLC) Deputy Director, welcomed GLDT members and observers, introduced other members of the GLC staff support team, and expressed appreciation to the Duluth Seaway Port Authority and the Propeller Club of Duluth-Superior for inviting GLDT attendees to its annual Maritime Lunch.

T. Crane presented a brief history of the GLDT, including its origins as a GLC task force, and its evolution into one of 13 Regional Dredging Teams created in 1997 along with the creation of the National Dredging Team by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other federal agencies.

Outgoing Non-Federal Co-Chair Steve Galarneau expressed thanks for the team’s support during his chairmanship, saying “It has been a great pleasure to serve.” Outgoing Federal Co-Chair Marc Tuchman also expressed thanks, saying “The participation of the ports and states has been critical to the success of the GLDT, as has the strong support from the GLC staff.”

T. Crane thanked corporate sponsors for the GLDT annual meeting including the Duluth Seaway Port Authority, Barr Engineering, MarineTech LLC, and Great Lakes Dredge and Dock Co. LLC.

T. Crane announced results of election of officers: New Federal Co-Chair Karen Keil of the USACE Buffalo District, and Non-Federal Co-Chair Tom Rayburn of Lake Carriers’ Association. New Federal Co-Chair of the Technical Committee will be Jennifer Miller of the USACE Chicago District, with Jim Sharrow of the Duluth Superior Port Authority returning as Non-Federal Chair. New Federal Chair of the Outreach Committee will be Andrew Kornacki of the USACE Buffalo District, with Joe Cappel of the Toledo Lucas County Port Authority returning as Non-Federal Chair.

The outgoing chairs were recognized with personalized gifts.

USACE 2017 Great Lakes Dredging Program

Marie Strum, USACE Detroit District, reported that consistent growth in annual appropriations to support Great Lakes navigation have reflected a better understanding and recognition of the Great
Lakes as a system. She noted that funding has increased from levels around $90 million in 2010-13 the $120-130 million range today, the level USACE considers necessary for navigation sustainability. The USACE program continues to have four main areas of focus: dredging, dredged material management, navigation structures, and locks.

The President’s FY 17 budget featured $102.8 million for operations and maintenance (O&M), and some 20 dredging projects totaling $38.4 million and 3.2 million cubic yards. Special attention was paid in the Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) to low use, or, “emerging” harbors, for which 10 percent of the O&M budget was designated.

In the area of dredged material management, placement of material in confined disposal facilities (CDFs) has been reduced from 50 percent overall in the Great Lakes to 45 percent, thanks to more nearshore placement, beneficial use and habitat restoration such as the Cat Island project in Green Bay. That project in particular, said Strum, has represented a “tremendous win for dredging efficiency and environmental improvement.” But it still faces some challenges, including more rapid than expected vegetation growth, a rapid fill rate, and presence of endangered species, i.e. snowy owl and piping plover. Duluth’s in-water habitat restoration project at the 21st St. location has also been successful.

Growing attention is being paid to the Soo Locks, particularly the now 50-year old Poe Lock. New data have confirmed that some 85 percent of the cargo transiting the Soo is restricted to the Poe Lock, up from a figure of 70 percent that has been assumed for several years. Strum identified two USACE efforts now underway: 1) An asset renewal plan addressing such needs as replacement of embedded lock gate anchorages, and 2) An updated benefit/cost ratio for a new Poe-sized replacement lock. As part of this, an economic re-evaluation report will consider many factors, including reliability, commodity forecasts, alternative transportation modes, and cost updates. The entire process, including technical and peer reviews, was expected to be completed by December 2017 but has been pushed to mid-2018 due to funding shortages.

**Legislative update**

**Steve Fisher,** Executive Director of the American Great Lakes Ports Association (AGLPA), noted that, historically, maritime transportation has primarily involved federal policy, but now states are getting increasingly involved, and that is good. AGLPA is also working with ports and port-related groups all across the country, including American Waterway Operators on the inland rivers, American Association of Port Authorities, Dredging Contractors of America, and the American Petroleum Institute.

Fisher pointed out that, in Congress, the Great Lakes delegation was particularly effective, as it has long been established as a voice for the region; he noted that not many other parts of the country have a caucus as organized and effective.

