

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey Responses on Remedial Action Plan Activities In the U.S. Areas of Concern

Survey Responses Received from

Indiana

Grand Calumet River

Michigan

Detroit River

River Raisin

Saginaw River and Bay

St. Clair River

St. Marys River

White Lake

Michigan/Wisconsin

Menominee River

Minnesota/Wisconsin

Lower Green Bay- Fox River

St. Louis River and Bay

New York

Buffalo River

Eighteenmile Creek

Niagara River

St Lawrence River at Massena

Ohio

Ashtabula River

Black River

Maumee River

Wisconsin

Sheboygan River

- 1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.
- 2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?
- 3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?
- 4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?
- 5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?
- 6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Grand Calumet River AOC

Area of Concern: Grand Calumet River / Indiana Harbor Ship Canal

Submitted By: Danielle Barnett, IN Dept. of Environmental Management LaMP/RAP Coordinator

1) **Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.**

Our citizen's advisory group, Citizens for the Remediation of the Environment (CARE) currently meets once a month to discuss activities within the AOC. Now that delisting targets are in place, we are striving to develop a management plan by which we can showcase progress within the AOC. By dividing the AOC into related habitat segments, we will be able to match beneficial use impairments (BUIs) to habitat areas and determine actions that need to be taken to delist BUIs.

2) **What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?**

As mentioned above, CARE has been working on a segmentation approach to our AOC. The segmentation strategy includes dividing the AOC into different "reaches" based on habitat type. This approach allows us to better view problems affecting individual segments and how best to approach each segment. The segmentation approach is still being worked on, but has a lot of potential for simplifying our approaches to delisting. Because our AOC is rather diverse as well as listed for all fourteen BUIs it was necessary to come up with a method to characterize and approach problem areas. Identifying reaches and which BUIs affect each individual reach is our first step. The next step will be to characterize current projects that are occurring in each reach that will move us closer to our delisting goals. The end result will be a "gap analysis" of areas and/or BUIs that currently do not have projects positively affecting them and what projects can be undertaken to fill in those gaps.

3) **What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?**

One of the key obstacles we face revolves around monitoring. We are working to determine whether current monitoring efforts will be enough to determine delisting status for BUIs. A second key obstacle is determining projects that will move us closer to delisting and how to rate the efficiency of a project. Funding is of course also always a key obstacle.

4) **What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?**

The successes fall into two major categories. The first includes activities that are a result of regulatory action such as the aforementioned US Steel five-mile dredging as well as an NRDA settlement with 8 major companies that impact the Grand Calumet River directly. Over the years there have been several other regulatory driven activities resulting in environmental enhancements. The other major category includes the work being done by concerned organizations such as The Nature Conservancy, the Shirley Heinze Land Trust, and the Save the

Dunes Council. These organizations have worked closely with state and federal agencies in the acquisition and restoration of key habitat properties. Additionally, the Army Corps of Engineers, consistent with their federal mandate, will be moving forward on the dredging of polluted sediments from the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

Funding and/or a framework for monitoring as well as funding for remediation projects.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

On October 21st, 2008 there was a press release given about Legacy Act funding that was awarded to dredge and cap a one mile stretch of the Grand Calumet River in an effort to clean up legacy contamination. While dredging has not yet begun, we feel this is an important step towards progress in the Area of Concern.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Detroit River AOC

Area of Concern: Detroit River

Submitted By: Charlie Bristol

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

PAC has received a small grant to document the BUI #7 Taste and Odor for Drinking Water. This will lead to delisting the BUI. In addition, information is being collected on the Coliform TMDL which may supersede the BUI for Beach Closings.

The PAC has established several Habitat projects (Five) that are the top priority for implementation to begin the delisting for Fish and Wildlife BUIs

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

The PAC is working with members to identify environmental projects that may be implemented within the AOC.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

The Detroit River PAC is still 100% volunteer and the time required to keep this vital topic moving forward is a full time job. Funding MUST be made available to the local PAC fiduciaries to hire the required staff.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

We have very committed volunteers.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

Funding for a full time RAP/PAC coordinator - The Detroit River AOC has not been able to complete the Stage II report due to lack of staff.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

The volunteer approach to the BUI delisting process and the coordination of such a large AOC is not realistic. The Detroit River AOC will always be the "step child" of the area as long as there is no paid staff to work on the delisting process.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: River Raisin AOC

Area of Concern: River Raisin AOC

Submitted By: Dan Sefanski

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Developed major projects and guidelines to delist & restore use impairment working with MDEQ & USEPA on the final study that may lead to removal of contaminated sediments to acceptable levels.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

Continue meeting with MDEQ, EPA, & stakeholders to address the delisting targets, programs are continuing to bring public attention to the raisin – we are even now on Face Book and Twitter

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

Funding is the #1 issue – the Raisin is a small AOC that can be quickly delisted if there is adequate funding. We know our targets for delisting - we are doing our outreach – we need dollars for sediment removal

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

Major PCB Clean-up 1997 – contamination still above acceptable – good community outreach with the Commission on the Environment (City of Monroe)

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

Funding for our 4 identified Targets – funding for PCB removal

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

If the Raisin is not remediated with this inflow of federal dollars – we have missed the boat, and we may never get adequate funding in the future. 22 years in a long time to fight for an AOC clean-up and now with proper funding the Raisin can be an AOC delisting success story.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Saginaw Bay and River AOC

Area of Concern: Saginaw Bay/River AOC

Submitted By: Warren Smith

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Late last year we delisted 2 of our BUIs; Fish Tainting and Drinking Water. We are continuing work this year on delisting BUIs associated with Fish and Wild Life Habitat and Degradation of Fish and Wildlife Populations.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

We have an educational speaker series associated with shore muck and issues associated with beach closings. We have been using advanced telecommunications to bring speakers into our meetings from other states and countries utilizing this technology. There is also continuation of Bald Eagle monitoring and DO level monitoring in the Saginaw River and Bay.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

We find some of the conditions in the AOC are changing due to ecological changes that were not present when we started. This requires us to correlate data from before this change and today. It also causes us to rethink our priorities in what BUIs we may be able to delist in the near future. We are checking with other AOCs in Michigan and other states such as Wisconsin to see how they are handling it and what ideas they are trying.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

I believe our successes have been to accept the State parameters for delisting of BUIs and spend time to prioritize the order of BUIs. We made a decision to address the lowest hanging fruit first moving in order to the most difficult. It has helped us to delist 2 BUIs to date and place us within striking distance of a couple more.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

We are looking forward to the grants that may come from the GLRI to help accelerate programs we already have in progress and add to them with other stakeholder involvement. We continue to see the value of a committed DEQ employee dedicated to the needs of our AOC. It is what keeps us focused and coordinated with other stakeholders and agencies

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

We have found a key to our success is to have an outside consulting firm such as Public Sector Consultants helping us formulate our grants, secure the required data that addresses our progress, and use this to form the basis for delisting requests

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: St. Clair River AOC

Area of Concern: St. Clair River

Submitted By: Janice Littlefield

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

WE HAD A FUNDING COMMITTEE MEETING AS A RESULT OF THE SPAC WORKSHOP AND IDENTIFIED SEVERAL PROJECTS THAT HAD BEEN SUBMITTED UNDER THE NOAA ARRA ACT; WE PLAN TO SUBMIT THEM AGAIN. THEY ARE THE DESMOND LANDING SHORELINE RESTORATION (.8 MILES OF THE ST. CLAIR RIVER), 2 SITES FROM THE CITY OF PORT HURON ON THE ST. CLAIR RIVER (HABITAT AND SHORELINE RESTORATION) AND A RESTORATION PROJECT FROM THE CITY OF MARYSVILLE THAT INCLUDES 2500 FEET OF THE ST. CLAIR RIVER AND 2500 FEET OF CUTTLE CREEK. WE FEEL THAT THESE PROJECTS, IF FUNDED, WILL PUT A GOOD DENT IN THE LOSS OF FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT BUI.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

I AM IN TOUCH WITH CHRISTINE ALLIEO FROM THE DEQ ABOUT FORMING A TECH COMMITTEE TO REMOVE THE RESTRICTIONS ON DREDGING BUI. ALSO, WE ARE READY TO DO A PRESS RELEASE JOINTLY WITH OUR CANADIAN COLLEAGUES ON THE REMOVAL OF THE TAINING OF FISH AND WILDLIFE BUI.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

THE BIGGEST OBSTACLE FOR US REMAINS FUNDING FOR SOMEONE TO GET THE WAGONS IN A CIRCLE. I RECENTLY GOT \$2K FROM THE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION FOR GRANTWRITING FOR THE BPAC, WHICH WILL AT LEAST GET SOME ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS STARTED. I AM LOOKING FORWARD TO THE CONFERENCE IN MILWAUKEE AND THE BREAK OUT SESSIONS. SHARING INFO WITH THE OTHER AOC'S IS ALWAYS BENEFICIAL.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

WE JUST LAUNCHED A RAIN BARREL PROJECT THAT WILL ACCOMPLISH TWO THINGS: 1) STORMWATER EDUCATION AND WATER CONSERVATION WITH THE PUBLIC AT LARGE. 2) PUBLIC OUTREACH REGARDING THE RAP ~ TWO BROCHURES WILL BE HANDED OUT WITH THE RAIN BARRELS. ONE THAT EXPLAINS THE INSTALLATION OF THEIR RAIN BARREL WITH GENERIC

STORMWATER FACTS, AND A SECOND BROCHURE THAT EXPLAINS THE NATURE OF THE AOC PROGRAM AND THE MYSTERIES OF THE RAP, WHICH MOST OF THE PUBLIC HAS NEVER HEARD OF.

THIS PROGRAM IS BEING DEVELOPED WITH COCA COLA ENTERPRISES NORTH AMERICA HEADQUARTERS IN ATLANTA GA.. I HAVE BEEN DISCUSSING THE PREMISE THAT WE COULD HOOK UP NONPROFITS IN EACH AOC (THROUGHOUT THE GREAT LAKES BASIN) WITH THEIR LOCAL BOTTLER (COKE HAPPENS TO HAVE BOTTLERS IN EVERY MAJOR CITY) WHO WOULD DONATE THE 55 GALLON FOOD GRADE BARRELS. THE NONPROFIT RE-CREATES WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE IN THE ST. CLAIR RIVER WITH THE 2 BROCHURES, AND THIS ALSO GIVES THE NONPROFIT AN INCOME STREAM. IF THE BARRELS ARE SOLD FOR \$50, THE NONPROFIT NETS ABOUT \$38 PER BARREL ~ BETTER THAN MOST FUNDRAISING ACTIVITIES... IT'S A GREAT WIN-WIN SITUATION FOR PUBLIC OUTREACH FOR THE RAP AND IT ALSO GETS THE NONPROFITS NAME OUT IN THE COMMUNITY AS WELL.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

FUNDING FOR A COORDINATOR. SORRY TO DRAG THAT OLD HORSE OUT ONCE AGAIN!

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

IT'S NICE TO FEEL THE POSITIVE MOMENTUM WITH THE GLRI MONEY.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: St. Marys River AOC

Area of Concern: St. Marys River

Submitted By: Gregory Zimmerman, BPAC Chair

1) **Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.**

We continue to meet regularly as a binational PAC to review progress by agencies toward delisting. For example, the meeting next week will include updates from Env Canada on sediment contamination sampling from last year and a review of this year's sampling. We continue to monitor progress of the agencies' sampling of bacterial contamination.

Will begin in October working under PAC support grant to establish network of water quality reporting for stakeholders.

We work closely with partners to seek funding for specific projects that could lead to delisting.

2) **What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?**

We continue to provide outreach to stakeholders to keep them informed on issues related to St. Marys River water quality and to encourage them to get involved with BPAC. Such activities include our annual Environmental Summits.

3) **What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?**

Over the years, we've been frustrated by the lack of funding for specific projects on the Canadian side and an ambivalence on the part of some agencies regarding BPAC's continued role in helping guide the restoration. That's improved with the hiring of a RAP coordinator for the Canadian (and replacing the one that resigned recently) and more activity in terms of contaminated sediment sampling, but it took a long time to get to this point. Also OPAC has gotten active again in terms of developing tools for local PACs to use for communications.

4) **What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?**

Key successes have included writing the delisting criteria for the US side, participating in the oversight of agencies such as Sugar Island Monitoring Work Group, and just being part of the team on projects such as tannery bay cleanup. Through Gt. Lakes Commission, we submitted a grant application for a major project which did not get funded but did help build our collaboration with local stakeholders. We are working with DEQ and Gt. Lakes Commission to wrap our priority projects into the larger funding applications for Gt. Lakes funding.

