

# **APPENDIX H**

## **ISSUE RESOLUTION CONFERENCE MEETING MINUTES**

**Cleveland Harbor  
Dredged Material Management Plan  
Issue Resolution Conference  
14 June 2006  
1:00 – 5:00**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Attendees:**

NAME		AGENCY	PHONE	E-MAIL
Alsenas,	Paul	Cuyahoga County Planning Commission	216-443-3700	<a href="mailto:palsenas@cuyahogacounty.us">palsenas@cuyahogacounty.us</a>
Alvarado	Christopher	Cuyahoga County Planning Commission	216-443-3700	<a href="mailto:calvarado@cuyahogacounty.us">calvarado@cuyahogacounty.us</a>
Asquith	Michael	USACE, Buffalo District	716-879-4352	<a href="mailto:Michael.asquith@usace.army.mil">Michael.asquith@usace.army.mil</a>
Bankey	Mindy	Ohio Department of Natural Resources	614-265-6836	<a href="mailto:Mindy.bankey@dnr.state.oh.us">Mindy.bankey@dnr.state.oh.us</a>
Berkeley	Phil	USACE, Buffalo District	716-879-4145	<a href="mailto:Philip.e.berkeley@usace.army.mil">Philip.e.berkeley@usace.army.mil</a>
Berry,	Debbie	City of Cleveland	216-664-6740	<a href="mailto:dberry@city.cleveland.oh.us">dberry@city.cleveland.oh.us</a>
Bournique	Randy	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency	614-644-2013	<a href="mailto:Randy.bournique@epa.state.oh.us">Randy.bournique@epa.state.oh.us</a>
Brown	Jonathan	USACE, Buffalo District	716-879-4430	<a href="mailto:Jonathan.w.brown@usace.army.mil">Jonathan.w.brown@usace.army.mil</a>
Brown	Robert	Cleveland City Planning	216-664-3467	<a href="mailto:rbrown@city.cleveland.oh.us">rbrown@city.cleveland.oh.us</a>
Brown	Tab	USACE, Lakes and Rivers Division	513-684-2974	<a href="mailto:Theodore.a.brown@usace.army.mil">Theodore.a.brown@usace.army.mil</a>
Cox,	Jim	Flats Industry Association	216-241-8060	<a href="mailto:jimcoxiii@scbglobal.net">jimcoxiii@scbglobal.net</a>
Edger	Elva	League of Women Voters	440-826-0157	
Greer,	Lynn	USACE, Buffalo District	716-879-4260	<a href="mailto:lynn.m.greer@usace.army.mil">lynn.m.greer@usace.army.mil</a>
Haberly	Roger	USACE, Buffalo District	716-879-4164	<a href="mailto:Roger.e.haberly@usace.army.mil">Roger.e.haberly@usace.army.mil</a>
Hambly	Charles	Cuyahoga River RAP	216-241-2414 x253	<a href="mailto:Hamblyc@cuyahogariverrap.org">Hamblyc@cuyahogariverrap.org</a>
Harkins	Rick	Lake Carriers Association	216-861-0591	<a href="mailto:harkins@lcaships.com">harkins@lcaships.com</a>
Hauser	Ed	Interested Citizen	216-651-3476	<a href="mailto:ejhauser@ameritech.net">ejhauser@ameritech.net</a>
Hedrick	Ray	USACE, Nashville District	615-736-5026	<a href="mailto:Ray.d.hedrick@usace.army.mil">Ray.d.hedrick@usace.army.mil</a>
Hempfling	Tom	USACE, Lakes and Rivers Division	312-353-6351	<a href="mailto:Thomas.hempfling@usace.army.mil">Thomas.hempfling@usace.army.mil</a>
Hicks	Craig	USDA, Wildlife Services	216-664-6897	<a href="mailto:craig.r.hicks@usda.aphis.gov">craig.r.hicks@usda.aphis.gov</a>
Holland,	Steve	Ohio, Department of Natural Resources, Office of Coastal Management	419-626-7980	<a href="mailto:steven.holland@dnr.state.oh.us">steven.holland@dnr.state.oh.us</a>
LaWell	Michael	Mittal Steel USA	216-401-9132	<a href="mailto:mwlawell@aol.com">mwlawell@aol.com</a>
Martin	Barbara	League of Women Voters	440-243-9070	<a href="mailto:barbaramartin2001@juno.com">barbaramartin2001@juno.com</a>
McKenna	Patti	USACE, Buffalo District	716-879-4367	<a href="mailto:patrice.m.mckenna@usace.army.mil">patrice.m.mckenna@usace.army.mil</a>
Pfeiffer,	Stephen	Port of Cleveland	216-241-8004	<a href="mailto:spfeiffer@portofcleveland.com">spfeiffer@portofcleveland.com</a>
Regener	Carla	Cuyahoga County Planning Commission	216-443-3700	<a href="mailto:cregener@cuyahogacounty.us">cregener@cuyahogacounty.us</a>
Ryan,	Dana	Cleveland Airport Systems	216-898-5215	<a href="mailto:dryan@clevelandairport.com">dryan@clevelandairport.com</a>
Stumpe,	Lester	Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District	216-881-6600	<a href="mailto:stumpel@neorsd.org">stumpel@neorsd.org</a>
Worthington	Rich	USACE, Headquarters	202-761-4523	<a href="mailto:richard.t.worthington@usace.army.mil">richard.t.worthington@usace.army.mil</a>
Zavoda	Rich	Mittal Steel USA	216-429-6542	<a href="mailto:rzavoda@mittalsteel.com">rzavoda@mittalsteel.com</a>
Zimmerman	Angela	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	614-469-6923 x22	<a href="mailto:angela_zimmerman@fws.gov">angela_zimmerman@fws.gov</a>

