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Welcome!
Pledge of Allegiance
Welcome and Introduction

Bill Lorenz
President
Buffalo Post SAME
Sponsors!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Bill Lorenz, President SAME Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05</td>
<td>Regional Awards</td>
<td>Tom Heinold, SAME Great Lakes Regional VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>National Awards and Officer &amp; Board Installation</td>
<td>BG (ret) Joseph SchroedelSAME Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>SAME Vision 2020</td>
<td>BG (ret) Joseph SchroedelSAME Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Update on NFSS and Tonawanda Landfill</td>
<td>Jeff Rowley Project Manager USACE Buffalo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50</td>
<td>Buffalo River Cleanup</td>
<td>Brian Murphy Anchor QEA Katherine Winkler Buffalo Niagara Waterkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Opportunity Forecast FY19 and Small Business Discussion</td>
<td>Jeff Ernest Chief of Contracting Sherrie Plonski Small Business Deputy Buffalo &amp; Pittsburgh Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-5:00</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Update on NFSS and Tonawanda Landfill

Jeff Rowley, PM
Buffalo District
US Army Corps of Engineers
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) Objectives

- Identify and evaluate sites
- Protect human health and the environment
- Clean up and control radioactive material

Protect human health and the environment
CERCLA Process for FUSRAP

Pre-Investigation Phase
- Site Referral (USDOE)
  - Preliminary Assessment
  - Site Inspection
  - Site Designation

Investigation Phase
- Remedial Investigation
  - Feasibility Study
  - Proposed Plan
  - Record of Decision

Remedial Action Phase
- Remedial Design
  - Remedial Action
  - Project Completion
  - Legacy Management (USDOE)

CERCLA - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
NFSS and IWCS Location

- Lake Ontario Ordnance Works
- Niagara Falls Storage Site
- Interim Waste Containment Structure
The LOOW Site Today
Aerial photograph of the Developed Area

Interim Waste Containment Structure
NFSS Operable Units

- Interim Waste Containment Structure (IWCS)
- Balance of Plant
- Groundwater (underlies site)
Niagara Falls Storage Site
Manhattan Engineer District (MED) Waste Streams

Belgian Congo and Other Sources 1940s

Uranium Ore (Uranium, Radium, Thorium)

Uranium Ore Processing Wastes
Niagara Falls Storage Site
Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) Waste Streams

Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Schenectady, NY
(Cesium, Plutonium)

Lab debris & animal remains from radiological testing
(Plutonium, Strontium)
NFSS Interim Waste Containment Structure
Historical Photo (1944) Showing Site of IWCS
(Constructed by USDOE 1982-1985)
Placement of Wastes into the IWCS

IWCS area prior to construction (circa 1970s)

- R-10 Residues
- Buildings 413 and 414
- Building 411

K-65 residues

Other residues

R-10 residue and other contaminated soil

Cutoff Wall
Cut-off Walls Under Construction

Clay Dike/Cut-off Wall

IWCS Cover
(Soil, Grass)
(Clay)

Brown Clay

Gray Clay

Building 414
Bay A

K-65 Residues
Other Residues
Other Contaminated Soil

~1983
IWCS Operable Unit

Preferred Alternative Selection
IWCS Subunits

Subunit A
K-65, F-32, L-30, and L-50 Residues

Subunit B
Rubble/Debris and Contaminated Soils

Subunit C
R-10 Residues and Contaminated Soils
Remedial Alternatives

1. No Action - (screened out)

2. Enhanced Containment of Subunits A, B, and C with Land-use Controls and Monitoring

3A Excavation, Treatment, and Off-site Disposal of Subunit A; Enhanced Containment of Subunits B and C with Land-use Controls and Monitoring

3B Excavation, Treatment, and Off-site Disposal of Subunit A; Excavation and Off-site Disposal of Subunit B; Enhanced Containment of Subunit C with Land-use Controls and Monitoring

4. Excavation, treatment, and off-site disposal of Subunit A; excavation and off-site disposal of Subunits B and C
## Comparative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERCLA Balancing Criteria</th>
<th>Alt 2: Enhanced Containment</th>
<th>Alt 3A: Partial Excavation (Subunit A only)</th>
<th>Alt 3B: Partial Excavation (Subunits A and B only)</th>
<th>Alt 4: Complete Excavation (Subunits A, B and C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Effectiveness &amp; Permanence</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume through Treatment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Effectiveness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Capital</td>
<td>$23.4M</td>
<td>$259.6M</td>
<td>$318.4M</td>
<td>$490.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (O&amp;M* Discounted)</td>
<td>$44.0M</td>
<td>$44.0M</td>
<td>$44.0M</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$67.4M</td>
<td>$303.6M</td>
<td>$362.4M</td>
<td>$490.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - O&M costs are assumed for a period of 1,000 years and are discounted.
Preferred Alternative - Alternative 4: Excavation, Treatment, and Off-Site Disposal of Subunits A, B, and C

- Excavation, treatment, and off-site disposal of Subunits A, B, and C
- No five-year reviews or land-use controls for the IWCS Operable Unit
- Eliminates future operations and maintenance, environmental surveillance, and security costs associated with the IWCS Operable Unit
Primary IWCS Remedial Challenges

• Proximity to hypothetical receptors:
  • Lewiston-Porter Central School District, adjacent Landfill Workers, nearby Residents

• Waste Retrieval/Remote Handling
  • Physical Location of Residues
  • Dose/Radon Emanation (primarily from K-65 residues)

• Transportation/Disposal
  • Meeting DOT dose limits and WAC (due to radium in K-65 residues)
  • 11e.(2) byproduct designation of residue material – Water Development Appropriations Act of 2004
  • Potential for detectable concentrations of SNM (KAPL/U of R)
NFSS Path Forward

- Remedial Investigation (2007 and 2011)
- Feasibility Study (2015)
- Proposed Plan (2015)
- Record of Decision (2018)
- Site-Wide Remedial Design/Remedial Action (TBD)
- IWCS Operable Unit
- Balance of Plant/Groundwater Operable Units
- Feasibility Study (2019)
- Proposed Plan (2021)
- Record of Decision (2023)
- Site-Wide Close-Out (TBD)
- Transfer Site to DOE (TBD)

Public and agency input throughout process
Tonawanda Landfill Vicinity Property Timeline

Pre-Investigation Phase

1930s - 1989 Operating Landfill

1990 Preliminary Assessment

1991 Site Inspection

1992 Site Designation

Investigation Phase

2005 Remedial Investigation

2007 Proposed Plan

2008 Mudflats OU Record of Decision

2009-2011 Landfill OU Remedial Investigation

2012 Landfill OU Baseline Risk Assessment

2015 Landfill OU Feasibility Study & Proposed Plan

2017 Landfill OU Record of Decision
Soil Sampling in the Landfill OU

- Soil sample location above preliminary remediation goals
- Soil sample location below preliminary remediation goals
Remedial Alternatives

1. No Action - (screened out)
2. Single-layer Capping of FUSRAP-related Material
3. Targeted Shallow Removal and Off-site Disposal of FUSRAP-related Material
4. Deep Excavation and Off-site Disposal of FUSRAP-related Material
Alternative 4: Deep Excavation and Off-site Disposal of FUSRAP-related Material
Alternative 4: Deep Excavation and Off-site Disposal of FUSRAP-related Material
Alternative 3: Targeted Shallow Removal and Off-site Disposal of FUSRAP-related Material
Alternative 3: Targeted Shallow Removal and Off-site Disposal of FUSRAP-related Material
Selected Alternative
Alternative 3: Targeted Shallow Removal with Off-site Disposal of FUSRAP-related Material
## Comparative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume Through Treatment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Effectiveness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementability</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost (Present Worth)</td>
<td>$10.6 Million</td>
<td>$12.2 Million</td>
<td>$55.4 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Buffalo River Cleanup

Brian Murphy
Anchor QEA
Katherine Winkler
Buffalo Niagara Waterkeeper
Buffalo River Area of Concern Dredging and Habitat Restoration

May 10, 2018

Katherine Winkler, Buffalo Niagara Waterkeeper
Brian Murphy, Anchor QEA
Pre settlement:

“an uninhabited marsh, infested with mosquitos” 
Bingham, 1931

“the site for temporary Indian hunting and fishing camps” “a wealthy source of food but not desirable for settlement” Laux, 1960

1758 – establishment of a trading post at the mouth of the River – settlement begins.

“A view of the Lake and Fort Erie, from Buffalo Creek.” 1810. Edward Walsh.
The villagers took it upon themselves to dredge the harbor and construct a pier.

In 1821, Buffalo was selected as the terminus.
The foot of Main Street at around the 1890's

Aerial view of the Foot of Main St, circa 1850’s.

Buffalo ranked as the nation’s eighth-largest city by 1900, with 352,000 residents.
Buffalo Color Corporation
City Ship Canal
Katherine St Peninsula
Republic Steel
Economic growth through the 1950s.
Buffalo Color Corporation
Katherine St Peninsula

Buffalo Color Corporation

Republic Steel

Copyright 2013 James Cavanaugh
Buffalo River Restoration Partnership

- A unique public-private-non-profit partnership, including U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper® and Honeywell.

- Goal is to address a number of environmental problems affecting the Buffalo River including contaminated river sediments, poor water quality, a lack of safe public access, and insufficient fish and wildlife habitat.
BUFFALO RIVER CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS-
ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING FEASIBILITY STUDY OVERVIEW

**Completed Projects**
- Buffalo River Environmental Dredging Reconnaissance Report ‘03
  - USACE-Section 312 ~$150,000

**Ongoing Projects**
- Buffalo River Environmental Dredging Feasibility Cost Share Agreement
  - USACE-Section 312 & Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper $2.1 million

**Pending Projects**
- Assessment of Potential Aquatic Habitat Restoration Sites
  - Riverkeeper, BSC & YSU $168,000 *Not part of local match*

**Future Projects**
- Bioaccumulation Study of the Buffalo River
  - USACE Section 401, WRDA ’90 $70,000 *Not part of local match*

- Sediment Trend Analysis and Hydrodynamic Modeling
  - UB, Buffalo State, and USACE Section 516 $180,000 *Not part of local match*

**Cost & Volume Estimates for FS**
- USEPA-GLNPO Discretionary Funding Subcontract #1 to Tetra Tech for $50,000

- Upper River Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for FS
  - USEPA-GLNPO Discretionary Funding Subcontract #2 to SulTRAC for $150,000

**Remedial Design**
- Overmatch from new GLLA agreement
- Great Lakes Legacy Act and/or USACE Section 312 plus local match
- Estimated Cost ~$60-$100 million

**LOWER RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING &**

- NYSDEC Sediment Sampling of the Upper Buffalo River
  - $718,000 *Portion of local match*

- Bioaccumulation Study of the Buffalo River
  - USACE Section 401, WRDA ’90 $70,000 *Not part of local match*

- Sediment Trend Analysis and Hydrodynamic Modeling
  - UB, Buffalo State, and USACE Section 516 $180,000 *Not part of local match*

- NYSDEC Sediment Sampling of the Upper Buffalo River
  - $718,000 *Portion of local match*

**Remedial Design**
- Overmatch from new GLLA agreement
- Great Lakes Legacy Act and/or USACE Section 312 plus local match
- Estimated Cost ~$60-$100 million

**USACE FS Suspended in 2005 due to lack of 312 funding; Project taken over by USEPA-GLNPO.
  *FY-2008 authorization of ~$225,000. Corps continues work on 312 project.*

**Merged Upper and Lower RI/FS via March 9, 2007 Great Lakes Legacy Act Agreement. September 2008 modify GLLA to include Honeywell as additional non-federal sponsor.
  New Total Project Cost: ~$3 million**

**Remedial Design**
- Overmatch from new GLLA agreement
- Great Lakes Legacy Act and/or USACE Section 312 plus local match
- Estimated Cost ~$60-$100 million

**LOWER RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING &**

- NYSDEC Sediment Sampling of the Lower Buffalo River
  - Completed June 2007 $350,000 *Portion of local match*

**Completion of the Remedial Alt. Analysis**
- ~$100-150K – GLNPO Discretionary Funds Committed for Fall 2007

- Cost & Volume Estimates for FS
  - USEPA-GLNPO Discretionary Funding Subcontract #1 to Tetra Tech for $50,000

- Upper River Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for FS
  - USEPA-GLNPO Discretionary Funding Subcontract #2 to SulTRAC for $150,000

**Remedial Design**
- Overmatch from new GLLA agreement
- Great Lakes Legacy Act and/or USACE Section 312 plus local match
- Estimated Cost ~$60-$100 million

**LOWER RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING &**

- NYSDEC Sediment Sampling of the Lower Buffalo River
  - Completed June 2007 $350,000 *Portion of local match*

- Bioaccumulation Study of the Buffalo River
  - USACE Section 401, WRDA ’90 $70,000 *Not part of local match*

- Sediment Trend Analysis and Hydrodynamic Modeling
  - UB, Buffalo State, and USACE Section 516 $180,000 *Not part of local match*
Site Location - Buffalo River AOC
Buffalo River Site Characterization

Chemical Assessment
- Sediment geochemistry analysis
- Equilibrium partitioning evaluation
- PCOI analysis
- Water quality analysis
- Chemical/spatial distribution mapping
- Porewater chemical analysis

Biological Health & Integrity
- Sediment toxicity testing
- Benthic community assessment
- Chironomid mouthpart deformity assessment
- Fish community sampling
- Essential habitat assessment
- Aquatic vegetation survey
- Fish histopathology
- Laboratory bioaccumulation testing
- Fish tissue residue analysis

Physical Sediment Stability
- Hydrodynamic assessment & modeling
  - Geotechnical analysis
  - Bathymetric & topographic surveys
  - Water quality analysis
  - Water surface gauge monitoring
  - Sediment transport modeling
  - Sediment shear stress modeling
  - Ice jam Evaluation
  - River current profiling
  - Sediment coring
Sediment and Biological Sample Locations
Remedial Action Objectives

- **RAO 1**: Reduce human exposures for direct sediment contact and fish consumption from the Buffalo River by reducing the availability and/or concentration of COCs in sediments.

- **RAO 2**: Reduce the exposure of wildlife populations and the aquatic community to sediment COC concentrations that are above protective levels.

- **RAO 3**: Reduce or otherwise address legacy sediment chemical concentrations to improve the likelihood that future dredged sediments (for routine navigational, commercial, and recreational purposes) will not require confined disposal.

- **RAO 4**: Implement a remedy that is compatible with the Buffalo River Remedial Advisory Committee’s goal of protecting and restoring habitat and supporting wildlife.
Risk-Based Remedial Goals

- Site-specific risk-based remedial goals were developed for the four primary COCs using:
  - USACE 2005 Buffalo River toxicity testing results
  - NYSDEC and USEPA criteria for fish and wildlife tissue
  - Site-specific fish tissue data
  - Site-specific bioavailability results (AVS-SEM, pore water)
  - USEPA guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Remedial Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total PAHs</td>
<td>16 mg/kg (1 Toxicity Unit) in Surface Sediments (Depth of 0-1 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>0.44 mg/kg, Surface Weighted Average Concentration (SWAC)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>90 mg/kg, SWAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PCBs</td>
<td>0.20 mg/kg, SWAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SWACs are measured over 1/3-mile segments of the river
• Navigational channel dredging completed by USACE using GLRI funds

• Great Lakes Legacy Act Remedy
  • GLLA dredge volume = 470,000 CY
  • Sediment cap area = 6.6 acres

City Ship Canal
Overall Project Approach

- Combined efforts through GLRI and GLLA funding
- Initial phase of USACE navigational dredging
  - Removed impacted sediments within nav channel footprint
  - Increased target depth to aid project goals
- Secondary main project phase targeting legacy sediments outside typical navigation dredging extents
Critical Structures - Overview

• **21 Structures Designated as Critical Structures**
  • Located directly adjacent to DMUs
  • Structural failure could represent a danger to the contractor, public safety, or the river
  • Structures include grain elevators, warehouses, bridges and confined disposal structures

• **Coordinated with Property Owners**
  • Dredging plans made available to owners
  • Owners performed structural analyses where possible
  • Coordinated owner recommendations and acceptance of dredge plans
Remedy Design – CDF Disposal

- Non-TSCA Sediment Disposal at USACE CDF #4
  - Confined disposal facility located in the outer Buffalo Harbor
  - Storage capacity of approximately 1,100,000 CY below mean lake level, additional 980,000 CY below outflow weir invert

![Disposal side](image1)

![Lake side](image2)

Figure 9-2. Cross-section of a confined disposal facility dike with a filter layer.
DMU 8b Contains Sediments Exceeding TSCA Criteria

- 2011 sampling added 129 samples to refine horizontal and vertical extents of TSCA and non-TSCA materials
- PCB concentrations range from 1.1 mg/kg to 1,200 mg/kg
Remedy Design - TSCA

- TSCA Material Handling
  - TSCA material transported to upland TSCA handling area for dewatering, stabilization and transport to an offsite TSCA permitted landfill
Ship Canal Sediment Cap

• Cap placed over 290,000 ft² of the end of the City Ship Canal
• Additional clean fill to create habitat elevations
Sampling and Monitoring

- Two Long-Term Monitoring Events Planned
  - Post-Remediation Interim Performance Monitoring – 2 Year Event
  - Post-Remediation Performance Monitoring – 5 Year Event
Habitat Restoration

- 5 Habitat Restoration Areas Selected
- Goal of Restoring, Enhancing, and Improving Existing Habitat
- Variety of Restoration Methods Applied
  - In-water backfill, rock vanes, anchored large woody debris/rootwads, porcupine cribs
Ship Canal Sediment Cap

- Cap placed over 290,000 ft² of the end of the City Ship Canal
- Additional clean fill to create habitat elevations
### Habitat Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restoration Area</th>
<th>Restoration Element</th>
<th>Element Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Street Peninsula</td>
<td>Rock Vanes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchored Rootwad Logs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Ship Canal</td>
<td>Gravel Spawning Bed</td>
<td>7000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchored Rootwad Logs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend</td>
<td>Rock Vanes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchored Rootwad Logs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Color Peninsula</td>
<td>Rock Vanes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchored Rootwad Logs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Habitat Plantings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restoration Area</th>
<th>Restoration Element</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Street Peninsula</td>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EV</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Ship Canal</td>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EV</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend</td>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EV</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Color Peninsula</td>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EV</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Street Shoreline</td>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EV</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?

Contact:

Katherine Winkler
Buffalo River Projects Manager
kwinkler@bnriverkeeper.org
FY 19 Opportunity Forecast and Small Business Discussion

Jeffrey Ernest
Chief of Contracting, Lakes Districts

Sherrie Plonski
Deputy Small Business

Buffalo & Pittsburgh Districts
Buffalo District Award Forecast – FY18

Presented by
Jeff Ernest
Chief of Contracting
Great Lakes Districts

716-879-4173
Jeffrey.G.Ernest@usace.army.mil
### FY17 Execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>FY 17 Actual ($K)</th>
<th>FY 17 Actual %</th>
<th>FY 17 Goal %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>54,780</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Disadvantaged</td>
<td>14,047</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Owned</td>
<td>4,938</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Zone</td>
<td>21,792</td>
<td>37.01%</td>
<td>26.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Disabled Vet</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Top Ranked District in USACE for % to SB FY15, FY16, and FY 17
- Missed Goal again for SDVOSBs
## LRD PROGRAM - LIFECYCLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Remedial Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linde, NY</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLDA, PA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckey, OH</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaway, NY</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonawanda LF, NY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harshaw, OH</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Remedial Action TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guterl, NY</td>
<td>FS/PP</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Remedial Action TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSS, NY - IWCS</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remedial Action TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSS, NY - BOP</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSS, NY - GW</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSS, NY - VP E, E', G</td>
<td>Awaiting Access</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSS, NY - VP H'</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior, PA</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joslyn, IN</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Investigation Phase** (RI = Remedial Investigation, FS = Feasibility Study, PP = Proposed Plan, R = Record of Decision)
- **Awaiting Funding / Contract Procurement**
- **Remedial Action / Cleanup Phase** (CA = Contract Award)
- **Closeout / Turn Back to USDOE** (CR = Closeout Report, TO = Turnover)
FUSRAP

► Town of Tonawanda Landfill
  • $5M - $10M Task Order
  • Likely using the LRL ERSC MATOC
    ▶ PARS-Gannett Fleming JV, Bay West, Cape Environmental Management, HGL, