

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION

HREP Team Meeting Monitoring Breakout Session

Monitoring Report Out Form Cover Sheet

Complete one cover sheet form per table.

Table Topic:	Sedimentation
--------------	---------------

Table Participants	Role
1. JIM ROGAZA	Facilitator
2. Kalleigh Scott	Scribe
3. Chuck Thelning	Note-Taker
4.	Reporter
5. Rebecca Laugen	
6. KURT RASMUSSEN	
7. Leo Keller	
8. Erica Stephens	

Cyrus Vaghobi
Jehk House

Sharonna Baylot

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION

HREP Team Meeting Monitoring Breakout Session

Monitoring Report Out Form

Complete one Report Out Form for each Discussion Question discussed at your table.

① **Table Topic:** Project objectives closely linked to monitoring: Is site altering geomorphology

Facilitator:

Discussion Question:

② **Findings:** What would be a good approach

deepwater survey

Dredge cuts: establish early vertical control; post construction digital survey
Baseline - ongoing - ideal - sweep system, but on large boats - after equipment
Frequency: ideal 3yr for sloughing & initial & 5yr intervals

Completion: Depth, volume, area, maintenance frequency, in perpetuity

Recommendations:

③ **Other sites**
Baseline: photos & mapping
Ongoing: physical survey of geomorphic features
Frequency: site specific based on conditions

④ **Implementation:** each year focus on a project feature across many projects
• routine survey
• less reporting

⑤ **Learning:** where are best places to do work

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION

HREP Team Meeting Monitoring Breakout Session

Monitoring Report Out Form

Complete one Report Out Form for each Discussion Question discussed at your table.

Table Topic:

Facilitator:

Discussion Question:

Findings:

1. Rachel
Corps survey - getting cheaper
Costly, effectiveness; scheduling
Corps water quality - use depth at WQ sites
Some ~~type~~ better than others
dredge cuts work
Trade-offs on survey techniques
Curt: related project objective & physical metric.
How much data?
diversity of

Recommendations:

2. Jim
Other geomorphic change

3. Houser - System/reach sedimentation rates
prioritization

4. As built - contractor overdredge
don't know real baseline
contractor final cross sections (electronic)

5. Leo transect vs survey
has real problems in the field
lots of specs; low priority
No event based considerations

7. Sharone - too few surveys ~~events~~ transects
- can we change methods in middle
- tie to events

Lesson learned - dredge cut design

⑧ Prioritize HREFs with good data & continue
to study those

✓ ~~⑨~~ ⑨ Jeff - costs of maintaining depth vs
starting new projects

★ 6. Rachel use similar contractors
(IDIQ or LTRM) to get uniform
methods/results