



**Great Lakes Dredging Team  
Meeting Summary  
April 13, 2004  
Hilton Garden Inn, Cleveland**

Attendees

Name	Affiliation
Victoria Pebbles	Great Lakes Commission
Dave Knight	Great Lakes Commission
Thomas Magness	USACE
Paul Alsenas	Cuyahoga County Planning Commission
Stephen Pfeiffer	Cleveland Port Authority
Randy Helland	U.S. Coast Guard
Larry Kieck	Wisconsin DOT
Ray Skelton	Duluth Seaway Port authority
Scott Pickard	USACE
Rich Greenwood	U.S. FWS
Floyd Miras	U.S. Maritime Admin/DOT
Doug Clarke	USACE, Environmental Lab
Jim Weakley	Lake Carriers' Associations
Jim Casey	IDNR/OWR
Don Wadleigh	USACE - Chicago
Todd Goeks	NOAA
Scott Ireland	USEPA/GLNPO
John Hughs	Ports of Indiana
Steve West	Indiana DEM
Kathleen McCoe	New York DEC
Jan Miller	USACE,LRD
Richard Saichek	USACE, Chicago

Dave Wethington	USACE, Chicago
Mary Baker	NOAA - Nat'l Ocean Service
Bill O'Donoghue	USACE, Detroit
Bob Engles	USACE/ERDC/WES
Jon Dettling	Great Lakes Commission
Kim Majerus	USACE, Chicago
Frank L. Beodray	Weston Solutions, Inc.
Don Guy	ODNR - Geo Survey
Matt Hammer	SAIC
Rod Beals	Ohio EPA
Steven Loue	Ohio EPA

### State Updates

Steve Pfeiffer, representing Ohio, reported progress on the development of the DMMP for the Port of Cleveland, which faces considerable challenges with CDF capacity. He highlighted the status of the Dike 14 expansion project at the Port of Cleveland where there is consideration for raising the dike walls to increase CDF capacity and raised concerns with states' increasing restrictions on open lake disposal of dredged material. He also noted impending problems associated with the dredge funding shortfalls and expressed frustration at the inaccessibility of monies from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to assist states with dredged material management needs.

Ray Skelton, representing Minnesota, reported that even though the Port of Duluth-Superior relinquished some of its budget allocations for dredging last year to the St. Marys River deepening project, the port is "not in dire straits" and will be satisfied with having its East Gate section worked on this season. He added that the other Lake Superior ports of Silver Bay and Two Harbors do not foresee any difficulty staying operational this year, and that the port of Taconite Harbor, closed two years ago when then-owner LTV went bankrupt, may also re-open.

Jim Weakly, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, reported that he had written letters advocating for increased federal funding of Great Lakes maintenance dredging, and thanked the Port of Duluth-Superior for its help with the \$3.5 million shortfall for the St. Marys River work.

Jim Casey, Illinois, reported on an upcoming project that will move Illinois River dredged material from the Peoria Lakes area up the river by barge to Chicago where it will be used to cap a former USS brownfield site being reclaimed as green space. He noted that, all things considered, the movement and placement of dredged material for this purpose was competitive

with locally-available sources of topsoil. He also updated the situation in Waukegan where the federal government is anxious to start remedial dredging but is facing lack of \$6 million in local funding needed to get the project going.

Steve West, Indiana, reported on the Grand Calumet dredging project which involved 800,000 cy of highly toxic material. The upland CDF construction (technically known as a PDF, built with authority under RCRA) was finished ahead of schedule despite the challenges of a 100-year storm that struck right in the middle of the project and the fact that homeland security threat was at Code Orange level during the entire project. He added that local residents were generally pleased with the outcome and that property values in the area have actually increased.

Kathleen McCue of New York reported that New York State is overhauling its dredging and beneficial use policies and rewriting its regulations.

#### Federal budget issues and WRDA 2004

According to Jan Miller, this year the Corps of Engineers has been allocated \$90 million for O&M in FY05, down from \$91 million for FY04, and reduced even further by 5 to 6 percent “savings and slippage.” Due to a major budget shortfall in recent years, the Corps is “over-committed” in many projects, meaning that many approved projects are sitting idle waiting to get started. The President’s budget for FY 05 identifies \$77 million for the Great Lakes, including \$800,000 for the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway Study. No funds have been allocated for recreational harbors, continuing a policy that since the Carter administration. The results are that more project-specific adds are being made by Members of Congress, and that much needed structural maintenance is being deferred. Another offshoot is that some ports are turning to more creative ways to deal with dredging issues, such as the Bay Port facility in Green Bay which operates its CDF like a self-sustaining private landfill.

