

Supporting Decision-Making Through Analysis of the Beneficial Reuse of Dredged Materials in the St. Louis River

Sebastian Paczuski, Keahna Margeson, Katie Williams²& Joel Hoffman²

I) Oak Ridge Associated Universities; 2) USEPA ORD

SEPA Overview

Introduction to port dredging and its challenges

Description of research methodology

• Summary of progress

Implications going forward



https://dredgeresearchcollaborative.org

SEPA Operations & Maintenance Dredging

- 1 dislodging of in-situ sediment
- 2 raising of dredged material to the surface
- (3) horizontal transport
- (4) placement or further treatment

https://instrumentalism.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/backhoe.jpg

Obstacles for O&M Dredging

- Amounts
- Cost
- Stakeholder coordination
- Material characterization
- Public perception
- Placement
 - Confined Disposal Facilities (CDFs)
 - Open water placement
 - Beneficial reuse

SEPA The Potential of Beneficial Reuse

Dredged materials as "resource" versus "waste"

• Aquatic and terrestrial habitat restoration

Beach nourishment

Construction and materials

Brownfields remediation

I) What is the environmental quality, programmatic, and human benefit information needed to beneficially reuse dredged materials?

2) How are sediments dredged, moved, tested, planned for, and applied for?

€PA

Guiding Principles

Collaborative problem-solving

Environmental justice

Translational science

Set EPA

Methodology

- Collaborative Case Study
 - Context-dependent
 - 3 different reuse projects
 - I) DWP Roundhouse 2) Atlas Industrial Park 3) 40th Ave West Aquatic Habitat
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Data sources:
 - Document analysis
 - Stakeholder meetings
 - Stakeholder feedback & review
 - Stakeholder workshops

http://ww.dulutheda.org/parks

Discussion of progress & future implications

https://www.duluthnewstribune.com

https://www.fws.gov

	Covernance
Alaintain Navigation Channels: Yes	
Likelihood: Choose an item. Ma	agnitude: Choose an item.
Direction: Choose an item.	
nrolled in a voluntary program (often	assessment/clean-up support): Yes 🗆 No 🗆 Unsure 🗆
Likelihood: Choose an item.	Magnitude: Choose an item.
Direction: Choose an item.	
ble to be completed inside of relevan	t Environmental Windows: Yes 🗆 No 🗆 Unsure 🗆
Likelihood: Choose an item.	Magnitude: Choose an item.
Direction: Choose an item.	
eferred to or included in existing guid	ance documents: Yes 🗆 No 🗆 Unsure 🗆
Likelihood: Choose an item.	Magnitude: Choose an item.
Direction: Choose an item.	
	e project: Click or tan hara ta antar taxt

Identification of Six "Alternatives"

Potential placement sites to test the tool

- Upland Site (specific site not yet identified)
- Spirit Lake (sediment nourishment)
- Minnesota Point (beach nourishment)
- Superior Bay Anchorage Basin
- Allouez Bay

EPA

- Interstate Island (known site, using as example)
- A Data Worksheet will be filled out by stakeholders for each site prior to upcoming Decision Tool Workshop
- At the workshop, stakeholders will walk through the process of ranking alternatives

€PA

What this means going forward...

• Project level

- Host workshop to test tool
- Refine and adjust tool as necessary
 - Possibly work to include or expand for inclusion of criteria relevant for contractors
- Continue building database of beneficial use cases

Beyond this project

- Habitat work will continue in near future
- Other potential longer term project sites- mine land reclamation, brownfields
- Future collaboration- building into other mapping/databases
 - Ease of access to information
 - Classification and availability of dredged materials
 - Fitting material availability to potential site use
- Continue identifying expansive uses of the tool
 - Increasing transparency for natural resource decision making
 - Assisting with weighing other decisions and prioritizing resources