The current Great Lakes legislative strategy is to “grow the national pie;” with the thinking that the larger the national USACE budget is, the larger the Great Lakes’ share will be. Fisher noted that there is
still a $200 million dredging backlog to address, and another $250 million for navigation structures, plus
the need for a new Poe-sized Soo Lock.

Regarding the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), Fisher said that Congress is still not
appropriating enough, although there has been progress toward the goal of applying all HMTF monies to
their intended purpose by 2025. Fixes for HMTF have taken two forms:

1) Taking it off budget so the Harbor Maintenance Taxes (HMT) go right to USACE without
Congressional involvement, so-called “mandatory spending.” This was first proposed in the
RAMP (Restore America’s Maritime Promise) Act of 2011. It is opposed, however, by
Congressional leadership who fear that the whole appropriations system would be threatened.

2) Make incremental progress, as was proposed – and enacted – as part of the 2014 WRDA which
established non-binding increased spending targets for each year from 2015 to 2025, as a “road
map” to full HMTF utilization by 2025. To date, Congress has largely hit the targets, increasing
the spending by about $400 million each of the past three years.

These increases, however, have also attracted “mischief makers,” Fisher said, such as “donor ports” on
the West Coast that historically have generated more HMT funds than they received, and which are now
seeking HMTF funds for port development work not related to dredging or harbor maintenance. Also, a
recently introduced U.S. Coast Guard authorization bill included a provision calling for HMTF funds to be
used for USCG Aids to Navigation. Fisher warned that such bids for HMTF assistance should be strongly
opposed, since “once somebody is successful in getting access to HMTF, everyone else will want in.”

The Great Lakes strategy will thus continue to focus on efforts to 1) “grow the national pie,” and 2) fight
off raids on the HMTF.

Fisher also reported that a broad-based economic impact study for the Great Lakes navigation system is
underway to update the last such study done in 2010. It is due to be published in the first quarter of
2018.

**Introduction to the Duluth-Superior Harbor Tour and Beneficial Use Projects**

Prior to the boat tour of the Duluth-Superior Harbor and Lake Michigan, participants received
information about relevant local projects.

**Nelson French**, Supervisor, Lake Superior Unit, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), presented a
brief history of the 21st Ave. and 40th St. projects in the Duluth harbor. He noted that these sites
contained legacy contaminants resulting from industrial discharges from the 1870s to the 1960s. The
project work was largely enabled by the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) and the Minnesota
Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment to the state’s constitution in 2008. Funds for the project

---

1 Note: “donor port” is a misnomer. Ports do not pay Harbor Maintenance Taxes, the shippers of goods pay based
upon the value of the cargo.
included $11.9 million from HMTF, $6.9 million from GLRI, $248,000 from the MPCA and $107,000 from the USACE Engineering with Nature program.

Dan Breneman, Project Manager for MPCA’s Lake Superior Unit, looked ahead to what will come next for this project work. He noted that 1) they now have a process for such work, and 2) still have a need for more of it. What will be necessary going forward will be ongoing organization to keep things moving and funding. Other beneficial use opportunities may include re-use of dredged material processed at the Erie Pier facility for construction, in-water habitat restoration opportunities on the Wisconsin side of the harbor, and mineland reclamation at retired mine sites on the Iron Range.

Joseph Kreitinger, USACE Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), noted that the projects in the Duluth harbor involved “brownfield redevelopment for ecological benefit.” For these pilot projects, a good deal of new regulatory work had to be done, and even some new equipment had to be designed, such as a vertical discharge plate for dispersal of material in the water column. Also involved was the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) which developed data sets for monitoring turbidity and water quality. Among the challenges of the projects were determining how to balance short-term risk with longer term benefits and defining engineering strategies for risk reduction. Future beneficial use projects, said Kreitinger, should include efforts to 1) create partnerships; 2) harmonize state and federal regulations and guidelines; 3) engage other technical groups; 4) develop pilot projects; and 5) take advantage of the USACE Engineering with Nature strategies.

Day Two

Using Dredged Material to Create Wetlands

Andrea Chreston, Project Manager Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, presented on the experience of Tommy Thompson Park on the Toronto waterfront, a former CDF, converted into an urban wildlife area and “Important Bird Area.”

