Attachment #6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Information (e-mail/phone)</th>
<th>I would like to make an oral comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Weiland</td>
<td>Veritext Court Reporter</td>
<td>312-442-4087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Miller</td>
<td>Friends of the Forks</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lauracemolto122@gmail.com">lauracemolto122@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili Fikter</td>
<td>Friends of the Forks</td>
<td><a href="mailto:l.fikter@gmail.com">l.fikter@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Moore</td>
<td>Friends of the Forks</td>
<td><a href="mailto:moore.m@spotify.org">moore.m@spotify.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Braun</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george.braun@aecom.com">george.braun@aecom.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Nara</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nwaia.jacqueline@epa.gov">nwaia.jacqueline@epa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact Information (e-mail/phone)</td>
<td>I would like to make an oral comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Gavin</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gavin.megan@epa.gov">gavin.megan@epa.gov</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Schuessler</td>
<td>MWRD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:josey.schuessler@wrrc.org">josey.schuessler@wrrc.org</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hirt</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ihirt@e2sl.com">ihirt@e2sl.com</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Roemer</td>
<td>FOTP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eleanor.roemer@seeglobal.net">eleanor.roemer@seeglobal.net</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Pelloso</td>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov">pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Salazar</td>
<td>Southeast Coresona</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peggy-seff@seeglobal.net">peggy-seff@seeglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact Information (e-mail/phone)</td>
<td>I would like to make an oral comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie San Andres</td>
<td>Social Science Environmental Health Research Institute</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsanandres.04@ogmail.com">jsanandres.04@ogmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEITH HARLEY</td>
<td>CHICAGO LEGAL CLINIC FOR SETP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:K.HARLEY@KENTLAW.ILL.EDU">K.HARLEY@KENTLAW.ILL.EDU</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Sylvia</td>
<td>Friends of the Parks</td>
<td>G020HMIN@SBE Global Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McCraw</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Chicago.rick@att.net">Chicago.rick@att.net</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. A.</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Martinez</td>
<td>P.I.S.E.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Alex.martinezam@gmail.com">Alex.martinezam@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact Information (e-mail/phone)</td>
<td>I would like to make an oral comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Radaouzi</td>
<td>VPIA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nickrxh@yahoo.com">nickrxh@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chicago Area Waterway System
Dredged Material Management Plan
and Integrated Environmental Assessment

Public Meeting
June 22, 2015
6:00 – 7:30 pm
Agenda

- Study Overview
- Proposed Plan
- Next Steps
- Questions & Comments
USACE Civil Works Missions

- Flood Risk Management
- Coastal Storm Risk Management
- Navigation
- Ecosystem Restoration
Summary of Proposed Plan

- Dredging need: 1,330,000 cubic yards over 25-years
  - 680,000 cy – contaminated sediment
  - 650,000 cy – clean material

- Proposed Plan
  - Close the existing placement facility
  - Construct a new facility at a former industrial site

- Plan is cost-effective and protects the environment
  - Beneficially use clean material in facility construction
  - Contaminated material isolated from surrounding environment
Chicago Area Waterway System

Legend:
- Green: Deep-draft projects
- Yellow: Illinois Waterway shallow-draft projects

Channels are shown as currently authorized.
Why is Dredging Needed?

- Economic Benefits
  - 3rd busiest harbor on Great Lakes
  - Shipping and related activities support local jobs and revenue
    - 2,500 jobs
    - $455,000,000 in annual sales

- Environmental and Social Benefits
  - Waterborne transportation safety and efficiency
  - Remove legacy contaminated sediment from waterway

Commodity Movements (2003-2012)

- Coal
- Petroleum
- Aggregates
- Grains
- Chemicals
- Non-Metallic Ores & Minerals
- Iron & Steel Products
- Coal Coke
- Limestone
- Coal & Lignite
- Slag
- Cement & Concrete
- Other

Calumet Harbor and River
(Annual average 14,400 tons)

Calumet Sag-Channel
(Annual average 6,500 tons)
## Projected Dredging Need (25 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Projected Need</th>
<th>Current Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep Draft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumet Harbor and River</td>
<td>1,300,000 cy</td>
<td>Chicago Area CDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Harbor</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago River</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois Waterway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumet-Sag Channel</td>
<td>30,000 cy</td>
<td>No designated location¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Sanitary &amp; Ship Canal</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Previously designated placement site, Lucas Berg CDF, was deauthorized for dredged material placement by the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014
Existing Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility (CDF)
Sediment Quality & Dredged Material Management

Dredged Material Management Practices

- Open-water
- Upland
- Confined
- Confined & Beneficial Use


Clean Water Act (1972)

Regulated Discharges to Waterways

Total Maximum Daily Loads

Deep Tunnel Project (Reduced Combined Sewer Overflows)

Low Impact Development

Environmental Regulations
Sediment Quality

**Calumet Approach Channel** – No required dredging

**Calumet Harbor Channel** – Low levels of metals and PAHs, similar to Chicago background conditions

**Calumet River and Calumet-Sag Channel** – Elevated concentrations of metals and PAHs
Collaborative Planning

- Study funded by USACE based on need for dredged material placement capacity
- Ongoing coordination with stakeholder agencies
  - Prospective Non-Federal Sponsor for implementation: Illinois International Port District
  - Other Stakeholders: City of Chicago, Chicago Park District, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
Planning Process

- Federal Standard (33 CFR § 335.7)
  - Complies with environmental regulations
  - Sound engineering principles
  - Least cost

- Additional criteria
  - Economically justified: benefits exceed costs
  - Long-term planning: minimum 20 years
  - Sustainability: consider life-cycle costs and impacts
  - Regional perspective: meet needs for entire Chicago Area Waterway System
What Can We Do With the Sediment?