As always, it's the continued funding from EPA through DEQ through Gt. Lakes Commission and the continuing commitment just to keep the program alive on the part of staffers at DEQ and Gt. Lakes Commission. The PAC support grants have been crucial to keeping BPAC alive. Also the continued commitment of the old timers in BPAC as well as an ability to attract a few new members as we've gone along.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

As mentioned above, continued support (financial and just plain hard work) for US efforts through Gt. Lakes Commission and DEQ. If SPAC could be as empowered, that would make a difference on the Canadian side, but we recognize that the funding streams operate much differently on the Canadian side.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

Thanks again to DEQ and Gt. Lakes Commission staff for going above and beyond.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: St. Marys River AOC

Area of Concern: St. Marys River

Submitted By: Mike Ripley

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Most activities taking place in the St. Marys River that are related to the RAP or delisting of beneficial use impairments are still investigatory or in the planning stages with the exception of the City of Sault Ste. Marie, MI project to separate storm sewers from sanitary sewers. This is a long-range project that began in the 1990's and is anticipated to be completed by 2020. The project will lead to fewer sewage bypasses and overflows due to rain events. Canadian efforts to address contaminated sediments on the Canadian side of the river (one of the most serious impairments to the river) are still in the investigatory stage. U.S. efforts to address habitat BUs are in the planning stage and several projects including the Little Rapids restoration project and projects to improve water quality from urban tributaries, are ready for implementation but require funding.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

The St. Marys River Binational Public Advisory Council (BPAC) is working with Lake Superior State University (LSSU) on several projects to boost awareness of RAP goals in our community. LSSU receives funding from USEPA and Michigan DEQ to facilitate BPAC meetings and work on public education. LSSU's BPAC office is working on improvements to BPAC's website and planning for the annual Environmental Summit that showcases effort!! at improving environmental quality in the St. Marys River community. BPAC is also working on improving its communication strategy and hopes to widen its membership.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

Environment Canada and the Ontario Ministry of Environment have the lead on implementing the RAP recommendations in the St. Marys River.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

We have had remarkable improvements to point source pollution in the St. Marys River since inception in 1988. These improvements came about mainly because of stricter national and local regulations. One of the most recent successes has been a major upgrade to the East End Sewage Treatment Plan in Sault Ste. Marie, ON which will result in much higher quality discharges to the river and fewer overflows of untreated sewage. The cleanup of chromium contaminated sediments at a former leather tannery on the U.S. side of the river using Legacy Act funding was also a major success for the RAP. In both cases, BPAC took a leadership role in encouraging and

supporting these developments. BPAC has taken a lead in the community to push for these improvements including by writing letters to politicians and agencies, circulating petitions in the community, arranging educational events, issuing press releases and maintaining our participation in SPAC and OPAC.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

One of the most important things BPAC is pushing for right now is for Environment Canada and the OMOE to replace our RAP Coordinator who recently resigned. BPAC feels that it is critical to have a coordinator who will reside within the community and follow through on the action items required to delist our AOC.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

The St. Marys River BPAC is encouraging Environment Canada and the Ontario MOE to replace the RAP Coordinator with a long-term position, based in the St. Marys River watershed, who will work with the BPAC to address the remaining actions needed to delist our AOC including addressing remaining contaminated sediments and local watershed issues.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: White Lake AOC

Area of Concern: White Lake
Submitted By: Tanya Cabala

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Established restoration criteria for delisting BUIs, monitoring of fish and wildlife contamination levels (all accepted by MDEQ with the exception of our drinking water criteria), numerous habitat restoration projects, many public education programs. Research/writing of grant applications for implementation of needed restoration work/projects to remove BUIs. Developing a strategy to prioritize work for the next 3 to 5 years in order to begin delisting individual BUIs.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

Monitoring the status of cleanups at sites of contamination in the AOC. Working to institutionalize stewardship in the AOC.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

We have overcome many obstacles during the 16 years we have been working to restore the White Lake Area of Concern. Remaining challenges include getting local government officials interested and involved in education programs and restoration work and obtaining funding for restoration projects.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

We have had many successes. Major achievements include: two sediment cleanups, many cleanups underway at sites of contamination, numerous local habitat restoration projects, both public and private, a major native landscape initiative on the campus of one of the area's largest employers, Alcoa Howmet, a solid community framework for educational/stewardship programming, high/sustained public interest in restoration of the AOC, and a high level of trust by the public of the PAC and its efforts.

The primary reason for these successes is due to the effort made by the PAC to inform and involve the public and also the role that the PAC has taken on – as **THE** main entity responsible for ensuring the restoration of the AOC. We have been very fortunate to have the exceptional services and resources of the Muskegon Conservation District, which provides administrative and technical support to the PAC.

Our successes could easily be replicated in other AOCs. What is needed is a true commitment to involving the public and facilitating their involvement in every element of restoration work done in the AOC, from planning to completion. Also critical is making a key decision that it is the job of the community to take care of its lake or river –not state or federal environmental agencies – and that the PAC will do what is needed to solicit/obtain the funds and involve the appropriate agencies and responsible parties in order to accomplish this.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

More funds for education, restoration projects, PAC support and public involvement. Increased access to technical staff/resources within MDEQ.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

The Michigan Statewide Public Advisory Council on Areas of Concern has been a **huge** factor in our success in White Lake. Without this group, I am not sure we would have accomplished much at all. It has been invaluable for networking, providing resources, and mostly, for supporting the needs and interests of local PACs.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Menominee River AOC

Area of Concern: Lower Menominee River

Submitted By: Steve Zandek – Co-Chair RAP CAC

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Drafted and reviews Docs for the delisting of beach closings BUI

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

This RAP CAC just reformed. We are getting updates and are going through BUIs to prioritize which ones we can work on and what needs to be done.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

We have two remaining contaminate sites. Both have identified responsible parties and are under federal enforcement actions.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

Of our three contaminate sites, one has been cleaned up. We are currently working to remove (delist) one BUI (beach closings).