The 7.7-hectare (19 acres) Cell 1 wetland involved a 15-20 year process to get the necessary approvals for the work it would take to get it to function as a productive wetland. It was capped in phases with clay to isolate the toxic sediment below the wetland being developed above. The clay, however, made it more difficult for vegetation to be established, and it was five years before a true “green” environment was in place. It now features upland plantings of berry plants for birds, a trail system, outdoor classroom and fish gates to keep out carp. There were some turbidity issues in Cell 1, which were noted as something to attempt to avoid in Cell 2.

The 9.3-hectare (23 acres) Cell 2 was officially opened last year and included Coca Cola Canada as a corporate project partner. Also involved was Aquatic Habitat Toronto, a collaboration of public and academic partners to review projects in and around Toronto.
The 32-hectare (79 acres) Cell 3 will provide an estimated 30 years of capacity for dredged material, and is incorporating aquatic habitat made from discarded woody material.

GLDT member Sean Burkholder encouraged others to visit the site, which he noted has become a valuable social amenity for the greater Toronto area, as well as an environmental restoration example.

Ohio’s Program for Beneficial Use of Dredged Material

David Emerman, Dredge Program Administrator with Ohio EPA and legal counsel for the Ohio Lake Erie Commission, provided background and an update on the State of Ohio’s commitment to end open lake placement of dredged material in Lake Erie by 2020. He noted that, historically, seven of Ohio’s eight federal cargo ports on Lake Erie relied on the open lake to dispose of up to 1.5 million cubic yards of dredged material annually. He said that, while there have been many success stories around the Great Lakes of reusing dredged material beneficially rather than placing it in open lake waters, Ohio is just beginning to explore such alternatives, and doing so with a relatively small budget and a tight deadline.

Local partnerships are in the process of being assembled, and are working closely with USACE. Given the unique circumstances in each harbor, though, there will likely be no single “silver bullet” solution for all. Some of the potential dredged material management alternatives being considered include soil processing, manufactured products such as cement, agricultural uses such as farm field application, and environmental enhancement such as habitat restoration.

The state’s goal is to develop general permits for each harbor, though the challenge remains as to how to set appropriate standards. For agricultural use of dredged material on farmlands, for instance, farmers rightly have concerns about such impacts as contaminate uptake by crops, effects on crop yield, and how long it will take for detection of any unintended consequences. At present, the most promising alternative for Ohio’s dredged material is environmental enhancement.

Scudder Mackey, Chief, Ohio Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management, presented an overview of Ohio’s In-Water Habitat Restoration program, to which the state is committing $10 million. That budget has been allocated to three of the state’s largest Lake Erie harbors: $5.35 million to Toledo, $2.65 million to Cleveland, and $1 million to Sandusky.

In Toledo, projects are being developed at the Cullen Park wetland, and at the Facility 3 wetland in Oregon; both will involve some public access. In Sandusky the objective will be to improve water quality by controlling sediment and nutrient loading through wetland enhancement and provide public access where possible. All these projects are locally managed with funding from the Ohio Healthy Lake Erie Fund.

From a broader perspective, a systematic analysis has been conducted of Ohio’s entire 312-mile Lake Erie shoreline to identify potential beneficial use opportunities; the state is working closely on this with USACE, including a schedule of regular conference calls. Knowing that dredging of navigation channels
will have to continue as long as there is a navigational need for access to ports and docks, the object is to develop a portfolio of projects to start sequencing and planning, in order to avoid “random acts of restoration”. The intention is that the benefits flow from one site to the next. One challenge will be to secure the required non-federal match for each project, and assure that it matches the planning and sequencing timing for each respective project.

At present, 27 potential projects have been identified, and sorted into short, medium and long term categories. These have been embedded in GIS, and on a spreadsheet to create a format/template that could be used by other states. Also considered have been the economic benefits that could be realized by this approach.

**Beneficial Use Testing Manual**

Karen Keil, Risk Assessor/Environmental Toxicologist, USACE Buffalo District, provided an update of the review process underway for the draft manual, noting that comments that have been received from federal and state agencies and other stakeholders are being considered and will be the basis of smaller group discussions focusing on the draft, section by section. She said that the manual will not be finalized until consensus is reached, and added in response to a question that the finalized manual would be an appropriate model for individual states to adopt. USACE hopes to have a revised document to the GLDT for the next round of review in early 2018.

**GLDT Committee Reports**

See appendix A for the Technical Committee report and appendix B for the Outreach Committee report.

**GLDT Annual Meeting Wrap-Up**

Tom Crane advised that the Steering Committee will be meeting soon to develop a GLDT Priorities document, and to explore potential new products, and potential new alternatives for GLDT support. One possibility might be approaching the Great Lakes Fishery Trust for support of environmental dredging windows research.

T. Crane congratulated the incoming co-chairs: Federal Co-Chair Karen Keil and Non-Federal Co-Chair Tom Rayburn.

**Meeting Adjourned**
Appendix A
GLDT Technical Committee Proceedings
8 a.m. Tuesday, May 23

Participants:
Federal Co-chair Jennifer Miller, USACE Chicago District
Non-federal Co-chair Jim Sharrow, Duluth Seaway Port Authority
Immediate Past Federal Co-chair Karen Keil, USACE Buffalo District
Steve Galarneau, WI DNR
Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission
Suzanne Grix, Great Lakes E&I
Gene Clark, University of Wisconsin Sea Grant
Dan Breneman, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Lisa Young, Canadian Coast Guard
John Hull, Hull & Associates Inc.
David Emerman, Ohio EPA
Larry Karnes, MI Department of Transportation
Adam Bechle, Wisconsin Coastal Management/UW Sea Grant
Ronald Kozlowski, USACE Buffalo District
Phil Horstman, USACE Chicago District
Marc Tuchman US EPA, Great Lakes National Program Office
Joe Kreitinger, USACE Engineer Research and Development Center
Steve Brossart, USACE Duluth
Joe Graham, WI DNR
Cheryl Bougie, WI DNR
Dave Knight, Great Lakes Commission contract staff

Work Plan Updates

1. Beneficial Use “Lessons Learned” document from in-water beneficial use project work in the Duluth harbor
   Dan Breneman reported that the necessary data has been gathered and that the process is underway to compile it into a final report.

   Jim Sharrow presented a draft outline of a guidance document for private developers interested in incorporating best practices into a project involving beneficial use of dredged material (see attached.) Jennifer Miller noted that private contractors are often willing to consider beneficial use options but are often not aware of the federal regulations involved. Steve Brossart added that contractors not only need this information, but need it well in advance of the actual project work. He also noted that problems sometimes emerge with private developers trying to direct USACE contractors. Joe Kreitinger noted that real estate projects typically have tight parameters of cost and scheduling, of which state and federal agencies have to be aware. John Hull reported
that his firm has done many upland beneficial use projects, and each has had a local sponsor, and a guarantee to cover a cost delta, if there is one. High predictability of success, he said, is critical to each project.

**Action:** Add this issue area to the Work Plan, recognizing the need to define a more private development-friendly approach to beneficial use project scheduling and permitting.

2. **Conversion of CDFs to processing and re-use facilities**

Dave Knight and Gene Clark reported that a proposal to University of Wisconsin Sea Grant for follow-on work to the project supported in recent years by the National Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education (CFIRE) was not submitted due to a lack of available capacity of a necessary principle investigator for the project. Alternative funding sources for the proposal are being explored.

**Action:** Keep this project work on the Work Plan.

3. **Draft Regional Beneficial Use Testing Manual**

Karen Keil reported that she will be setting up calls with agencies that have responded with comments on the draft, and will organize the discussions on a section-by-section basis.

4. **Open Water Placement draft white paper**

J. Miller noted that this document has been placed on hold indefinitely. Tom Crane added that even if the paper is revisited, it will likely need significant changes to the current content.

**Action:** There were no objections to removing this item from the Work Plan.

5. **Turbidity research relating to environmental dredging windows policy**

G. Clark reported that MN and WI Sea Grants have established this issue area as a priority, specifically for the Duluth-Superior harbor, and will be inviting stakeholders to a scoping meeting/committee function to 1) explore the science being used to establish dredging windows in the Duluth-Superior harbor, and 2) build a collaboration to gather other related research that has been done and ultimately design a pathway to science-based windows, one that could be used as a template for other Great Lakes ports.

J. Kreitinger noted that, based on the success of the current pilot project in the Duluth-Superior harbor noted previously, it would probably be advisable to develop a windows pilot project, with measurable outcomes/findings from field work, rather than just an on-paper study. He added that given the fact that science behind windows can be “sketchy”, windows policy is typically conservative, with little good data to confirm whether and to what extent dredging
actually impacts fish spawning and/or the vulnerability of the population. This would also point to the need for a pilot project involving all the resource managers involved.

J. Hull added that dredging windows are critical to privately-driven beneficial use projects, saying that when a developer gets financing for a project he has a tight financial window within which to operate; if that window is missed, the entire project can be jeopardized. He also noted that upland brownfield projects involving beneficial use must always have economic benefit as well as environmental benefit.

**Action:** Keep this item in the Work Plan, explore additional technical resources available from USACE, ask state resource managers to go back to their agencies and identify willingness/availability to engage in this issue area.

6. **Mitigation of open water habitat**

J. Sharrow presented a draft report of responses (see attached) to a questionnaire sent to all Great Lakes states about their respective policies on open water mitigation for projects that consume open water habitat. He reported that four states responded, and that each is essentially guided by its own policies and practices.

7. **Lifting of dredging beneficial use impairments (BUIs) in delisted Areas of Concern (AOC)**

Beth Murphy of U.S. EPA has this information compiled. J. Miller will ask if she is willing to hold a webinar on this issue, as yet unscheduled. S. Galarneau suggested that the topic be addressed at the regular AOC conference to be held in Sheboygan WI next year.

8. **“State of Science and Policy” Symposium**

T. Crane reported that although symposium planning is inactive right now, he would like to retain it on the Work Plan, and perhaps explore other approaches, including a more scaled-down approach with tighter focus. J. Miller suggested that it could be piggy-backed on an existing event, such as the State of the Lake meeting or AOC conference. Also mentioned were the Western Dredging Association (WEDA) meeting coming to Toledo in 2018, and the Great Lakes Dredging Team annual meeting.

9. **Open discussion: suggested topics for Technical Committee, and upcoming GLDT informational webinars**

The aforementioned AOC-BUI topic was suggested for a possible webinar.

J. Hull suggested as a topic the future of confined disposal facilities, noting that these facilities were originally built in partnerships with local communities, and that sense of partnership is being lost. He suggested that these communities should be looking ahead for what’s next, and planning the long-term investments that will be necessary.
Sustainable dredged material management plans (DMMPs) was suggested as a topic. This could be a webinar explaining the USACE’s DMMP process, including the opportunities for community input and investment.

D. Knight suggested a “lessons learned” case study of one small harbor, Leland, MI, that recently acquired its own dredging equipment to operate a self-supporting maintenance dredging program without reliance on federal or state resources.

Meeting adjourned
DRAFT REPORT OF RESPONSES FROM THE 2016 OPEN WATER MITIGATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Open water habitat mitigation questionnaire
The USACE is responsible for federal permitting of dock reconstructions and other projects that consume open water habitat. Many states also have their own requirements for when mitigation is required and how it can be accomplished. Through the questionnaire below, the Dredging Team Technical Committee would like to learn how your state approaches this issue and whether your state’s permitting process is affecting the timing, design and expense of projects. We would like a response from each state represented on the Dredge Team. Please answer the questionnaire and return to Jim Sharrow, at jsharrow@duluthport.com by September 15, 2016.

Responses have been received from New York, Ohio, Wisconsin and Minnesota. This report will be updated when and if responses are received from the other states.

1. Does your state have procedures and requirements separate from the USACE regarding permitting for open water mitigation? If your answer is “No”, jump down to question No. 6.

MINNESOTA
Yes.
Under MN statute 6115.0250, mitigation for loss of public waters must be accomplished by
A. Restoring degraded or impacted public waters having equal or greater value;
B. Creating or restoring additional replacement water areas having equal or greater public value; or
C. any other measures approved by the commissioner that compensates for the detrimental aspects of the change.
The MN DNR has applied internal guidance to initiate the need for mitigation when more than 10,000 square feet of water surface are affected. Mitigation is considered to be a 1:1 Ratio of replaced open water if on the same site or a 2:1 ratio if the newly created open water is off site. The mitigation must be approved as part of the construction permit, which leads to blocked projects.

The DNR has prepared a draft general permit that will ease the process and exempt most dock reconstruction project permitting from open water mitigation rules.

WISCONSIN
Yes and No. Wisconsin has mitigation requirements for structures placed in open water.

NEW YORK
Article 15 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law as codified into 6NYCRR Part 608 is New York State’s regulatory framework for the permitting of docks. NYSDEC also has internal guidance for regulation of docks, etc. There is no specific “open water mitigation” requirement.
OHIO
No. (With their response being “No.”, the responder skipped to question No. 6.)

2. If your state does have its own procedures for open water mitigation, please describe or attach the statute, rule or regulation.

MINNESOTA
This is covered by Mn statute 6115.0250. Jim Sharrow can provide this if requested

WISCONSIN
Permitting: Ch. 30, Ch. 31 Wis. State Statutes, NR 300 Code Series

NEW YORK
No response

OHIO

3. How long does it take, typically, to receive state construction permits for dock construction or reconstruction projects that consume open water?

MINNESOTA
Months to years.

WISCONSIN
General Permits are issued within 30 days. Individual Permits are issues within 105 days. (These are statutory time limits; the majority of permits are issues faster than this).

NEW YORK
Many docks do not require permits from NYSDEC. Larger docking facilities (like marinas or mooring fields) are more likely to require permits than docks for single family residences. It depends on the nature of the project, but the permitting process for those larger projects typically takes 1-2 months if all necessary information is provided.

OHIO

4. Are projects in your state currently delayed due to the state permitting process?

MINNESOTA
Yes.
WISCONSIN
No.

NEW YORK
Dock permits are only required if the square footage is > 4,000 SF or designed for > 5 boat slips. A preliminary permit meeting is recommended in order to ensure all necessary information is provided for the permitting process. Delays can occur, if the permit submittal is determined to be “Incomplete” due to the failure to provide necessary information/documentation. With a cooperative permit applicant, there aren’t inordinate delays.

OHIO
No.

5. Do you have an open water mitigation bank for state waters? If so, please describe how it is managed and how it is utilized in the permitting process.

MINNESOTA
No.

WISCONSIN
No.

NEW YORK
No.

OHIO

6. Are there any other problems or issues associated with achieving timely permits (either state or federal) for harbor construction projects in your state?

MINNESOTA
No.

WISCONSIN
Permits need to be fully complete before the “review clock” starts. As long as a completed application containing sound engineering is submitted, decisions are made quickly.

NEW YORK
State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) process is used in the permitting process. This process has its own requirements that must be evaluated before a permit can be issued. SEQR
incorporates environmental factors into permitting. A project sponsor who makes a proposal with significant adverse environmental impacts would be required to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**OHIO**

It becomes difficult to issue timely 401 WQC when poorly prepared applications are submitted by applicants. We are looking to address this issue through the development of our Water Quality Certified Professional (WQCP) Program. It is our intent to certify individuals to ensure the quality of applications submitted to Ohio EPA is complete to minimizing processing time.
Appendix B
GLDT Outreach Committee Proceedings
8 a.m. Tuesday, May 23

Participants:
Non-federal Co-Chair Joe Cappel, Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority
Jim Killian, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Matt Doss, Great Lakes Commission
Todd Breiby, Wisconsin Coastal management
Kareem El-Naggar, USACE
Floyd Miras, U.S. DOT – Maritime Administration
Thomas Rayburn, Lake Carriers’ Association
Carl Platz, USACE
Scudder Mackey, Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Michele Leduc-Lapierre, Great Lakes Commission

The following elements were discussed during the Outreach Committee breakout session

**Newsletter**
Several ideas to increase the amount of news in the newsletter were discussed. One of the possibility would be to do a “spotlight on” article on a company, agency or person. There could also be a legislative briefing included to complement the presentation we have at the meetings. We could also try to reach out outside of the basin to hear about projects that can be inspiring and from which we can learn.

**Webinars**
The group discussed ways to increase participation in information webinars. Some of the ideas proposed were to use the GLIN network to announce the webinars. Also, members of the committee are asked to share the information when they get it.

**Increase audience**
Another item discussed was how to increase the group of people who get the information from the team, but also who gets involved in the activities of the GLDT. Participants listed these as potential groups to target: elected officials, small harbors groups, state and federal agencies staff, terminal operators, contractors, and other dredging teams.

M. Leduc-Lapierre will work with the Outreach Committee co-chairs and members to update the workplan. It will be discussed and adopted in the next committee conference call.

Meeting adjourned