Victoria Pebbles reported on the Great Lakes Commission’s WRDA advocacy strategy. WRDA ‘03 passed the House in September, 2003 and was subsequently received in the Senate, which has not yet released its own bill. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works held its first WRDA reauthorization hearing on March 31. The GLC has identified 12 WRDA reauthorization priorities, including one expanding the definition of and encouraging beneficial use of dredged material, and one calling for a separate budget itemization for shallow draft harbors in the Great Lakes. The House-passed version of the WRDA bill includes a provision to expand the types of projects eligible for beneficial use and calls for regional sediment management planning to enhance beneficial use of dredged material.

Some dredging team members expressed concern that 100 percent federal funding for shallow draft harbors is unrealistic and fear that any federal funding would compete with deep draft ports, which are already backlogged. It was suggested that an effective strategy should include some type of cost-share and ensure that funding for shallow draft harbors not compete with deep draft ports, but could also provide flexibility to take advantage of geographic proximities. It was also

suggested that the long term maintenance needs of shallow draft harbors and marinas should be considered and financing assured when they are planned and built, as is increasingly done with development on land.

### Case Studies

GLC staff identified a list of case study candidates on which it is working: Michigan City, IN Toronto, ON, St. Joseph, MI, Grand Haven, MI and Peoria Lakes, IL. Team members suggested that in addition to the site studies, some “technology case studies” could be developed to study such topics as Geotubes used for containing and dewatering dredged material, wick systems for dewatering, used of sheet pile rather than riprap in port or marina settings, and open lake disposal.

**Action Item: Staff will continue to work with GLDT members to develop case studies for posting on the GLDT web site and hard copy distribution at appropriate venues.**

### Canadian Interest in GLDT

V. Pebbles indicated that outreach to solicit Canadian interest in the GLDT as a follow up to an IJC recommendation was still being pursued by staff.

### Dredging Outlook

Jan Miller presented the Corps’ plans for maintenance dredging in the Great Lakes in 2004 and highlighted the proportionately higher costs of dredging in the Lakes than many other U.S. port ranges (approximately \$6.50 cu yd in 2003, not including CDF construction costs) In addition to the high cost of disposal, overall cost increases are also being driven by the shrinking number of dredging contractors in the Great Lakes. As the volume of dredging activity has gone down, contractors are not finding enough business on which to bid.

Looking to the broader picture, Lt. Col. Thomas Magness said that “Congress has an appetite for information on the Great Lakes that has not been fed.” He highlighted that 25 of the top 100 U.S. ports are in the Great Lakes and that the continued backlog in dredging projects presents a serious threat to the region. He called for new strategies and approaches to demonstrate cost effectiveness and enhance the region’s competitive edge, including new and different cost/benefit documentation for Great Lakes dredging and more creative applications of dredging technology. He called on the GLDT to assist the Detroit District in coming up with ways to prioritize projects and maximize efficiencies in the use of public funds for dredging maintenance. He also displayed a matrix of all approved harbors in the Detroit District (which is posted on the District’s website) with detailed information on dredging activity and needs for each.

**Action Item: Detroit District will supply its port matrix for posting on the GLDT website.**

### Great Lakes Legacy Act

Scott Ireland of the U.S. EPA Great Lakes National Program Office reported that, under the Act signed into law Nov. 27, 2003, \$10 million will be appropriated in FY 2004. President Bush's FY 2005 budget proposes \$45 million. The Legacy Act authorizes \$50 million per year from FY 2004 through FY 2008 for contaminated sediment projects in the Great Lakes. Projects must be located in an Area of Concern, the non-federal cost share must be at least 35 percent of total project costs and 100 percent of O&M costs. The closing date for this year's proposals was March 31, 2004. The Act also authorizes small amounts of funding for research and public outreach, but no money has been appropriated for these to date. Although the focus is on contaminated sediment remediation in AOCs, there are opportunities for projects to link remediation and navigation needs.

### Regional Sediment Management

Scott Ross of the Detroit District Office reported on the Southern Lake Michigan Regional Sediment Management demonstration program, and the National RSM Authority from which it derived. The demonstration project focused on balancing shoreline erosion and accretion issues in Michigan City, IN and Saugatuck, MI with an emphasis on shore property protection and shore structures. RSM has the potential to address a broader array of sediment management issues in the region.

### Portfields

Mary Baker, of the NOAA Office of Response and Restoration, Coastal Protection and Restoration Division, made a presentation on the newly initiated Portfields program which is a partnership product of NOAA, EPA and six other cooperating federal agencies. It is part of the Brownfields Federal Partnership Action Agenda that focuses on redevelopment of brownfields in port communities. Baker reported on the first three port cities selected as Portfields pilot studies, New Bedford, MA, Tampa, FL and Bellingham, WA.

**Action Item: Mary Baker will advise GLDT when the next round of Portfields candidates will be selected, and will further advise on application process in hopes of including a Great Lakes port in the program.**

### Windows

Doug Clarke of the USACE Research and Development Center at WES in Vicksburg, MS reported on the Environmental Windows project which has been focused most recently on the effects of dredging on walleye, pike and bass spawning. He described the science and technology being used to evaluate the impacts of dredging on fish habitat through plume characterization and turbidity monitoring. WES Hopes are to carry out more field work this year in Maumee Bay, and subsequent laboratory experiments if resources are available.

**Action Item: GLDT staff will pursue opportunities to ensure continued state involvement in the Windows Advisory Team.**

### Upland Testing and Evaluation Project

Victoria Pebbles and Jon Dettling presented the finished products of the Upland Testing and Evaluation Project, the 81-page document *Testing and Evaluating Dredged Material for Upland Beneficial Uses: A Regional Framework for the Great Lakes*, and a companion Annotated Bibliography. The Framework Provides a step-by-step guide to identifying upland beneficial use opportunities; evaluating and testing for physical and chemical suitability, using a risk-based approach; and ensuring safe and effective implementation. The document includes a flow chart depicting the overall decisionmaking process to make a determination for upland beneficial uses as well as detailed flowcharts for the phases involving physical testing and chemical testing. An appendix offers eight case scenarios of different upland beneficial use applications and includes detailed references to the potential suite of state and federal regulations and contaminant criteria that might apply. The document represents a major step forward for a regional approach to beneficial use in the Great Lakes in that it is based on existing state policies and practices and supports a risk-based approach. The annotated bibliography contains over 240 references organized by topic and by number, with each number having a detailed annotation. All references cited in the Framework are cross-referenced in the annotated bibliography. The documents were distributed to GLDT members and are available online via the GLDT web site.

There was inquiry regarding next steps. Staff indicated that additional funding would be needed to undertake anything beyond document distribution. GLDT members expressed interest in workshops to conduct outreach and explore application of the document in particular settings.

**Action item: Corps Districts (Detroit, Chicago, Buffalo) will identify DMMP or other efforts that could benefit from directed outreach and application of the Framework.**

### Elections

**Action Item: Jan Miller will hold an email balloting for the federal co-chair before the end of April.**

#### GLDT Priorities

J. Miller reviewed the team's priorities over the past two years. Team members noted the following continued and potential new priorities:

- ongoing advocacy for Corps budget shortfalls (state caucus)
- analysis of the Corps budget to see how the region can better compete for funds
- explore increase in regional sediment management to match supply and demand, such as through CDF mining, beach nourishment, and creative application of technologies

#### State Caucus

The state caucus agreed on the following priorities for the GLDT:

- Continue beneficial use advocacy and provide technical support on beneficial use
- Advocate to Congress and to Corps Headquarters and Divisions on the discrepancy of O&M funding in the GL region
- Develop criteria to assist Corps in prioritizing dredging projects
- Examine current decisionmaking criteria
- Evaluate what should be considered in a cost-benefit analysisDevelop a case study on open water disposal practices

Items 1 and 2 have an advocacy component and must be pursued by the state caucus only. The others are items that can be pursued by the full dredging team.

**State Caucus Action Item: GLC staff, as the legislative liaison for the GLDT state caucus, will draft letters to Members of Congress on:**

- 1. Expanded authority under Section 204 WRDA 99 to allow the Corps to engage in a variety of beneficial uses of dredged material.**
- 2. Great Lakes funding for O&M under WRDA; with copies to Corps leadership at the Division level and at Headquarters**

**Action Item: Steve West will initiate and complete elections (via email) for new state co-chair prior to next GLDT conference call–July 2004.**