

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

Date: December 6, 2007 Place: Maumee Bay State Park Office
Present: Rahel Babb, Amie Brady (speaker phone); Jim Brower, alt for Scott Denham, Kevin Egan, Hans Gottgens, Deanna Bobak, alt for alternate for Daryl Dwyer; Bob Neubert alt for Keith Earley; Paul Roman, Jenny Carter-Cornell, Mindy Carr [on speaker phone], Bill Petruzzi, Paul Wetzel, Kurt Erichsen

The Maumee Bay State Park Project Management Team met to review and take action on the draft *Maumee Bay State Park Restoration Project* conceptual plan, as prepared by Hull & Associates. Kurt Erichsen convened the meeting at 1:30 PM and noted that a quorum was present.

Kurt outlined the remaining project schedule, which called for review of the draft document at this meeting, approval of the draft with any comments or changes from the Project Management Team, and the completion of final document and submission to ODNR by the end of the calendar year.

Bill Petruzzi, Jenny Carter-Cornell, and Mindy Carr presented the draft report to the Project Management Team on behalf of Hull & Associates. Project Management Team consensus agreed to the following points in finalizing the draft document:

1. Kurt Erichsen offered several comments, mostly editorial, attached to these minutes. The most significant point was the need for a concise Executive Summary for the document.
2. Amie Brady also offered several comments, attached to these minutes.
3. Hans Gottgens (page 4 text and table 1), Bob Neubert, and Amie Brady commented on variable stream flow discharge predictions for the watershed, depending on which model was used. Hans commented that a top width of 350' would not provide adequate detention time at peak flows. Discussion ensued that the report was conceptual in nature, and should reflect that, notably in Figure 8. Bill noted that there was space available on the suggested sites to make the top terraces wider. Kurt added that while the site dimensions may be conceptual, the cost figures need to be adequate to accomplish our purpose.
4. Hans commented on page 5 text: "...toward Lake Erie or backing up in the channel die to the seiche) reached 15 cfs ... " — there is an additional provision missing that needs to be added.
5. Hans commented on the units of *E. coli* loading — cfu/sec is the unit of concern for bacterial loading rates from a stream, rather than cfu present in the sediments.
6. Hans provided additional comments in writing, which are attached to these minutes.
7. Kevin Egan noted that the rpt discussed well the benefits of the wetland restoration coming from public access and habitat; and that this was an important point to cover in the document.
8. Rahel Babb suggested contacting Dan Mecklenburg of Ohio DNR for input on stream restoration design. Hull agreed to follow up on that contact.
9. Rahel asked about the reference to existing Class 3 wetlands on the Maumee Bay State Park site. She recommended the nature of these wetlands be verified.
10. Rahel asked for changes in Table 2 to the characterization of wetland difficulty permitting for the various alternatives. Alternatives A and B should be "medium to high" in difficulty, and Alternative C should be "low to medium."
11. Rahel asked that this wetland restoration conceptual plan be submitted for inclusion on Ohio EPA's

Mitigation Clearinghouse website. Paul Wetzel asked that it be submitted to the Corps of Engineers' office in Oak Harbor as well.

12. Deanna Bobak raised a question regarding inclusion of Colin de Saint Victor's data in the study. She noted that it was part of his thesis, which requires original, unpublished data. Kurt noted that the data had been used in development of this conceptual plan, and as such it was public information. Following discussion it was agreed to discuss with Daryl Dwyer and/or Colin de Saint Victor how his work may be cited or summarized in a way that does not compromise the needs of his thesis.
13. Kurt raised additional points, stemming from the presentation to Jerusalem Township. He suggested that the project timeline, and the degree to which it depends on availability of funding, should be clearer. There should also be an explicit discussion in the text that the Maumee Bay State Park and City of Oregon wetland sites would be owned and maintained by ODNR and the City of Oregon respectively; and the property owners would be the lead agencies for funding. The text should also state that use of the City of Oregon site would be subject to approval by City Council.
14. The listing of permits required for the project should be more exhaustive. Permits for OEPA and the Corps of Engineers are complete, but there are others involved — FEMA, for example.

Kurt reviewed the list of comments with the Project Management Team. Hans moved that the Project Management Team approve the report with the changes listed above. Paul Roman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Kurt noted that the next step would be to develop minutes with the report comments, and with those, Hull can finalize the report by the end of the year, and provide a copy to all the Project Management Team members.

Bill Petrucci said that Hull & Associates has appreciated the opportunity to work with this Project Management Team, and will be glad to be of assistance as the project moves ahead.

Kurt thanked the Project Management Team members for their participation on this project (and thanks them again now). Formally this Project Management Team's role ends with the completion of this report, but we will need to meet to follow up and support implementation of the current report, and discuss other watershed issues relative to bacterial loadings. Kurt will follow up with the group after the first of the year to arrange a next meeting. He noted he thought we should ask for additional appointments to the group, notably from Jerusalem Township and Toledo/Lucas County Health Department.

The meeting was adjourned.

Amie M. G. Brady
U.S. Geological Survey
Ohio Water Science Center

1. When referencing the USGS gage, the correct spelling is gage or you can use stream gage (according to USGS style manual).
2. on page 5, under discussion of the auto sampler. There are 2 conditions that need to be met for the auto sampler to be triggered:
 - a. there is a change in flow of 8 cfs or larger over a 10 minute interval, and
 - b. the flow is less than -15 cfs or greater than 15 cfs
3. Then because of #2, on page 8, the sampling may not have been triggered because the flow was low. I suppose I object to the phrase "technical reasons" because it could be construed that the sampler or monitoring equipment were malfunctioning.
4. I suggest you look at E. coli on the graphs on a log scale. The data will be more visible, even on the extremely low and high ends.
5. On Figure 5, the gage is not in the right spot. The gage is actually just north of Cedar Point Rd. approximately 100 ft.
6. This comment is in for use in future analysis. I would suggest looking at discharges of E. coli, that is, cfu/s based on streamflow. The reason I suggest this is because the peak discharge may not always coincide with the peak concentration and may occur later.
7. This is a more important comment. Because I didn't understand the peak flow regression calculations very clearly, I went and spoke with Jim Sherwood regarding this. I asked him why there would be such large discrepancies between the event flow results for the SWMM model, the Jennings et al. regression equations, and Jim's regression equations. We looked into it a little and found that there is a lot of water storage in the basin (around 2.2%). The equations in his publication are for sites without storage. Therefore, his equations should not be used for Berger Ditch. He suggests that the equations from the Jennings et al. publication may be outdated. He suggested instead the use of StreamStats (<http://water.usgs.gov/osw/streamstats/ohio.html>). This is a very useful tool and would be worthwhile to examine. He thought that the SWMM model produced results lower than those of the other two calculations because the SWMM model takes into account the storage and basin slope.

Kurt Erichsen, P.E.

TMACOG

Vice President of Environmental Planning

“XS Berger Ditch” figure on page 4. Took me a minute to figure out what this meant. It’d be better to label it “Cross Section”.

Data: the word data is plural and datum is singular.

Title page: not really a good idea to title the project “draft implementation summary report”. That title adds to up saying nothing about its contents. Use the title you have at the top of page 1 instead.

“TBD” costs table 4. Does this mean you’re working on the figures and will include them in the final version of the report?

The document needs a good executive summary. One page that gives the bottom line, benefits of the project, and cost.

Dr. Johan Gottgens, University of Toledo Department of Environmental Sciences,

Data” is plural

Table 1: Not sure what “upstream wetland project reach” and “downstream wetland project reach” means. Hasn’t been explained in the text.

Page 4: “Concurrent flow and rainfall data for the subject watershed were not available to support model calibration;”

Don’t we have a Doppler flow meter installed in Berger Ditch, as well as nearby rainfall data? Real time discharge data are actually available on the web.

Table 1 doesn’t represent flows (feet/sec). It reports discharges (cubic feet/sec).

Page 5: I think discharges do matter in the conceptual design. The difference between 200 and 700 cfs for the same storm event results in very different storage times in a designed wetland.

Page 5. Should we be concerned with E. coli concentrations (in cfu/100ml) or is the problem better defined in terms of E. coli loadings to the Bay (in cfu/sec-1) determined by multiplying E. coli concentration with water discharge (as was done in the USGS report (Appendix B)? In that case, low flows really don’t contribute much. One single large storm contributes more bacteria to the bay than perhaps the rest of the year combined.

USGS data (Appendix B) demonstrate clearly that higher discharges correlate with higher E. coli levels (see Fig 4 in Amie’s report). To suggest different is not appropriate.

Most of June 2007 and August 2007 data show little or no contribution of water to the Bay with discharges (labeled “flow” in figs. 3 and 4) ranging between +25 and -25 cfs (the August 21 storm is an exception).

Fig. 5 (page 9): Is the UT gage located in the right spot?

Fig. 8 (Alternative C on Page 14): The different floodplain stages need to be modified. For example, the floodplain level marked with “250 cfs” would only inundate once every 10 years. That will not provide any significant treatment. It will not become “an active floodplain” as described on Page 19. It will also not “provide aquatic/wetland habitat restoration opportunities” (Page 19). Perhaps these stages should be labeled differently.

The level below that would hold ditch water more frequently but would be too small (ca 60-70ft wide) to provide any storage and treatment for storms less than 250 cfs. Alternative C needs to become much wider (particularly towards the West where there is no road and plenty of room) and the levels need to be at lower elevation.