- Source reduction
- Beneficial use of clean material
- Confined disposal of contaminated material
Potential Dredged Material Disposal Facility (DMDF) Sites

Tiered selection process
Identified: 61 sites
Screened: 5 sites
Evaluated: 3 sites
Tentatively Selected Plan
Preliminary DMDF Site Layout
Conceptual DMDF Design

- Two-stage perimeter berms, each approx. 11-ft high
- Compacted clay liner serves as barrier
- Erosion and dust control incorporated in site design
Phased DMDF Construction
(estimated timeline, pending funding)

- **Engineering and Design**
  - 2016
  - Site Preparation (bottom liner, decant structures, loading dock)
  - 2018
  - Stage 1 Berm Construction
  - 2024
  - Stage 2 Berm Construction
  - 2035
  - Site Closure

- **Stockpile Clean Dredged Material for Beneficial Use**
  - 2024
  - Contaminated Material Placement
  - 2035

- **Chicago Area CDF Closure (Clean Dredged Material)**
  - 2042
Plan Benefits

- National Economic Development (Transportation Cost Savings)
  - $7,000,000 average annual net benefits
  - Benefit-to-cost ratio: 3.2
    (Oct 2014 price level, 3.375% discount rate)
DMDF Implementation

- **Total project cost:** $25M to $35M (with inflation)
  - Construction costs are shared
    - 65% Federal, 35% non-Federal
  - Non-Federal sponsor provides necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way

- **DMDF Operations:**
  - Facility operation & maintenance by Chicago District
  - Dredged material placement by USACE contractors

- **DMDF Closure:**
  - Final cover placed by USACE
  - Maintained by non-Federal sponsor
Next Steps

Public Comment Period
*Ends July 15, 2015*

- Incorporate public comments
- Finalize non-Federal sponsorship
- Final USACE internal reviews and approvals

USACE Approval of Report
*January 2016*

- Real estate acquisition
- Develop final site design

Construction start
*Spring 2018*

(Estimated timeline, pending funding)
Public Comment Period

- Comment period ends July 15, 2015
- How to comment:
  - E-mail: chicagodistrict.pao@usace.army.mil
  - Mail: USACE, Chicago District
    231 S. LaSalle Street, Suite 1500
    Chicago, IL 60604
    ATTN: Planning Branch
    (postmarked by July 15, 2015)
Thank you for your participation!

e-mail: chicagodistrict.pao@usace.army.mil
Plan Overview

Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility (Existing)

Republic Dredged Materail Disposal Facility (Proposed)

Sources: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community.

For Official Use Only
June 2015

Chicago Area Waterway System
Dredged Material Management Plan
TWO-STAGE BERM

FILTER CELLS
LIFT STATION

CRANE PAD

DECRYPT STRUCTURE

INTERIOR CLAY LINER

STAGING/STORAGE AREA

12'-0"

12'-0"

2'-CLAY

3'-CLAY

78'-0"

78'-4"

6" TOPSOIL & SEED

STAGE 1
CLEAN FILL/BENEFICIAL USE MATERIAL

STAGE 2
CLEAN FILL/BENEFICIAL USE MATERIAL

Each stage approximately 11 feet high

2-Stage Berm Cross Section (Not-to-Scale)
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER, IL & IN / CHICAGO AREA WATERWAY SYSTEM (CAWS) DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Stakeholder Roundtable

Presentation by
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Chicago District

February 20, 2018
Illinois International Port District
Offices, Chicago, IL

*The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the authors(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.*

BUILDING STRONG®
and Taking Care of People!
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER DMMP PROJECT - STATUS

Loss of real estate required for recommended plan identified in 2015 (Former Republic Steel Site)
- Study stalled in Spring 2017 due to lack of viable non-federal sponsor
- Former Republic Steel site sold; redevelopment plan would benefit the community

New non-federal sponsor: City of Chicago

Need to plot a new path forward
- Existing confined disposal facility full as of 2022 – negative impacts to regional economy
- Revisit site selection to identify a location for a new facility – reevaluation screened sites as well as new locations
- Retain general site selection process from 2015
- Incorporate lessons learned in this second iteration
  - Most efficient site layout: upland, beneficial use of Calumet Harbor material
  - Involve the public earlier in the process: utilizing support from the Collaboration and Public Participation Center of Expertise
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER DMMP PROJECT – PATH FORWARD

Identify opportunities for flexibility within USACE regulations

• Federal Standard
  – based on environmental quality of the sediment
  – technically feasible, environmentally responsible, & economically justified
• Learn from and improve planning process from 2015 draft DMMP
  – addition of screening criteria
  – increased stakeholder and public involvement

Challenges

• Currently projecting a delay to dredging due to the lack of disposal capacity
• Available sites may have historic industrial uses
• Legal coordination required for brownfield sites

There are no “perfect” sites, but the Chicago District believes that this group can work towards a solution that provides benefits to a wide range of stakeholders

• Remove unconfined contaminated sediment from the Calumet River
• Support navigation industry, jobs, and local economy
AUTHORIZED NAVIGATION CHANNELS AND PROJECTED DREDGING NEEDS

The Chicago Area Waterway System (CAWS) is composed of:
1. Chicago River
2. Chicago Harbor
3. South Branch of the Chicago River
4. Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal (CSSC)
5. Calumet-Saganashkee (Cal-Sag) Channel
6. Calumet River
7. Calumet Harbor

Only Calumet Harbor, Calumet River, and the Cal-Sag Channel are anticipated to require dredging in the next 25 years.