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

More funding to agency personnel to complete research and data gaps needed to delist other BUIs

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Lower Green Bay-Fox River AOC

Area of Concern: Lower Green Bay and Fox River

Submitted By: John Kennedy, Green Bay Metropolitan Sewerage District and WDNR

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Fox River PCB Contaminated Sediment Remediation: The last phase (Phase 2) began in May of 2009. The project includes the remediation of all sediment with PCB concentrations greater than or equal to 1.0 ppm, in the area from the mouth of the Fox River (and a short distance into Green Bay) to just upstream of the Little Rapids Dam (approximately a 13 mile stretch of the River).

The specific remedial action varies by area and characteristics, and includes a combination of dredging, dredging and capping, and sand covering. The project schedule includes 7 years of dredging (from 2009 through 2015) and 9 years of capping and sand covering (from 2009 through 2017). The estimated area of each remedy is as follows: (These areas may/will change somewhat as additional data is collected and experienced gained as the remediation progresses)

- 526 acres of dredging
- 414 acres of capping (including dredge and cap)
- 210 acres of sand cover

Projected dredge volume is about 3.3 million cubic yards (cyds) of sediment, which will be hydraulically dredged dewatered and disposed in a landfill. The annual dredge volume will be approximately 500,000 cyds. As of the week ending September 5, 2009 approximately 326,000 cyds has been dredged.

Several smaller PCB remedial dredging actions have occurred over the last 10 years on the Fox River, which have removed approximately 590,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediments including:

- Demonstration Projects N in Kimberly (1999)
- Demonstration Project 56/57 (1999 – 2000) adjacent to Georgia Pacific
- Little lake Butte des Morts (2004 – 2009)
- Phase I (US Mills in De Pere - 2007) - contained the highest PCB concentration in the river.

Due to various factors, including lower PCB concentrations and mass, the remedy for the Bay of Green Bay and the section of the Fox River between Little Lake Butte des Morts and the Little Rapids dam, is Monitored Natural Recovery which relies on natural attenuation mechanisms including dilution, sedimentation, degradation (although not considered a significant mechanism) to reduce the concentration and associated exposure and risk to PCB.

Lower Fox Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL): Seven beneficial use impairments are at least partially caused by excessive nutrient and sediment loads in the Lower Fox Watershed. A TMDL is being developed for total suspended solids and total phosphorus should be completed in spring of 2010 for all impaired waterbodies in the Lower Fox Watershed (including waters upstream of the AOC boundary). Multi-stakeholder Technical and Outreach teams are active participants as the TMDL is developed.

Fish and Wildlife Projects:

- Cat Island Chain Restoration Project (RAP Biota & Habitat Committee). Brown County, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, UW Sea Grant, and WDNR plan to rebuild the Cat Island chain of barrier islands that were destroyed by high water and storms in the 1970s. These once protected a large expanse of shallow bay waters and wetlands from destructive wave action; protecting important fish habitat and providing needed habitat for shorebirds, waterfowl, colonial nesting birds, amphibians and reptiles. The Corps proposes to construct the project as part of a dredged material management plan for the Green Bay Harbor and lower Fox River. Funding is being sought for the Brown County match to the Corps' proposed federal funding.
- Northern Pike Spawning Area improvements (Brown County Land and Water Conservation District). This ongoing habitat restoration and enhancement project also benefits other wetland dependant wildlife. In 2008 accomplishments included installation of 14 acres of spawning marsh, 5.8 acres of vegetated riparian buffers, replacement of perched culverts, and outreach presentations to local conservation and government groups.
- Restoration of flow within a channel of the Suamico River was completed in spring 2009. This area is now available and enhanced for spawning and nursery use by fish populations in the Bay.
- Great Lakes Spotted Muskey Management (WDNR). The re-introduction of a Great Lakes strain of muskellunge to Green Bay was initiated in 1989 and is ongoing. Muskellunge were extirpated from Green Bay in the 1930's. Muskellunge are an important native predator and are pursued by anglers as a trophy fish. Current management includes; increasing the genetic diversity of the population through stocking, assessing levels of natural recruitment and spawning habitats, restrictive length and bag limits to protect adult fish.
- Forster's Tern nesting platforms (WDNR). Funding has been received to create Forster's Tern nesting platforms at multiple locations along the West Shore of Green Bay. At least one of these will be within the AOC. These platforms will be placed prior to the nesting season in 2010 and will include visual and auditory attractants for terns.
- WDNR has requested funds to conduct contaminant monitoring on waterfowl, marshbirds, and wetland-dependent mammals using the AOC.
- An invasive plant inventory and control project is ongoing on the West Shore of Green Bay. Mapping and control efforts will take place within the AOC as well as elsewhere on the Bay. Giant reed and buckthorn are the main targets, but Japanese knotweed has been found and treated within the AOC.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

- NRDA projects (administered by a separate council)
- UW Sea Grant Institute developed a State of the Bay website
- Continued work on environmental stressors assessment at UW-GB

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

- For the TMDL we are having problems coordinating with State efforts to establish nutrient standards
- Over the long term it has been difficult to maintain community engagement

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

- Initiation of the sediment remediation project required years of effort and communication between agencies, paper mills, and stakeholders
- Focus of EPA attention on Lower Fox TMDL. Previous efforts were recognized by EPA for future funding

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

- Public involvement and participation

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

- The PCB cleanup and TMDL have lives of their own. Linkage to original RAP is barely visible. Should the IJC/State have program to maintain original RAP process?

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: St. Louis River AOC

Area of Concern: St. Louis River

Submitted By: Julene Boe, St. Louis River Alliance

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Completion of the Sturgeon Spawning Habitat Project. This project, which improves spawning habitat for sturgeon will help address the loss of fish habitat and degradation of fish population BUIs. This project was a partnership with the MN DNR, the Nature Conservancy and the SLRA, with funding provided by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Wildlife Foundation.

Substantial completion of the remediation work at the Interlake/Duluth Tar Superfund site. In 2010, work will continue with the habitat restoration efforts. The MPCA is in charge of this effort.

Contaminated sediment assessment has been conducted on the MN side of the St Louis River. This effort is begun through efforts of the MPCA and the USACOE.

In 2009, the SLRA expanded our volunteer stream monitoring program from 12 sites to 15. This project, which has 20 volunteers, is funded by the MPCA.

The SLRA's annual river clean up project focused on Merritt Creek, a designated trout stream that is a tributary to the St Louis River. Over 40 volunteers filled a 20 yard dumpster as well as removed a pickup load of hazardous waste that we removed from this stream less than a half a mile from the St Louis River.

The SLRA Habitat Work Group, working with the MPCA, developed a number of project proposals for the 2010 Great Lakes Restoration Initiative funding from the Lower St Louis River Habitat Plan projects.

In partnership with the MN DNR, the SLRA also submitted funding proposals for habitat restoration projects to the MN Lessard Outdoor Heritage Fund and the NOAA stimulus grant. While we were not successful in either submission, we still have a viable project that is ready for implementation.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

We had a number of efforts and activities that we believe helped bring a greater awareness of the river and making a stronger connection to the public.

In 2009, we conducted an informal survey of the public's knowledge of the St. Louis River, including asking their knowledge of the AOC designation. This informal survey was also an opportunity to educate those who filled it out about the river as an AOC and its vital relationship to Lake Superior.

In May 2009, we presented over 500 copies of the book "Trout Are Made of Trees" to area school children. This book was written to give the very young readers a connection between trees in the life span of a trout.

In June 2009, we co-sponsored, along with the City of Duluth, the Spirit Valley Citizens Economic Development Association, an event called the St Louis River Corridor Summit. This event, which was attended by 50 people, provided an opportunity to generate ideas of how the businesses and neighborhood along the river could be better connected and to better leverage limited resources. From this summit, a number of groups have been meeting to discuss action steps.

The St. Louis River Alliance sponsored a tour of the river and invited area community, business and political leaders to show them what has been done and what needs to be done. Agencies personnel provide narrative to the various projects. The WDNR and MPCA helped produce a brochure that was handed out to the participants.

We are beginning the planning process for a program in 2010 to introduce lifelong recreation opportunities to youth and families.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

Connecting with our local Chamber of Commerce staff has been a challenge. I know Chambers in other communities are very active and supportive of Great Lakes clean up. Any suggestions on how to bring them on board would be welcomed.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

Creating partnership with business and community leaders has been very rewarding (except the chamber) .The river tour was a very successful event in that we were able to get a number of key community, business and political leaders to participate and they were able to see first what has been done and what needs to be done. In addition, there was a tremendous amount of networking that occurred on the boat. We see tremendous value to doing this type of activity in the future.

The St Louis River Summit has also been a very positive effort, which is still a work in progress.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

More funding!

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

The message of economic benefits is a great attention getter especially now. Now if we can also tie health care concerns with healthier lakes and rivers, we may be even more successful.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Buffalo River AOC

Area of Concern: Buffalo River

Submitted By: Jill Jedlicka; RAP Coordinator, Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

- Ongoing Great Lakes Legacy Act project - The draft feasibility study for the Buffalo River was completed in May 2009. The Project Coordination Team is currently conducting an internal review of Remedial Alternative 6 and is 90% to consensus on the preferred alternative. It is anticipated that the Remedial Alternative will become public by the end of November 2009. Limited sediment remediation could occur in 2010 followed by major volume removal beginning in 2011.
- Habitat Restoration – Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper has coordinated numerous collaborative efforts towards habitat restoration in the AOC. Riverkeeper anticipates seeking diverse sources of funding and in-kind to begin habitat restoration in parallel with sediment remediation.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

- Riverkeeper has over 100 Riverwatch “captains,” 27 of which solely work in the Buffalo River watershed, who are trained to be our volunteer eyes. They monitor water quality and shoreline conditions year round.
- Riverkeeper’s newly launched program, “Rivercare,” has successfully distributed nearly 1000 rainbarrels to members of the western New York community and has installed a rain garden in the City of Buffalo.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

- Obtaining matching funds and coordinating funding streams has been an obstacle to best utilizing the funding that is available for the AOCs. Coordinating key stakeholders on various projects.
- Navigating the individual bureaucracies within the agency and corporate partners in order to continue making forward progress- at regulatory, programmatic, and interpersonal level.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

- Riverkeeper was the first non-profit to serve as the non-federal sponsor for both a Great Lakes Legacy Act Project and a 312 Study through the USACE. Riverkeeper was also the first non-profit to be selected as a RAP Coordinator.
- All of our success has occurred in part due to the commitment and professionalism of our varied partners- government, non-government and corporate.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

- It would be helpful if agencies shared their expectation as to “moving the needle” towards delisting. The percentage improvement towards BUI delisting is very subjective at this point. A state or regional standard/guidance of metrics to compare against would be helpful to ensure more funding and BUI delisting.
- Continued dialogue and coordination between USACE Headquarters and USEPA Headquarters to streamline parallel and complementary programs.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

Small, successful project management experience can go a long way in building credibility, respect, and momentum in order to make serious progress towards the “big lift” of delisting.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Eighteenmile Creek AOC

Area of Concern: Eighteenmile Creek

Submitted By: Victor DiGiacomo, Remedial Action Plan Coordinator

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

- a. Legacy Act Sediment Investigation project, currently assessing 11 miles of stream. Specific objectives of the investigation are to: collect and analyze sediment samples within Eighteenmile Creek for pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and metals; further evaluate the nature and extent of contamination at suspected sources by collecting and analyzing surface water, groundwater, and soil samples; and assist in the control of confirmed sources of contamination within the watershed.
- b. Legacy Act contract signed to complete Feasibility Study and corresponding design work for the 11 mile project area.
- c. Contract signed with USACE Buffalo District to complete a Trace Trophic Food Web Model and collection of corresponding ground-truth data.
- d. New York State's Department of Environmental Conservation is making progress at the Eighteenmile Creek Corridor Site in Lockport, NY. The Eighteenmile Creek Corridor Site has been identified as the most prevalent and potential source of contamination to the impact AOC. The site was recently listed as a Class II Hazardous Waste Site. NYSDEC has been conducting various site investigations within the corridor, sediment sampling, surface soil and waste sampling, micro-well installations, groundwater investigations and a fish & wildlife impact analysis. A supplemental Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study were completed in 2009. A Record of Decision (ROD) for the site is expected to be released in late 2009.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

- a. We have a fairly exhaustive public outreach campaign up and running. Some highlights include: Annual AOC Clean Sweep; AOC Environmental Field Days for 4-5th grade students; Annual Report Card and; AOC website.
- b. We have been investigating nutrient and sediment loads from the watershed since 2005. In 2009, we were awarded funds to complete a Stress Stream Analysis for Eighteenmile Creek. In relation to sediment and nutrient loading to Lake Ontario, NCSWCD will complete a stress stream analysis that will determine the environmental health of the watershed by investigating at the sub-watershed and constituent stream level. The project will identify the sources, extent, effects and severity of nutrient and sediment loading from Eighteenmile Creek to Lake Ontario.
- c. A Soil Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) is also utilized in our planning process. An updated GIS watershed landuse layer for the SWAT was completed in early 2009.

d. Storm sewer outfall mapping and Storm water discharge monitoring and illicit discharge track down work began in 2009.

e. In 2009, we were awarded funds to protect water quality in the watershed. Best Management Practices to be installed on three farms that are negatively impacting water quality include: milk center wastewater treatment, silage leachate management system, barnyard runoff management system, roof water management system, and a composting system. This assistance is awarded through the NYS Agricultural Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control Program (ANSCAP).

f. In 2009, we were awarded with funds to promote watershed awareness and water quality issues. Eighteen (18) roadside signs identifying the Eighteenmile Creek watershed were erected within Niagara County. Three (3) larger signs at public gathering places were also installed which included a: map of the creek and its entire watershed with a "You are Here" point of reference; brief explanation of where the water comes from and where it goes; educational message(s) with suggestions for ways to help protect and restore waterways and water quality. Two hundred (200) storm-water markers were placed on storm drain catch basins in the Town of Newfane that discharge directly to Eighteenmile Creek.

g. Assisted the Town of Newfane/Olcott Harbor with the design of an Invasive Species Boat Wash Pad.

h. Completing a full Stage 2 RAP for Eighteenmile Creek.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

a. Given that Eighteenmile Creek is an orphaned AOC (no parties responsible for existing contamination), securing in-kind dollars for on-going projects is always key obstacle to progressing the RAP.

b. A large portion of Eighteenmile Creek is inaccessible, making in-stream sediment and habitat remediation very complicated.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

a. A number of successful habitat restoration projects have already been completed within the AOC. These successes can be replicated by forming and sustaining partnerships with key stakeholders at the federal, state and local level at the same time. Partnerships have increased the potential to fund these habitat projects, as well as provide for a comprehensive array of technical assistance from agency experts.

b. Partnerships between federal agencies and a non-profit government entity. For instance, project agreements have been signed with USEPA GLNPO (Legacy Act) and USACE Buffalo District (USACE 401 RAP Authority). A funded RAP Coordinator is a crucial component to developing these local relationships and corresponding partnerships.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

a. Continued support from NY State level programs, i.e.: Rotating Intensive Basin Study (RIBS), Stream Biomonitoring, Lake Assessment, and Toxicity Testing programs.

b. Continued support from USEPA GLNPO and Region 2 for local coordination of the Eighteenmile Creek RAP beyond 2011.

c. Reduce the local match required for Legacy Act Project Agreements.

d. Continue to support and fund on an annual basis the various USACE RAP Authorities. i.e.: The Great Lakes Remedial Action Plan Technical Assistance (GLRAPTA), Great Lakes Fisheries and Ecosystem Restoration (GLFER), and Great Lakes Tributary Modeling (GLTM)

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Niagara River AOC

Area of Concern: Niagara River

Submitted By: Mark Filipski, NYSDEC

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

Progress is continuing on combined sewer overflow (CSO) control. A Long Term Control Plan for the Niagara Falls Water Board's combined sewer system was approved by the Department last year. It verified that Niagara Falls was achieving the 85% wet weather capture rate required under USEPA's CSO Control Policy and that the CSOs were not causing water quality standard violations. The Niagara Falls Water Board is constructing six CSO control projects in 2009. As a result, two of eight CSOs in Niagara Falls will be eliminated.

The Buffalo Sewer Authority (BSA) is revising its Long Term Control Plan and conducting additional combined sewer system modeling and receiving stream monitoring in 2009. BSA will also complete construction of a project to eliminate one of its CSOs along Cazenovia Creek this year.

Under the terms of the Niagara Power Project relicensing, the New York Power Authority continues to implement eight habitat improvement projects in the Niagara River.

Work continues to complete the remediation of hazardous waste sites that may be sources of contaminants to the Niagara River.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

Efforts are under way to expand the membership of the Niagara River Remedial Advisory Committee, and to develop public outreach plans and materials.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

The lack of funding and limits on staff resources due to the current fiscal climate are the most significant obstacles at this time. There is also a need to build greater interest in the Niagara River Area of Concern among local officials.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

The upstream/downstream water quality monitoring program under the Niagara River Toxics Management Plan (NRTMP) has continued since before the publication of the Remedial Action Plan. This program, operated by Environment Canada under an agreement between that agency, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region II, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), involves the ongoing collection and analysis of water and suspended solids samples at the head (Fort Erie) and the mouth (Niagara-on-the-Lake) of the Niagara River. Its purpose is to measure concentrations of chemicals in the river in order to determine loads of contaminants and report on trends, specifically in relation to implemented control measures.

Reducing toxic chemical inputs to the Niagara River through hazardous waste site remediation has been a very successful control measure. The U.S. EPA and the NYSDEC originally identified 26 New York State sites as being responsible for over 99% of the pollutant load on the U.S. side of the basin. Remedial measures have been completed at 21 of the sites, with site plans including long-term operation and monitoring. The remaining sites are under active remediation or design phases. The U.S. EPA estimates that site remediation to date has reduced the potential pollutant inputs into the River by approximately 94 percent.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

Due to New York State's currently limited staff resources, technical assistance is needed to conduct data synthesis and reassess the beneficial use impairments.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: St. Lawrence River AOC

Area of Concern: St Lawrence River at Massena AOC

Submitted By: Stephen Litwhiler, RAP Coordinator

1) **Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.**

The 3 major industries – Alcoa aluminum production plant, Reynolds Metals aluminum projection plant and the Former GM foundry – have been cleaning up contamination for the past 2 decades, much of which has been completed, with a notable exception of the Grasse River sediments.

The New York Power Authority project has a number of habitat improvement projects which is addressing some of the beneficial uses.

The committee is collecting information and reports on the dozens of studies – past and ongoing – to determine if the resources have been restored.

2) **What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?**

Outreach and working on the international aspects of the AOC with Cornwall and the St Regis Mohawk Tribe.

3) **What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?**

With almost \$1 billion spent on cleanups in the Massena area, trying to get the public interested in and participating in the RAP process.

Organizing the available reports and data that are available about the AOC resources to determine what information is useful to which BUIs and where the data gaps are.

There is a Natural Resource Damage Claim under development and until there is a determination on that, progress on evaluating the restoration of uses is slow.

4) **What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?**

Using current technologies it is fairly easy to put together acceptable fact sheets about the AOC and what is going on, put that into a computer generated slide show, also easily updated to fit the audience.

5) **What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?**

Having a full time RAP coordinator who lives and works in the Massena AOC

6) **Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.**

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Ashtabula River AOC

Area of Concern: Ashtabula River

Submitted By:

1) Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.

a). The Ashtabula River Partnership completed dredging the vast majority of contaminated sediments from the Ashtabula River in 2008 at a total cost of \$72 million. Funding for the entire project was obtained from the Great Lakes Legacy Act (GLLA), WRDA, Ohio EPA and potentially responsible parties. Closure of the consolidation facility, a dedicated site for containment of the 630,000 yds.³ of contaminated sediments, is underway and scheduled for completion later this year. With the remediation of the river essentially complete our major efforts have turned to restoration activities.

b). In the middle of the 2 mile AOC is a 24 acre site on east bank, called the 5 ½ Slip. The slip itself was a historic river mouth before the tributary was redirected. The slip had been used in the past for decommissioning lake freighters. Although proposed habitat improvements through NRD will help some RAP impairments, the NRD remediation as proposed falls short of a complete restoration. A RAP endorsed restoration, which includes 1,700 feet of fish habitat shelves and a connecting channel with wetland complex creation to the stagnant slip area, may improve habitat conditions to such an extent that a complete AOC delisting for both fish habitat and degradation of benthos impairments may be possible. The State of Ohio applied for habitat funding through an earlier NOAA ARRA funding source, but the funds were not granted. The State of Ohio plans to apply for GLRI funding during the 4th Q.

A project to construct 1,700 feet of fish shelves, as noted above, is expected to be initiated in October 2009.

c). Immediately upstream of the upper boundary of this dredging operation is a short main stem segment containing sediments that may be contaminated, but were not found to be suitably degraded for removal under the GLLA funding. This segment is delineated as a federal shipping channel, but with no commercial shipping companies operating this far upstream, the Corps has not maintaining the channel. The RAP is seeking funds to assess sediment quality. If sediments in this stretch are found to be contaminated under current state listing guidelines for Ohio AOCs, the RAP will need to locate and secure the funds to have these sediments removed. The RAP has submitted a letter of need to the Corps to have this segment dredged.

d). The lower river and outer harbor have approximately 270,000 yds.³ of slightly contaminated sediments. Efforts are underway with the USACE, Ohio EPA and a property owner to utilize one of several existing lagoons to contain these sediments, when dredged. As noted above, these sediments did not qualify for GLLA funding. At this writing the RAP, Ohio EPA and USACE concur that these sediments will not likely qualify for open lake disposal.

2) What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?

- a). RAP members worked with other watershed stakeholders to secure a state Scenic River designation for the upper Ashtabula River watershed. The protection offered by this designation will serve to help protect the AOC when it is delisted.
- b). RAP members are concerned about the sediments behind the Hadlock Ford at river mile 10.0. We hope to identify the impacts of the ford and sediments behind it. The ford serves as a barrier to sea lamprey, steelhead, native fish and a dam failure would release sediments blocked by the ford from downward migration. It is not known if the sediments are contaminated and if their release would impact the restoration efforts in the Ashtabula AOC.
- c). RAP members are working on a local workgroup looking into the degradation of aesthetics and the potential for river sediment contamination from a coal dock and transfer facility located on the riverbank, in the AOC and near the mouth.

3) What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?

The key obstacle is obtaining funding, as follows:

- a. Ongoing NRD legal issues, which have slowed obtaining a settlement.
- b. NOAA grant denied.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

- a. GLLA and WRDA dredging
- b. Scenic River designation

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

- a. If the comprehensive 5 ½ Slip restoration were to be funded by the GLRI, the RAP might be able to delist fish habitat, fish populations and possibly benthos impairments.
- b. If sediments in the upstream stretch of the main stem are found to be contaminated and therefore 'RAP impaired,' the AOC could not be delisted for dredging operations until this segment is dredged. Funding to assess sediment quality is needed and if the sediments are found to be 'RAP impaired,' additional funding will need to be located to have the sediment removed. The RAP has requested funding from the USACE for this project.
- c. Coal is transported by rail to Ashtabula Harbor, loaded on lake freighters, and shipped throughout the Great Lakes. A study of the coal dust is underway in order to determine, if the dust has the potential to re-contaminate river sediments. Funding for this study is being pursued.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

Please see our 2008 Annual Report, which is attached, for additional information.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Black River AOC

Area of Concern: Black River

Submitted By: Kenneth G. Pearce, Chair, Black River Remedial Action Plan

- 1) **Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.**
 - a. Developing request to place Restrictions on Dredging Activities impairment into In Recovery Phase. Sediments from Outer Harbor and 2.8 miles of federal navigation channel received approval from state for open-lake disposal.
 - b. Studying current condition of Eutrophication and Undesirable Algae in East Branch sub-watershed. If sufficient progress has been made, RAP will develop a request to delist this impairment in this sub-watershed.
 - c. Developing environmental master plan to restore and protect habitat in the Black River main stem.
 - d. Developed DVD outreach material to improve O&M for home sewage treatment systems. A copy of this video is being presented to each system owner at the time of system inspection by county health department staff.
 - e. Working with US EPA and Ohio EPA on remedial efforts for Ford Road landfill. This landfill is suspected as source of PCB contamination and fish consumption advisories.
 - f. Working to develop regional and more reasonable / attainable goals for delisting Wildlife Habitat.
 - g. Monitoring bacterial contamination in East Branch and Black River main stem. Ohio EPA now lists lower East Branch and Black River main stem as attaining recreational use. RAP wants to determine if improvement is real or only due to meteorological conditions. Bacteria data for upper East Branch is old and needs to be updated.
- 2) **What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?**
 - a. Relocated RAP Secretariat office to within the AOC. Gives a more local presence for the RAP.
 - b. Outreach
 - i. Developed new AOC web page.
 - ii. Developed and distributed sub-watershed specific brochures
 - iii. Updated 1990-era RAP video
 - c. Continue initiative to re-invigorate old RAP members and add new ones.
 - d. Continued the sub-watershed initiative to focus on remedial efforts at a more local level.
 - i. Now have a watershed coordinator working on upstream areas of the AOC.
 - ii. Local watershed groups formed for French Creek (largest tributary to Black River main stem) and the West Branch sub-watershed.
- 3) **What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?**
 - a. Funding
 - i. Local SWCD is on reduced work week due to lack of funding

- ii. Watershed Coordinator position could be lost due to lack of local county funding. Position is housed within the county government structure.
 - iii. Funding needed for support of local RAP secretariat office
 - iv. Funding needed by state to update data in AOC
- b. Develop complete buy-in and adoption by City of Lorain and other local river stakeholders of the lower Black River master plan.

4) What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?

- a. Remedial dredging of contaminated sediments in main stem led to In Recovery Phase listing for Fish Tumors impairment. Improvements took time to realize, dredging occurred in 1989-1990 and re-designation of the impairment occurred in 2004.
 - i. Finally, in 2009, river sediments may be improved to the extent that a re-designation of Dredging impairment may also be possible.
- b. Upgrades to small municipal WWTPs lead to water quality improvements that led to delisting benthos impairment in East Branch in 2005 and soon could led to delisting Eutrophication and Undesirable Algae impairment in same sub-watershed.
- c. Constructed Fish Habitat Shelf which is now being copied by other river systems in Great Lakes.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

- a. Retain funding for State of Ohio's RAP and Lake Erie programs
- b. Secure additional funding for Ohio to update conditions in AOC.

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Maumee River AOC

Area of Concern: Maumee River

Submitted By: Patrick Lawrence, President, Board of Directors, Partners for Clean Streams Inc.

1) **Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.**

Completion of a wetlands and habitat inventory for two watersheds (Ottawa River and Swan Creek); installation of a stream restoration project on Swan Creek to improve fish passage and aquatic habitat conditions; development of a wetland/pond restoration project for Camp Miakonda, Human Health and Environmental Risk Assessment for Duck and Otter Creeks as basis for preparation of a GLA application by local industries; updates and completion of AOC Stage II report/Watershed Restoration Plan; community outreach and education activities (Clean Your Streams, Watershed Patch program, Get the Lead Out); following progress with Ottawa River GLA project.

2) **What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?**

Ongoing fund raising and public education activities, assisting in the preparation of a regional project list for potential GLRI funding opportunities in conjunction with regional partners and OEPA; supporting the efforts of watershed organizations and groups with interests or projects within AOC and watersheds such as Toledo Metroparks, Duck and Otter Partnership, Lucas County, Toledo Rain Gardens Initiative, and the University of Toledo; advocating for further water quality and aquatic monitoring (fish and sediments) for rivers and streams in the AOC including in regards to contact advisory posted for the Ottawa River, encouraging the completion of TMDLs for remaining streams and rivers in the AOC.

3) **What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?**

To main continued and consistent public support and long term sustainable financial support and fund raising in order to maintain operational and staff support in addition to funding tied to project development, implementation and completion; the development of innovative means for self sustaining revenues would be of great interest.

4) **What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?**

Strong partnerships with local agencies and the continued support of OEPA with staff position and funding mechanisms have been fundamental successes and essential to our operation as has the continued assistance of UESPA GLNPO; also increasing local awareness and profile of our organization and the Maumee AOC although that is a continual effort; the recent funding support and involvement of the Joyce Foundation was essential to the recent urban stream restoration projects and enhanced connections between other regional watershed organizations with the AOC; our establishment of an independent 501c3 non –profit in 2007 has allowed us the freedom and flexibility to development projects and pursue a wider range of funding opportunities.

5) What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?

Long term viable funding support from GLNPO targeted to address BUIs and related AOC planning and activities so that we can maintain the organizational structure (staff) as we continue to pursue project funding support and address BUIs; also the establishment of continual long term water quality and aquatic ecosystem monitoring (fish and sediments) would improve our ability to assess BUI conditions and determine priorities for projects and efforts to address selective BUIs with the greatest opportunity for improvement and delisting. Clear path and milestones outlined for delisting for AOCs with multiple independent watersheds within boundaries. Need to better integrate fed and state programs geared towards watershed coordinator with the structure and framework of AOCs and their process to allow for more diverse federal and state agency support (for instance, support from brownsfield staff and programs to support AOC work and direct support of modeling or sampling staff specific for AOC work)

6) Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.

Support by the state and federal agencies is critical along with local and community support and involvement to our success; such support needs to include long term commitments of staff, resources and financial support in order to make progress on the numerous, challenging and complex BUIs that we face in the large geographic area of the AOC and associated watersheds.

U.S. Areas of Concern Program Annual Meeting: Implementing Restoration Targets and Achieving On-The-Ground Results for the Great Lakes



October 1-2, 2009 ~ Hyatt Regency Hotel ~ Milwaukee, Wisc.

Survey of RAP Activities: Sheboygan River AOC

Area of Concern: Sheboygan River

Submitted By: Jon Gumtow, Citizens Advisory Committee Chair

1) **Summarize the activities underway in your RAP to restore beneficial uses and make progress toward delisting.**

Maintaining Citizen Advisory approach to engage public in reaching delisting goals.
LGUs starting to become more involved
striving to find sources of funding to implement the delisting targets
several grant attempts have failed
expending a considerable amount of time (volunteer, LGU, and State) to identify and apply for funding.

2) **What are you doing in addition to working on your beneficial use impairments?**

Public involvement, education/outreach, and strategizing about approach to delisting and funding

3) **What are the key obstacles that you face and how could you benefit from the experiences of the other U.S. Areas of Concern?**

Every AOC is different, is difficult to know what has been effective with other AOCs that have similar delisting targets or strategies. Better communication between AOCs would be helpful.

4) **What key successes have you had in your AOC? How can they be applied or replicated in other AOCs?**

Unable to answer at this time. Local public and LGU support appears to be a critical component.

5) **What types of resources or assistance would be most useful in expediting progress in your RAP?**

Better understanding of the delisting process, regulatory assistance, and applicable funding opportunities/strategies in today's economy.

6) **Please provide any other comments or information about your RAP that you feel is important.**

Currently the RAP is being lead by volunteers that have limited time, resources, and technical knowledge leading to a very slow delisting pace. Additional funding to support hiring outside experts will expedite the delisting process.