**Agenda:**

1:00 – 1:30  
1:30 – 3:00  
3:00 – 3:15  
3:15 – 4:00

Introductions  
Interactive Discussion of Cleveland DMMP  
Break  
Questions and Wrap Up

### **General Summary**

Phil Berkeley, Plan Formulator of the Cleveland Harbor Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) provided a power point presentation to discuss the status of the Cleveland Harbor DMMP. During the course of the presentation meeting attendees participated in discussions, and questions and answer sessions. A copy of the Power Point presentation will be temporarily available at the project website listed below.

### **Project Website**

The Cleveland Harbor DMMP project has a website where you can obtain copies of final documents. The address is:

<http://www.lrb.usace.army.mil/missions/cleveland/index.html#DMMP>

### **Public Information Meeting**

USACE will notify all meeting attendees and those on the e-mail distribution list of the date, time, and location of the Public Information Meeting, tentatively scheduled for later this summer.

### **Measures**

USACE returned to Buffalo with additional measures to consider and address in the DMMP Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) including use of adjacent harbor CDFs, develop a regional CDF, and implement sediment traps and address sediment loading.

### **Best Management Practices**

There was a high degree of stakeholder interest in measures to control/reduce sedimentation in the Cuyahoga River. USACE recognizes that we would most likely need additional authority to participate in implementing such measures. The DMMP EIS will however document work to date on sediment management and identify ongoing efforts.

### **Sediment Transport Model**

There was significant discussion pertaining to the Sediment Transport Model currently being developed by USACE, Buffalo District. Project status and Project Manager contact information is below:

The ultimate goal of the Great Lakes Tributary Modeling program is to provide local interest with tools that will support state and local prioritization and implementation of best management practices designed to keep non-point source pollution (sediment) on the land. These tools can help local interests better manage sedimentation issues and, if they implement appropriate practices, should reduce the loading of sediments and pollutants to navigation channels and Area of Concerns. This will reduce costs for navigation maintenance and promote the restoration of beneficial uses over time. The model that is being created for the Cuyahoga River is the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model designed to understand watershed-scale sediment contributions and water quality issues. The SWAT model is interfaced with the Better Assessment Science Integrating point and Non-point Sources (BASINS) Geographic Information System (GIS). The model will provide stakeholders with the ability to look critically at land uses in the basins and estimate the effects of best management practices related to land use. A meeting to discuss the model capabilities and to transfer the technology to local interests is being scheduled for September 2006.

Project Manager: Tony Friona  
Phone: 716-879-4215  
Fax: 716-879-4194  
E-mail: Anthony.m.friona@usace.army.mil

**Habitat Creation**

Habitat creation was mentioned both in the context of beneficial use and CDF design. The IRC documentation clearly indicates that beneficial use will be addressed but does not currently mention the potential of creative CDF design to create presumably aquatic habitat. The next iteration of the document will address habitat creation within CDF designs.

Due to the open communication and forum provided at the Issue Resolution Conference, the meeting minutes document the communications among meeting participants and identify the applicable section of the presentation.

### **Definition of DMMP**

A DMMP is a study conducted to verify that all Federally maintained Navigation projects have sufficient capacity for dredged material disposal for a minimum of 20 years. Requirements for the study are listed below:

1. Establish a Base Plan for the Project.
2. Assess the potential for beneficial use of dredged material.
3. Establish a Management Plan for the Project
4. Demonstrate that continued maintenance is economically warranted based on high-priority (non-recreational benefits).

Lester Stumpe (NE Ohio Regional Sewer District): Can the project (DMMP) include sediment traps and erosion control measures?

Rich Worthington (HQ USACE): USACE does not currently have the authority to conduct such studies; sediment traps and like projects would require congressional authorization.

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE is considering many alternatives which will be discussed later in the presentation.

### **Problems and Opportunities**

- CDF Site 10B will be essentially filled in 2006.
- No further CDF capacity available without modifications.
- Historical average annual dredging and disposal of 330,000 cy.
- Fill Management Plans being developed for 2007-2011 disposal.
- Fill Management Plans needed for 2012 and 2013.
- Beyond 2013 will need a new CDF or disposal method for dredged material at Cleveland.

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Panning Commission):

Q1. Is sediment traps part of the Fill Management Plan (FMP)?

A1. Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): No, however USACE will consider potential impacts of sediment trap use.

Q2. Is dewatering of dredged material being considered under the FMP?

A2. Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): No. Dredging in Cleveland Harbor occurs two times per year allowing no time for consolidation.

Q3. Has USACE considered other dredging mechanisms to minimize the quantity of water discharged?

A3. Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): Yes but USACE is limited, through contractual procedures, to the Contractor's who bid on the job and the equipment they have available.

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters):

Q1: How often does USACE dredge the Outer Harbor?

A1. Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE dredges the Outer Harbor every 3-5 years.

Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): The Port Authority dredges approximately 10,000 cubic yards every 7 years. Overall, the eastern portion of the Outer Harbor is not maintained to authorized depths.

Q2. Where do freighters enter the harbor?

A1. Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): Freighters use the Entrance Channel to gain access to the Harbor and River Channels.

### **Existing Conditions – Port of Cleveland**

Bob Brown (Cleveland City Planning): Suggested when assessing the economic importance of the City and Port of Cleveland, studies should include Akron, Lorain, and Cleveland.

Ed Hauser (Interested Citizen): Requested clarification of the difference between the Port of Cleveland and the Port Authority, and Harbor and River Channel authorized depths.

Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): The 'Port' includes the entire Cleveland area. The Port Authority is a separate entity that has no control over other industry and private lands within the Port. The Port Authority receives approximately 35% of harbor tonnages; approximately 65% of harbor tonnages are delivered throughout the Port, mainly to industry located upstream in the Cuyahoga River.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): Informed meeting attendees page 6 of the IRC documentation provides channel depth details.

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters): Does USACE require non-Federal users of the CDF to sample sediment that will be disposed in the Federal facility?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE conducts sediment sampling in Cleveland Harbor and Cuyahoga River Channels every five years. When a non-Federal user requests use of the Federal facility to dispose dredged sediment USACE must assess the suitability of the material for placement in the CDF. However, if the non-Federal user proposes to dredge an area in close proximity to a sediment sampling site located within the Federal Channel, USACE will use the results from the Federal sampling location to determine the suitability of the material. If a Federal sampling site does not exist in close proximity to proposed non-Federal dredged area, USACE would require the non-Federal users to conduct sampling. Sediment sampling results are then forwarded to USACE and [I] would analyze them to determine suitability for placement in the CDF.

### **Burke Lakefront Airport (BKL)**

Phil Berkeley included BKL statistics and noted there are impacts the current operational CDF10B has on BKL operations.

Bob Brown (Cleveland City Planning): Are there new FAA regulations to prevent CDF construction?

Dana Ryan (Port Control): CDFs are deemed non compatible use with airports due to wildlife attractants caused by their operations. FAA has concerns with any construction, specifically CDF construction, within a 4-5 mile radius of the airport.

### **Base Case Dredging (and Map identifying existing and proposed CDFs)**

Phil Berkeley explained the Base Case identifies current and potential future dredging conditions that are used to provide a comparison to the selected alternative plan under the DMMP. The comparison is used to determine the feasibility of the selected alternative plan. The Base Case assumes that all dredged material will be placed in existing or yet to be constructed CDFs. The Base Case begins in 2007, when CDF capacity has been exhausted without implementation of FMPs at existing CDFs.

Debbie Berry (Cleveland City Planning): What are the impacts of reduced dredging?

Michael LaWell (Mittal Steel): Reduced dredging requires an increase in private dredging between the Federal Channel and private dock.

Rick Harkins (Lake Carriers Association): The reduction in dredging means the channel width may not be as wide as in the past.

Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): Every year it is necessary to assess where dredging is needed most. Upstream near Mittal Steel is a crucial area that requires frequent dredging.

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Phil reiterated the Base Case is an assumption and may not reflect actual occurrences.

Rick Harkins (Lake Carriers Association): [I] Participate in annual soundings of the Federal Channels with USACE and Masters to assess areas that need to be dredged annually.

Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): Part of the problem is a decreasing Federal budget that prevents USACE from dredging additional quantities from the harbor. Aside from the current capacity issue at the harbor, funds are not currently available to dredge more than 300,000 cubic yards per year.

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters): Confirmed that reduced Federal funds is Great Lakes wide, not unique to Cleveland Harbor.

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Planning Commission): Are other harbors being assessed (such as Ashtabula) etc. to provide a facility (CDF) to be used by multiple harbors?

Rick Harkins (Lake Carriers Association): Stated a regional facility would be cost prohibitive.

Michael LaWell (Mittal Steel): Stated upland disposal has also been done in the past but cost prohibitive.

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Planning Commission): Is rail transport being considered?

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Yes.

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Planning Commission): Clarify that it is not just cost of alternatives being considered but FAA requirements, Lakefront development, etc. Paul requested clarification of who pays for Federal dredging.

Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE is responsible to dredge Cleveland Harbor and Cuyahoga River Channels two times per year. The cost includes plans and specifications, bids, contracts, and actual dredging and disposal.

Michael LaWell (Mittal Steel): Added that non-Federal entities often 'piggy back' the Federal contract and obtain the same contractor to dredge the non-Federal docks.

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Planning Commission): Confirmed USACE operates and maintains the CDF (10B).

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Reiterated the Base Case proposed building a CDF somewhere in the Outer Harbor. Outer Harbor CDFs are much deeper and provide greater capacity; this would allow for 'catch up' dredging from 2014 – 2020 as assumed in the Base Case.

Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): Took the opportunity to remind meeting attendees that CDFs provide opportunity for future development. When facility 14 was proposed many people opposed its' construction, now it is coveted lakefront property that many are trying to protect for wildlife habitat and educational outreach.

Michael LaWell (Mittal Steel): We need to remember the end use and value to the region for creating a CDF is lakefront property.

Ed Hauser (Interested Citizen): Paul mentioned earlier the possibility of rail transport. What technology is available for dewatering dredged sediment to allow for rail transport?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): There are various means that enable dewatering and some will be mentioned when we discuss Beneficial Use of dredge material.

Bob Brown (Cleveland City Planning): Reiterated that local preferences should be considered due to cost share requirements. CDF 10B has marginal use for lakefront development.

Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): Stated that CDF 10B was expected to be used for BKL expansion.

Bob Brown (Cleveland City Planning): Stated there is little need for BKL expansion at this point in time.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): Informed attendees that during Phase I of the DMMP, USACE met on many occasions with Federal, State, and local interests to identify alternative locations for proposed future CDFs. The purpose of the coordination was to identify future development plans when identifying proposed CDFs for consideration. The proposed sites on the map (2.3 in IRC documentation) took into consideration the City of Cleveland's 50 Year Waterfront Development Plan.

Ed Hauser (Interested Citizen): What is the depth of water at the outer harbor sites? Are CDFs lined?

Mike Asquith (USACE, buffalo District): The depth at the proposed CDF locations varies. CDFs are not lined.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): Informed attendees that page 31a of the IRC documentation provides the depth of water at each proposed CDF location in addition to other statistics.

Ed Hauser (Interested City): Questioned how the facilities contain contaminated material if they are not lined?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): The CDFs are semi porous structures. As the facilities are filled with dredged material, sediment fills the voids within the rock perimeter preventing discharge outside of the facility. In 2004 USACE conducted sediment sampling within and adjacent to currently operational CDFs and found no leaching of material beyond the boundaries of the CDF.

Chuck Hambly (Cuyahoga River RAP Coordinator): RAP has taken cores from within the river that show overall sediment is getting cleaner but there is still contaminated 'legacy' sediments in the river.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): In addition to what Chuck stated about legacy sediments, USACE has historical sediment data. I recently worked on a project with OEPA and ODNR where I compared contaminants of concern from historical sampling events (1993, 1998, and 2002) and found that there is still significant contamination of sediments that warrant placement in a CDF. However, the data shows the hotspots have migrated through the river.

Lester Stumpe (NE Ohio Regional Sewer District): Can we have copies of the data?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): Sediment sampling reports can be obtained through Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. The data analysis has been shared with many entities in this room including OEPA, ODNR, and the Cuyahoga River RAP (Marie Sullivan).

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters): Fish are now spawning in the Cuyahoga River, how is it possible that material is still contaminated?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): ODNR for the first time in many years has placed an environmental window on Cleveland Harbor. An environmental window is a period of time in which no in water construction activity can occur in order to protect fish spawning. However, the window placed on the Cuyahoga River is for an area upstream of the Federal Channel limits. So, for the purposes of this project and area of interest, there is no environmental window.

Craig Hicks (USDA, Wildlife Services): Can non-Federal entities recoup benefits from a CDF for future development?

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE turns CDFs over to non-Federal sponsors once they have been filled to capacity, at which point the users can develop the property. USACE does not necessarily place limitations on the use but the user must consider structural integrity of the CDF for development.

Rich Worthington (HQUSACE): Non-Federal entities could build a facility on a CDF that has been turned over.

Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): To expand on that, a problem with a non-Federal entity building a CDF vs. the Corps constructing the CDF is that there is no guarantee the non-Federal entity would recoup the money. The Port Authority could build a new CDF using revenue bonds but the constrained budget of the Corps may prevent USACE from having money to pay the tipping fee to use the non-Federal facility. In that case the Port could not recoup funds for the revenue bonds. Or, if the Corps could pay the tipping fee it would most likely mean a reduction in the amount of material dredged from the harbor channels.

Tab Brown (USACE, Lakes and Rivers Division): In addition Great Lakes funding has decreased overall.

*\*skipped slides 28 -32 (without project conditions and Key Assumptions)*

### **Economic Justification**

- \$ 293,000,000 Federal Investment at Cleveland Harbor since late 1800's.
- Based on 2003 tonnage data continued maintenance dredging is economically justified.
- Based on preliminary analysis over \$200,000,000 in new work at Cleveland is justified.

Rich Worthington (HQ USACE): The economics justify expending a total of \$200 million to construct a new CDF. The \$200 million is comprised of Federal and non-Federal cost share requirements.

Jon Brown (USACE, Buffalo District): The \$200 million value is based on the National Economic Development (NED) losses prevented by continued maintenance of the harbor (dredging). The NED includes transportation commodity.

Debbie Berry (Cleveland City Planning Commission): How close are we from being able to open lake place sediment dredged from Cleveland Harbor and Cuyahoga River Channels?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): OEPA has recently tried to minimize open lake placement in the Western Basin of Lake Erie; I would defer to OEPA to address the likelihood of this occurring in the Central Basin, which could affect Cleveland Harbor.

Randy Bournique (OEPA): It is true that OEPA has tried to minimize open lake placement and we are encouraging beneficial use of dredged sediment over open lake placement.

Debbie Berry (Cleveland City Planning): Does the Base Case assumption include cost share requirements?

*\*Skip to slide 49 of 70 – Cost Sharing)*

### **Cost Sharing**

Rich Worthington (HQ USACE): Cost share requirements for construction of a new CDF is 75% Federal 25% non-Federal due at time of construction. Another 10% non-Federal is due over 30 years and any costs associated with Lands, Easements, Rights-of-Way, Relocations and Disposal Areas (LERRD's).

Roger Haberly (USACE, Buffalo District): When developing CDF costs, all costs associated with making that CDF usable is included in the costs. Thus if there are utility relocations (gas water, electric, cable), sewer line or outfall extensions, the costs associated with these components are added into the total cost of the CDF. Thus when comparing one CDF cost to another, these costs include all costs (Federal and non-Federal) that are needed to make the CDF operational.

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Reiterated that the selected alternative must be engineeringly feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable.

Ed Hauser (Interested Citizen): Will the EIS identify official end state land use?

Phil Berkeley/Patti McKenna (USACE, Buffalo District): The DMMP EIS will provide recommendations for end use but USACE does not dictate end use requirements once a facility is turned over to the local sponsor.

Ed Hauser (Interested Citizen): The County is completing a Maritime Study; will this study be included in the EIS?

Phil Berkeley: The DMMP EIS schedule proposes distributing the Draft DMMP EIS for public comment and review in June 2007 and completing the Final DMMP EIS in 2008. If the Maritime Study is complete before the dates in the USACE schedule it will be considered, in some degree, in the DMMP EIS documentation.

*\*Returned to slides 35 through 43 title 'Measures'*

### **Measures (Treatment)**

Craig Hicks (USDA, Wildlife Services): Has USACE sampled sediments within the CDF to identify if treatment is needed?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE sampled sediments within currently operational CDFs in 2004. The results from facility 10B were not what was expected; specifically coarse grain material that USACE has been disposing in the west end of CDF 10B for potential harvesting and beneficial use was more contaminated than what would be expected of material of the grain size and physical characteristic.

Debbie Berry (Cleveland City Planning): To add to that the City is working with USEPA, Cuyahoga Brownfields, Cuyahoga County Soil and Water District to complete a Risk Assessment at CDF 14.

Ed Hauser (Interested Citizen): [to Debbie Berry] Has the new Mayor [Jackson] approved the City's 50 Year Waterfront Development Plan? And what is the Mayor's focus? Is the Mayor supportive of relocating the Port Authority to the outer harbor land mass, proposed CDF number 2?

Debbie Berry (Cleveland City Planning): The status of the City's 50 Year Waterfront Development Plan is beyond the scope of this meeting however the Mayor would like to see stronger connections to the east. The Mayor is supportive of relocating the Port Authority.

### **Measures (Beneficial Use)**

Lester Stumpe (NE Ohio Regional Sewer District): What qualifies as beneficial use?

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Wetland development under Section 204 would be considered beneficial use.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): Beneficial use can also include dredge soil, mixture of sediment with other aggregates to create sub grade for road construction, or daily landfill cover. However, there needs to be a market for such uses.

Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): Reuse of sediment has occurred on a pilot project basis at Toledo Harbor. Approximately 10,000 cubic yards are reprocessed annually. Here at Cleveland, you would need 330,200 cubic yards processed per year. In addition you would need to identify potential users, needs, quantity needed for each project or annual quantities, etc.

Tab Brown (USACE, Lakes and Rivers Division): Alternative measures must be compared to the Base Plan; the Base Plan is assumed the least costly. If any alternative measure is above the cost of the Base Plan, it would require cost sharing.

Elva Edger (League of Women Voters): Who owns CDF 14?

Steve Pfeiffer (Port Authority): The Port Authority owns CDF 14 until the City requests ownership.

### **Final Questions/Wrap Up**

Michael LaWell (Mittal Steel): What is the next step?

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Phil referenced the current schedule:

- June 2006 – Issue Resolution Conference.
- Summer 2006 – EIS Public Scoping Meeting.
- September 2006 – Draft DMMP/DEIS completed.
- December 2006? – Alternative Formulation Briefing.
- January 2007 – Independent Technical Review of DMMP/DEIS.
- June 2007 – Agency and Public Review of DMMP/DEIS.
- September 2007 – Final DMMP/DEIS completed.
- November 2007 - Independent Technical Review of DMMP/FEIS
- January 2008 – Agency and Public Review of DMMP/FEIS.
- TBD - Record of Decision Signed.

Lester Stumpe (NE Ohio Regional Sewer District): What is the schedule for construction of a new CDF?

Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE has allocated two years for Plans and Specifications and three years for construction.

Tab Brown (USACE, Lakes and Rivers Division): Construction of a new CDF pends funding.

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Funding is an important point; we cannot proceed with construction unless Congress and the President pass the budget. We are not asking you to lobby but it is important that you understand we can only request the funds.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): It is also important to note the USACE budget process. USACE requests its budget two years in advance. If we are proposing to have a facility operational in 2014 we are scheduling construction in 2011 through 2013 which means we will be requesting construction funds in 2009 through 2011. Since we complete our budget two years in advance we will be completing the 2009 budget one year from now.

Lester Stumpe (NE Ohio Regional Sewer District): It is important to discuss beneficial use specifically habitat development outside the breakwall for any alternative.

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Planning Commission): How can there be more forums/interaction regarding the status of the project?

Rich Worthington (HQ USACE): It is essential to maintain communication and go beyond the guidance and meet frequently through workshops, conferences, etc.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): During Phase I of the DMMP USACE met monthly with Federal, State, local entities, and at times interested citizens for approximately 15 months in an effort to coordinate this project and identify proposed CDFs that meet the needs and interest of the community. At the completion of Phase I USACE informed all parties that correspondence during Phase II would be less frequent, however USACE can look at the schedule and identify when additional meetings can be scheduled to communicate project status and share information.

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters): Is the County a project sponsor? If no, why not?

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): No, the current Project Sponsors are the City of Cleveland and Port Authority. During Phase I meetings, USACE continued to solicit a project sponsor. It was the City and Port Authority who offered to be the Project Sponsor and submitted a Letter of Intent to the Corps of Engineers.

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters): What is the expected life of current facilities? Can you clarify the two year gap? When will a new alternative disposal area be available?

Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): Through implementation of the Fill Management Plan, CDF 10B is expected to provide capacity through 2008 and CDF 12 is expected to provide capacity through 2011. Since a new facility is not expected to be operational until 2014, there is a period between 2012 and 2013 in which we have not yet identified where dredged material will be disposed.

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters): The Environmental Assessment for the Interim Plan at CDF 12 states the plan is expected to provide capacity through 2012.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE originally planned on having a facility operational in 2013, however due to the budget process and the need for a Project Cooperation Agreement to be signed between USACE and the project sponsor before USACE requests funds from the President, we reevaluated the scheduled and pushed the date back one year to 2014 in an effort to ensure all agreements, real estate documents, and approvals are in place. In addition, we are now projecting the Fill Management Plan at CDF 12 to provide capacity through 2011 vs. 2012. This is due to the fact that the EA was written using a conceptual design. USACE is now formally looking at the design to meet FMP needs and capacity issues. However, the modifications to the design, in an effort to maximize capacity at the facility will not require a new EA.

Jon Brown (USACE, Buffalo District): Who, if anyone, is looking at doing anything to address or minimize sediment loads and implement sediment traps?

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Planning Commission): Sediment loading must be looked at holistically.

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE has budgeted the last two years for funds to conduct a watershed study; Congress will not appropriate funds.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE has spent three years developing a Sediment Transport Model for use in the Cuyahoga Watershed. The model has been developed at 100% Federal costs. Once the model is complete it will be turned over to a local 'keeper'. It is important for the community and agencies to gather and input information and data to make the model as effective as possible.

Michael LaWell (Mittal Steel): Informed attendees that at one point the steel mill was going to close. Now Mittal Steel is the number one steel mill in the world for production/hour. The steel company ranking is something the community and company is proud of; it is important to maintain the harbor so to maintain production at the plant.

Lester Stumpe (NE Ohio Regional Sewer District): The Preliminary Assessment on pages 31 a and b of the IRC documentation does not provide a detailed explanation of the ranking.

Lynn Greer (USACE, Buffalo District): The ranking is subjective to whoever is completing the table; however USACE has completed detailed documentation to justify the various matrix rankings. The matrix justifications will be included in subsequent reports.

Jon Brown (USACE, Buffalo District): Should without project conditions include BKL closure and other land use for current property?

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): USACE cannot solve or dictate how to manage City issues. It is not practicable for USACE to look at alternatives that include facility closures.

Paul Alsenas (Cuyahoga County Planning Commission): Will the comments received today and comments provided in the future be acknowledged in the report?

Phil Berkeley (USACE, Buffalo District): Yes, the report will acknowledge, to an extent comments received.

Barbara Martin (League of Women Voters): How far can material be pumped?

Mike Asquith (USACE, Buffalo District): The distance material can be pumped is variable. While in the lake, under water, material can be pumped up to five miles. Upland pumping distances are dependent upon topography and equipment (pumps). There must be a means to decant the water.

Rick Harkins (Lake Carriers Association): Trucking material to upland sites requires a dewatering facility, and would have negative impacts to the City of Cleveland including a large

quantity of trucks hauling foul smelling material through the City which would inevitably cause extensive road damage.

*Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.*