- **Calumet Harbor** 700,000 cu y
- **Calumet River** 600,000 cu y
- **Cal-Sag Channel** 30,000 cu y

→ 98% of the sediment will be dredged from Calumet Harbor & Calumet River

Calumet Harbor Sediment
- Suitable for beneficial upland use

Calumet River Sediment
- Requires confinement

Cal-Sag Channel Sediment
- Requires confinement
USACE evaluated 61 sites to determine whether the proposed project would be environmentally responsible, technically sound, and economically justified.

Sites screened out based on:

- **Size** – Must be at least 30 acres
- **Natural Resources** – Avoid quality habitat
- **In-Use** – Vacant land only
- **Environmental Conditions** – No unresolved contamination issues
- **Cultural resources** – No historic landmarks, etc.
- **Operational Feasibility** – Practical to build and operate (adjacent to waterway, flat, etc.)
- **Retained Sites** – USACE identified 5 potentially suitable sites during this screening process

Does not violate screening criteria:

- **Retained Site**
2015 RECOMMENDED PLAN: FORMER REPUBLIC STEEL SITE

Proposed Site: Western portion of the Former Republic Steel Complex

Why this site?

- Size - larger than 30 acres
- Natural Resources - Overrun with weeds; no endangered species
- Not-in-use - Vacant property

Environmental Conditions - IL EPA restricts this land to industrial use

Cultural Resources - No cultural resources would be impacted

Operational Feasibility - accessible by river; mostly flat; close to dredging areas

Of the 5 potentially suitable sites identified during the site selection and screening process, the former Republic Steel site represents the least cost alternative, based on lowest complete life-cycle costs:

- Dredging and dredged material handling
- Construction of the facility
- Operations and maintenance

The Republic Steel site is estimated to provide capacity for 25 years of dredged material disposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confined (Cal River)</th>
<th>Used in facility construction (Cal Harbor)</th>
<th>Mounded excess for other beneficial use (Cal Harbor)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>680,000cy</td>
<td>240,000cy</td>
<td>140,000cy</td>
<td>1,060,000cy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO LONGER AVAILABLE
LESSONS LEARNED: PRELIMINARY DMDF SITE LAYOUT

Can be applied to any site with appropriate site conditions:

- Upland Site
- Direct waterfront access on the Calumet River
- Large enough to provide adequate storage (>30 ac)
  - 2-stage berm design
  - 11-foot lifts
- Clay bottom liner
- Decant to sewer; not river

**PHASE I**
Step 1: Berms constructed Calumet Harbor sediment and a waterproof liner. Vegetation planted for erosion control

**PHASE II**
Step 2: Sediment not suitable for beneficial use would be confined

**CAPPED AND CLOSED**
A second level of berms would increase the facility’s capacity.

Once full, the facility would be capped, closed, and turned over to the non-federal sponsor.
SUMMARY OF SCREENING CRITERIA

Original 6 Screening Criteria (from 2015 Draft DMMP):

- **Size** – at least 30 acres
- **Natural Resources** – avoid quality habitat
- **In Use** – vacant or under-utilized land
- **Environmental Conditions** – no unresolved contamination issues
- **Cultural Resources** – no historic landmarks, etc.
- **Operational Feasibility** – practical to build and operate

Additional Screening Criteria based on Lessons Learned:

- **Upland Sites Only** – least-cost DMDF site layout
- **Direct Waterfront Access** – avoided additional costs/risk of spills
- **On Calumet River** – 98% of dredging occurs here; Cal-Sag channel represents ongoing additional O&M costs

Opportunities for Increased Public Involvement – the Chicago District received feedback that it did not involve the public early enough in its previous process
BREAK
SITE SELECTION

98% of dredging occurs in Calumet River and Calumet Harbor
- Sites on the Cal-Sag Channel represent ongoing increased operation & maintenance costs

Preliminary sites for analysis:
- All sites previously included in 2015 DRAFT DMMP (shown in white)
- 2 sites in Lake Calumet that the Chicago District did a screening level analysis on at the request of IL International Port (IIPD)
- Other sites brought to the Chicago District by NFS, IIPD, Alderwoman’s office (10th Ward)
- Potentially more sites to come as a result of public workshops planned for late March/early April
SITE SELECTION CONT.

Original Site Screening Process from 2015

- Removed all sites < 30 acres
- Removed sites that are still confirmed to be in-use

Incorporating Lessons Learned

- Upland sites only
- Removed sites without direct waterfront access

LRC performed a screening level analysis of 2 sites in Lake Calumet at the request of one of our stakeholders. Neither site proved to satisfy the 6 original screening criteria; neither were estimated to represent a least-cost alternative.
SITE SELECTION CONT.

FORMER KCBX NORTH TERMINAL (PETCOKE) (#1)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~40 acres
- Not considered during initial 2015 site screening due to active industrial use as a petcoke storage terminal
- Facility was closed in 2015 following community opposition to airblown deposition of fine grained petcoke across the ward due to a lack of material management by former owners
- Site appears vacant and paved; 2x waterfront access (river and slip)
- Potential Concerns: current site use, further environmental analysis
SITE SELECTION CONT.

FORMER CALUMET TRANSLOAD FACILITY (#2)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~34 acres
- Not considered during initial 2015 site screening due to active industrial use as a petcoke storage terminal
- Facility was closed in 2014 following community opposition to airblown deposition of fine grained petcoke across the ward due to a lack of material management by former owners
- Site appears mostly vacant; 2x waterfront access (river and slip), potentially ongoing use at riverfront
- Potential Concerns: adequate capacity (size and irregular shape), further environmental analysis
SITE SELECTION CONT.

FORMER WISCONSIN STEEL #1 (#3)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~50 acres

- Screened out during initial 2015 site screening as “in use” (planned asphalt plant) and 6 RECs reported at the site

- Southeast Environmental Task Force thoughts on the site as habitat/open space? (per YouTube video)

- Potential Concerns: adequate capacity (size and irregular shape), further environmental analysis
FORMER WISCONSIN STEEL #2 (#4)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~35 acres
- Screened out during initial 2015 site screening as “in use” (planned asphalt plant) and 6 RECs reported at the site
- Letter from owner during NEPA scoping process: site is currently used for construction material handling
- The size and shape of this site may not provide adequate capacity; civil design to determine through preliminary analysis
- Potential Concerns: adequate capacity (size and irregular shape), further environmental analysis
SITE SELECTION CONT.

116th and BURLEY (Beemsterboer) (#5)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~90 acres
- Not considered during initial 2015 site screening
- Potentially covered by same NFR’s as LTV (see # 8)
- Site proposed by NFS after communication with the owner (Beemsterboer); currently used as temporary parking for recalled VW vehicles
- Potential Concerns: existing site infrastructure, further environmental analysis
SITE SELECTION CONT.

LTV SITE (#6)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~58 acres
- Retained in final array of alternatives in 2015 site screening
- Similar cost estimate to formerly selected TSP
- Currently operated as a scrap metal recycling facility
- Potential Concerns: existing site infrastructure, further environmental analysis
SITE SELECTION CONT.

FORMER KCBX SOUTH TERMINAL (PETCOKE) (#7)

Quick Site Facts:

• ~70 acres

• Not considered during initial 2015 site screening due to active industrial use as a petcoke storage terminal

• KCBX began the process of converting this site into a covered/indoor direct transfer following community opposition to airblown deposition of fine grained petcoke across the ward due to a lack of material management by former owners

• Potential Concerns: current site use, existing site infrastructure, operability issues due to location on river bend (potential disruption to navigation?)
MARYLAND PIG SITE (#8)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~30 acres
- Not considered during initial 2015 site screening
- Site proposed by NFS and project stakeholders for consideration in January 2018. Currently operated as a "logistical trans-shipping facility"
- Potential Concerns: adequate capacity, further environmental analysis
SITE SELECTION CONT.

PARK no. 576 (#9)

Quick Site Facts:

- ~150 acres
- Screened out during 2015 site screening as “in use” in conjunction with then-ongoing Deep Tunnel Project
- Owned by Metro. Water Reclamation District; Long-term lease to Chicago Park District (Park no. 576)
- Isolated site surrounded by landfills
- Potential Concerns: natural resources, floodway and water management issues, 404(b)(1), 401, mitigation, affects operations at O’Brien L&D, increased operation costs
135th & Hoxie (#10)

Quick Site Facts:

• ~30 acres (open land + some property to the south)
• Not considered during initial 2015 site screening
• Land south of Hegewisch Marsh (LRC AER project) not large enough, would require expanding into marina and Local UAW 551 property further south
• Cultural resources: marina represents rare water recreation opportunity on the CAWS
• Potential Concerns: adequate capacity, cultural resources/recreation, affects operations at O’Brien L&D, increased operation costs
NEXT STEPS

GETTING TO A FINAL ARRAY OF ALTERNATIVES

Goal: Identify which sites would satisfy the Federal Standard (USACE)
- Technically feasible
- Environmentally responsible
- Economically justified

Expectation: it is likely that remaining sites would be approximately equivalent least-cost alternatives
- Upland site layout
- Directly on the Calumet River

Takeaways:
- Barring unknown constraints LRC believes it may be able to support a project at any remaining locations following the process outlined to this point
- Information gathered through stakeholder and public involvement should determine the preferred site from this point forward
NEXT STEPS CONT.

20 February 2018 Stakeholder Meeting – Present proposed path forward, gain input and listen to feedback on:
- Proposed process
- Preliminary sites
- Additional sites for consideration

06 March 2018 Stakeholder Meeting* – Dry run for public site screening workshops
- Finalize materials
- Identify stakeholder roles
- Launch Crowdsourced Reporter tool

2 Public Workshops in late March/early April*:
- Collect local, on-the-ground knowledge
- Participation from residents, local businesses, etc.
- Present informational materials based on concerns heard during 2015 public review (USACE)

21 April 2018* Final Array of Alternatives
- Initial screening complete
- Begin detailed analysis of remaining suitable sites

October 2018: 30-day Public Review of Draft Report*

[*] - all dates tentative and subject to change
Chicago Area Waterway System Dredged Material Management Plan
DISCUSSION

Existing Chicago Area CDF

Proposed DMDF Site Layout
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER, IL & IN / CHICAGO AREA WATERWAY SYSTEM (CAWS) DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Stakeholder Roundtable #2

Presentation by
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Chicago District

March 09, 2018
Illinois International Port District
Offices, Chicago, IL

*The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.*

BUILDING STRONG®
and Taking Care of People!
REVIEW OF SCREENING CRITERIA

Original 6 Screening Criteria (from 2015 Draft DMMP):

- **Size** – at least 30 acres
- **Natural Resources** – avoid quality habitat
- **In Use** – vacant or under-utilized land
- **Environmental Conditions** – no unresolved contamination issues
- **Cultural Resources** – no historic landmarks, etc.
- **Operational Feasibility** – practical to build and operate

Additional Screening Criteria based on Lessons Learned:

- **Upland Sites Only** – least-cost DMDF site layout
- **Direct Waterfront Access** – avoided additional costs/risk of spills
- **On Calumet River** – 98% of dredging occurs here; Cal-Sag channel represents ongoing additional O&M costs

**Opportunities for Increased Public Involvement** – the Chicago District received feedback that it did not involve the public early enough in its previous process
REVIEW OF SITES FROM
STAKEHOLDER ROUNDTABLE #1

Chicago District presented 10 sites:

- Former KCBX North Terminal
- Former Calumet Transload Facility
- WI Steel #1
- WI Steel #2
- Former KCBX South Terminal
- 116th and Burley (Beemsterboer)
- LTV
- Maryland Pig
- Park no. 576
- 135th and Hoxie

Two (2) additional sites identified for review:

- Stony Island
  - Analyzed in 2015
  - MWRD to submit letter
- SW Lake Calumet
  - New site for consideration

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted on this map are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
1. **Civil Design** – preliminary capacity estimates

2. **Environmental** – preliminary contamination analyses

3. **Concepts for beneficial site features**
   - Buffer areas
   - Screening
   - Habitat/open space
   - Compatible industry
   - Future site uses
     - Open space
     - Parking
     - Solar generation
   - Beneficial use opportunities
     - Capping contaminated sites to promote industry
     - Habitat
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

FORMER KCBX NORTH TERMINAL (PETCOKE)

Comments from 20 February:
- Recently sold to Century Docks
  - Believed to be for recycled asphalt
- Too close to homes
  - Community concerns related to dust

Site updates:
- Need info on investment, permits, plans, etc. of new owner to determine whether “In Use”
- Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, site could provide adequate capacity
  - limited room for additional features

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

FORMER CALUMET TRANSLOAD FACILITY

Comments from 20 February:
• Current berms are not covered adjacent to 106th St
  • Prevailing west winds (in direction of closest residential land use)
  • Dust should be controlled
• Dredged material facility may be preferable to current use
  • Gov’t facility is a ‘known quantity’
  • Highly regulated/controlled
  • Prefer potential facility not in view of 106th St.
• Site currently being sold?
  • Buyer unknown

Site updates:
• Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, does not provide adequate capacity – SCREEN OUT for SIZE

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

FORMER WISCONSIN STEEL #1

Comments from 20 February:
- What is the status of prairie planting carried out by AOS?
- Too close to homes
- Too visible from 106th St.

Site updates:
- Separate owner from SETF prairie plantings
- Partially in 100yr floodplain
- Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, site could provide adequate capacity
  - limited room for additional features
  - Suggested 200’ buffer

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

FORMER WISCONSIN STEEL #2

Comments from 20 February:
• Seems to be more out of the way/hidden
• Need to find out who owns SE adjacent parcel
• Is slip access usable/beneficial?
• Property may be “In Use”
• What is the timeline for use and/or ownership?

Site updates:
• Adjacent land to the SE has same listed owner
• Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, site could provide adequate capacity
  • limited room for additional features
• Used to maintain and refurbish heavy construction equipment, store construction materials, and possibly build projects partially on-site
• Per CDOT permits, investment in improvements including repairing the river wall

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

FORMER KCBX SOUTH TERMINAL (PETCOKE)

Comments from 20 February:
• Too close to neighborhoods
  • Would it be too close if a facility only utilized the furthest portion of the site?
• “In Use”? – clean-up, buildings, infrastructure

Site updates:
• Need to determine whether “In Use”
• Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, site could provide adequate capacity
  • Ample space for additional features
• Former environmental cleanup lawsuit
  • 2-layer cap for asbestos
  • No NFR in place
  • Env Covenant – site restrictions

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

116th and BURLEY (Beemsterboer)

Comments from 20 February:
• Large
• Site is close to baseball fields at 110th St.
• Solar generation as a possibility for compatible future site use (could apply to any site)
• Potential leakage from all the cars being stored here

Site updates:
• Need to determine whether “In Use”
• Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, site could provide adequate capacity
  • Ample space for additional features

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

LTV SITE

Comments from 20 February:
• Site is in use
• Too close to neighborhood
• How close is too close?

Site updates:
• Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, site could provide adequate capacity
  • limited room for additional features

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

MARYLAND PIG

Comments from 20 February:
- Dredged material facility could be more beneficial to region than current user
- How do RR tracks through site affect potential project?
- What would happen to current owner?
  - Move? Where to?

Site updates:
- PD 495 (1989)
- Need to determine whether “In Use”
- Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, does not provide adequate capacity – SCREEN OUT for SIZE

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

PARK no. 576

Comments from 20 February:
- Isolated
- Surrounded by landfills
- Park goals – restoration
- Natural resources
  - Bald eagles
  - Wetlands - Mitigation
- How much more costly would it be?

Site updates:
- Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, site could provide adequate capacity
  - Ample space for additional features
  - Additional costs – wetlands & mitigation
- Burnham Prairie project – similar location on river downstream of TJ O’Brien lock and dam
  - Potential to reduce the time it takes for river to reach flood threshold to trigger reverse flow through TJ O’Brien L&D

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

135th and Hoxie

Comments from 20 February:
• Encroachment on marina not favorable
  • Cultural resources – recreation
• $3 Million in renovations to the marina property
• Apparent stakeholder group concurrence re: cultural resource value that this site provides to the area

Site updates:
• Located in 100yr floodplain
• SCREENED OUT
  • In Use/investment in site development
  • Cultural resources/recreation
  • Natural resources and permitting
• Per Chicago District preliminary civil design, does not provide adequate capacity – SCREEN OUT for SIZE

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

STONY ISLAND

Comments from 20 February:
• Large paved site
• Far removed from residential
• Parking doesn’t seem like a high use
• Is parking compatible with proposed facility?
• MWRD acknowledges stakeholder input; planning to submit an updated letter concerning their use of the site
  • Previously a solids drying area
  • Statutes
  • Corporate use
  • Current lease: Ford Motor Co.

Site updates:
• Letter received from MWRD
• Located in 100yr floodplain
  • Would need to explore regulations, permitting, etc.
SITE RECAP AND UPDATES

SW LAKE CALUMET

Comments from 20 February:
• Brought up in discussion at Roundtable #1

Site updates:
• ~40 acres
• River and slip frontage
• Owned by IIPD
• Leased to ???
• Used for ??? (bulk material handling?)
• Adjacent to Bishop Ford and Calumet Water Reclamation Plant

NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted within are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
## SITE USE SCREENING DETERMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Site Name</th>
<th>Zoning*</th>
<th>Owner/User</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
<th>Full-Potential Site Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCBX North</td>
<td>PMD 6 (2004) – Lake Calumet</td>
<td>Century Docks</td>
<td>Vacant; potentially planned for asphalt recycling</td>
<td>At or near potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI Steel #1</td>
<td>FEMA Zone A**, PMD 6 (2004) – Lake Calumet</td>
<td>Heritage IL Land</td>
<td>Vacant/Open Space/Habitat(?)</td>
<td>Below potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI Steel #2</td>
<td>PMD 6 (2004) – Lake Calumet</td>
<td>Torrence Holding III/ Walsh Group</td>
<td>Construction staging and materials storage</td>
<td>At potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCBX South</td>
<td>PMD 6 (2004) – Lake Calumet</td>
<td>KCBX</td>
<td>Covered direct transfer facility</td>
<td>At potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116th and Burley</td>
<td>PMD 6 (2004) – Lake Calumet</td>
<td>Cal Trans RR (Beemsterboer)</td>
<td>Temp. parking recalled VWs</td>
<td>Below potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTV</td>
<td>PMD 6 (2004) – Lake Calumet</td>
<td>S Chicago Prop Mgt/ South Shore Recycling</td>
<td>Scrap metal recycling facility</td>
<td>Below potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park no. 576</td>
<td>Heavy Industry District (M3-3)</td>
<td>MWRD/Chicago Park District</td>
<td>Vacant/Open Space/Habitat</td>
<td>Public Use / Below potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Island</td>
<td>FEMA Zone A**, Heavy Industry District (M3-3)</td>
<td>MWRD/Ford Motor Co.</td>
<td>Parking (Ford)</td>
<td>Below potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Lake Calumet</td>
<td>PMD 6 (2004) – Lake Calumet</td>
<td>IIPD/Tenant(?)</td>
<td>Bulk material handling(?)</td>
<td>Below potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Potential Site Use in the Project Area:**

In determining whether a site is considered ‘in use’ we analyzed whether the current use ‘as is’ meets the standard real estate appraisal definition of “Highest and Best Use.” In short, the current use is legally permissible (zoning), physically possible, financially feasible, and maximally productive.

---

* City of Chicago - Zoning and Land Use Map

** 100yr Floodplain
The Lake Calumet PMD 6 is intended to:
1. Foster the city's industrial base;

2. Maintain the city's diversified economy for the general welfare of its citizens;

3. strengthen existing manufacturing areas that are suitable in size, location, and character and which the City Council deems may benefit from designation as a PMD;

4. encourage industrial investment, modernization, and expansion by providing for stable and predictable industrial environments; and

5. help plan and direct programs and initiatives to promote the growth and development of the city's industrial employment base.
NEPA SCOPING - SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

- Consider the effects upon and concerns of a community with a long history of pollution issues
- Location of the site must balance human health, environmental, and economic concerns
- Consider sites not on the populous southeast side
- Troubled by prospect of dredged material from Cal-Sag being brought into the southeast side
- Recognize that dredging is necessary – legacy pollution, maintain a vital shipping corridor
- Consider slurrying and piping material to MWRD’s Calumet Water Reclamation Plant
- Final closed site (grass-covered hill) has little value
- Reconsider contaminated slips in Lake Calumet for a facility (use to cleanup Clean Harbors site)
- Consider Stony Island site; protect surrounding wetland habitat
- Stony Island is needed for future MWRD corporate use, leased to Ford, and in the floodplain
- Consider additional compatible features (recreation, habitat, solar generation, parking, etc)
- Management decisions should be based upon high quality information about the contamination in the dredged sediment from Calumet River and Harbor
- Propose the Corps complete an EIS as opposed to an EA
- Park no. 576 should not be considered due to wetlands, bald eagles, open space, recreation
- Consider effect of potential sites on the floodplain in technical analyses
- Sediment characterization is a critical issue to discuss with the public
- Explain how confining contaminated material decreases exposure

Comments received outside of this stakeholder group (USEPA, Miami of OK, USFWS*)
NOTE: This is a draft document intended for project stakeholder use only. The sites depicted on this map are the result of preliminary assessment and have yet to be fully analyzed as potential locations for a dredged material management facility.
Chicago Area Waterway System Dredged Material Management Plan

Explore Map
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS – DRAFT AGENDA

- **Open House: Informational Posters**
- **Introductions** (City and USACE)
- **Presentation by USACE Chicago District**
  - Why we dredge
  - CDF is full
  - Site selection process
  - Design and operation (human health & environment)
  - Need for public feedback—learning about sites
  - Facilitated Q & A (Seth Cohen)
- **Crowdsource Reporter Intro and Demo**
- **Open House:**
  - Informational Posters
  - Potential Site Posters
    - Pros
    - Cons
    - Improvement opportunities
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS – MATERIALS LIST

- **Slide Deck**
  - Project background
  - Site selection process
  - Intro to workshop

- **Posters**
  - Why we dredge
  - Economic impact of CAWS – jobs, industry
  - Corps planning process and site design
  - What’s in the sediment? How is a CDF operated?
  - Facility controls to protect human health & the env

- **Crowdsourcing Reporter Intro and Demo**
  - Info cards

- **Potential Site Posters**
  - Sticky notes and note pads
  - Pros
  - Cons
  - Improvement opportunities

- **USACE Staff**
  - Subject matter experts for posters (3-4)
  - Facilitators for site posters (1 for every 2 sites)
DISCUSSION & QUESTIONS

Need to finalize:

Date(s):
1. Week of April 16
   • Day 1 - Evening
   • Day 2 - Afternoon
   • Thur or Fri, April 19-20
   • Sat, April 21; or
2. Week of April 16
   • Afternoon/evening

Time
• Afternoon?
• Evening?
• Thoughts from the 10th Ward

Location(s)
• Input from the community/stakeholders
  about good locations?
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER / CHICAGO AREA WATERWAY SYSTEM DREDGED MATERIAL FACILITY - FEASIBILITY STUDY

Stakeholder Meeting #3

Presentation by
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Chicago District
28 June 2018

"The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the authors(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation."

BUILDING STRONG®

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
AGENDA

1. Summary of public workshop & comments
2. Army Corps actions based on public feedback

3. BREAK

4. Next steps
5. Focused array of alternative sites
6. Discussion & questions

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

- April 28, 2018 – Rowan Park Field House - ~50 attendees
- April 30, 2018 – Vodak Public Library - ~ 70 attendees

- Transparency & Project Information
- Seeking Public Involvement & Feedback
  - Crowdsourse Reporter webapp
  - Site selection posters
  - Spoken comments
  - Written comments

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
PUBLIC OUTREACH OVERVIEW

Crowdsourcing Polling
• Open from April 9, 2018 through May 7, 2018
• 332 comments received

Workshop Posters
• ~100 comments over 2 days

Written Comment Cards
• 15 Comments received

Spoken Comments
• Court reporter present at workshops
• 25 people signed up to speak

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
CROWDSOURCE – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

- 9 site-specific comments
- 323 general comments

- Leave material in place
- Recommended placement in:
  - Indiana
  - North Side, Chicago, IL
  - Worth, IL
  - Shuttered military bases
- Health Concerns
  - Cancer
  - Asthma
  - Dust
- Environmental justice
- Want eco-friendly development
- RemEDIATE existing sites
- Treatment of Dredged Material
- General opposition to all proposed alternatives:

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
WORKSHOP THEMES – POSTERS, SPEAKERS, & COMMENT CARDS

- Stop dredging
- Not in 10th Ward
- Some sites are too close to homes
- Health concerns
- Would like to see athletic fields and sustainable development on sites in the future
- Want to see nature/habitat protected
- 21st century solution
- Preference for more isolated sites

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
COMMON PUBLIC CONCERNS

- **Concern #1** – negative impacts to human health and the environment; environmental justice

- **Concern #2** – continue to consider sediment treatment options in lieu of disposal

- **Concern #3** – need a larger, multi-agency vision for cleaning up SE Side

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
ARMY CORPS RESPONSE ACTIONS

• **Action #1** – will complete an Environmental Impact Statement instead of an Environmental Assessment

• **Action #2** – inquired about potential advancements in the treatment practices evaluated in the 2015 Draft Report

• **Action #3** – submitted letter of support to fund a Calumet master planning effort

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
ACTION #1 – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) TO RESPOND TO CONCERNS ABOUT HUMAN HEALTH

• This action is in response to human health and environmental justice concerns that we have heard repeatedly during the process
• Best tool available to determine whether impacts are likely to occur
  • Higher level of analysis
  • Longer review period

What to Expect / Next Steps

• Notice in the Federal Register
• Re-issuing scoping letters
• Extended period of public review
• Public meeting(s) during review period

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
ACTION #2 – UPDATES ON ANALYZED TREATMENT MEASURES

• Response to the human health concerns that we received

2015 Draft Report cited a study of the following technologies:

• Sediment Segregation
• Combustion in a Rotary Kiln
• Solidification
• Glassification
• Biogenesis

What We Learned

• May 31, 2018 - study author not aware of any advances since publication
  • Effectiveness remains unproven
  • Cost of treatment still a barrier to feasibility

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
ACTION #3 – SUPPORT FOR PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP A MASTER PLAN FOR THE WATERWAYS OF THE CALUMET

- USACE has no authority to lead a multi-agency visioning effort
  - Agree that such an effort would be valuable
  - Planning Assistance to States

Request to: IDOT for State Planning & Research (SRP) funds

- For funding to develop a master plan for the Illinois International Port District (IIPD)
- By Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) and IIPD
- Support Letter from Chicago District signed May 14, 2018
- Effort was selected for funding in July 2018
  (revised: 12 July 2018)

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
BREAK
NEXT STEPS

1. Identify a recommended plan per Army Corps guidance
   - TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE
   - ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE
   - ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED

2. Work with our non-federal sponsor to determine if there may be a preferred alternative outside of our guidance
   - Headquarters approval
   - Sponsor ability to provide additional funds

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
FOCUSED ARRAY OF ALTERNATIVE SITES

• 5 sites remaining
  • 4 screened out since Public Workshops

• 4 of the remaining sites identified because they are industrial sites with existing dock wall infrastructure

• Working with non-federal sponsor by request to further evaluate possible solutions at Park 576

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
SCREENSED ARRAY

Sites Carried Forward
Preliminary screening for existing contamination has been completed.
• KCBX North
• WI Steel #1 – Has NFR letter
• LTV – Parts of site have NFR letter
• 116th and Burley
• Park no. 576

Sites Screened
• SW Lake Calumet site
  • Limited dockwall access
  • Port is in development discussions
• Stony Island
  • Limited dockwall access
  • MWRD is in development discussions
• KCBX South and WI Steel #2
  • Long-term investments in the properties are supporting active businesses/jobs

NOTE: This feasibility study is in progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
**KCBX NORTH TERMINAL**

**Quick Site Facts:**
- ~40 acre site
- Closed in 2015
- Shown facility occupies most of site
- Preserves rail access to west and north
- Appears vacant and paved
- 2x waterfront access (river and slip)

**Public Input:**
- Good potential for solar
- Too close to residences

**NOTE:** This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
Quick Site Facts
- ~50 acre site
- 6 Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) previously reported have been resolved
- Avoid plantings to west & north
- Access on river bend potential traffic hazard
- Set back 200ft. from 106th St

Public Input
- Not a lot of housing nearby
- Too close to homes
- Previous planted with prairie grasses
- Habitat is rare in this industrial zone
- Site could be developed in the future

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
LTV SITE

Quick Site Facts
• ~58 acre site
• Retained in final array of alternatives in 2015
• Shown facility occupies most of the site
• Currently operated as a scrap metal recycling facility

Public Input
• Called second best site in one post
• Not too close to homes
• Development planned nearby
• Believe this area may be transformed into eco-industrial park

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
Quick Site Facts

- ~90 acre site
- Shown facility occupies approx. half of site
- Sited near river, furthest from residents
- Potential for additional site features – screening, plantings, compatible industry, etc.
- Open space buffer to east
- Temporary parking for recalled VW vehicles

Public Input

- Not too close to homes
- Too close to homes
- Concern about fluid from VWs
- Near recreation (ball field)

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
PARK NO. 576

Quick Site Facts
• ~150 acre site
• NFS interested in site due to isolation from residential
• Shown facility avoids wetlands
• No bald eagles present (April 26 survey and coordination with USFWS)
• Need to determine feasibility of offsite offloading
• Far from MWRD sanitary sewer system

Public Input
• Wetlands
• Eagles & migratory birds
• Close to Hegewisch Marsh
• Designated as parkland

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
DISCUSSION & QUESTIONS

NOTE: This feasibility study is in-progress. No final decisions have been made at this time.
ATTACHMENTS:

The Chicago District brought the following materials in hardcopy to the stakeholder roundtable to supplement the presentation materials and encourage discussion during the scheduled break.

1. Sediment Treatment Poster

2. Updated Focused Array of Final Sites
Calumet River sediment contains metals, PCBs, other organic compounds (from combustion and oil).

Solidification/stabilization
(Im mobilize the pollution by binding it into a concrete matrix, including making bricks or pavement)
Organics prevent hardening; only a small fraction of sediment can be used; pollution still remains in concrete – what happens in the future when we demo the site? Safe in residential areas?

Chemical Extraction
(Use solvents to “wash” pollutants from the sediment)
Doesn’t destroy the pollution; same solvents don’t work for metals and organics.

Grain size separation
(Sieve out the clean sand for beneficial use)
Calumet sediment contains small pieces of slag and coke, which contaminate the sand fraction.

Biological Treatment
(Use microorganisms to break down the pollutants)
Doesn’t work on metals; can create dangerous by-products; takes a long time and lots of handling of material.

Combustion/Thermal Treatment
(Burn the contaminants)
Doesn’t work on metals; creates air pollution and by-products (dioxins); leaves slag and ash for disposal.