

TMACOG
MAUMEE BAY STATE PARK WETLAND RESTORATION PLAN
PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING

Date: October 22, 2007Place: Maumee Bay State Park Office
Present: Amie Brady (speaker phone), Scott Denham, Hans Gottgens, Deanna Bobak, alternate for Daryl Dwyer, Mindy Carr [on speaker phone], Bill Petruzzi, Keith Carr, Kurt Erichsen

The Maumee Bay State Park Project Management Team met to review comments and input from the public meeting of October 2nd, and discuss their incorporation into the study design with Hull & Associates.

The Project Management Team reviewed and discussed public comments, both from the meeting and in writing.

Comment: send water to the existing wetlands for treatment in the northeast corner of the park

Response: Would require pumping and operation and maintenance costs; plus there are infrastructure barriers. Also, water pumped to the wetland would not stay there, because the wetlands are open to the lake. We also believe that the Corps of Engineers and/or OEPA would raise regulatory objections on the grounds that contaminated water from Berger Ditch would degrade the wetlands. Keith Carr disagreed with the public comment that the park's existing wetlands are not functioning wetlands.

Comment: Request for presentation on the project to residents of Jerusalem Township. This request came from the Jerusalem Township Trustees

Response: Kurt Erichsen and Bill Petruzzi will present; Kurt will coordinate meeting with Jerusalem Township. Other Project Management Team members are welcome to attend.

Comment: Sand the off the beach may be contaminated and should be tested for *E. coli*.

Response: May be a valid point, but beyond the scope of the current study.

Comment: Design the project to enhance stream habitat, not just control bacteria.

Response: Agreed, and that is our intent.

Comment: Include a statement in the study that "clearly states that the alternative for a wetlands in Maumee Bay at the western end of the park has been eliminated and a list of the reasons."

Response: The Project Management Team has not made such a decision. The scope of the current study calls for one conceptual design for controlling bacteria using a system of wetlands. It is not a comprehensive plan for habitat in and around the park.

Comment: "Toledo Edison and the shipping channel could still be a factor in Maumee Bay beach closings. The problem is that there is little to no information on circulation patterns in Maumee Bay as it relates to dredging and open lake dumping."

Response: The previous Maumee Bay bacteria study does not support the assertion about Toledo Edison and the shipping channel. In any case, this issue is beyond the scope of the current study, which is to develop one conceptual design for controlling bacteria using a system of wetlands.

Comment: *E. coli* are important, but phosphorus reduction is important to the lake, and should be tested.

Response: Agreed. The main goal of this study is to control fecal bacteria in Berger Ditch. The proposed wetland system will have benefits in reducing phosphorus loadings, though not enough to end toxic algae blooms.

Kurt agreed to distribute these notes and ask Project Management Team members who were not present if they had any additional public comments or responses to add to the record. In particular, ask Rahel Babb if OEPA/ the

Corps of Engineers had regulatory issues associated with discharging Berger Ditch water into the existing park wetlands.

Hans Gottgens suggested expanding the floodplain and channel restoration to the west. Alternative 'C', as currently presented, only allows for a max width of 250 ft of the multi-stage channel. Expanding the channel restoration farther to the west would increase the retention time. This will likely improve pathogen treatment.

Hull & Associates will continue work on the draft report. They anticipate it will be available to the Project Management Team in mid-November. Set the next Project Management Team meeting for early December to review the draft. As the Project Management Team's charge at this meeting will be to review/approve the draft, it is essential that a quorum be present.

The meeting was adjourned.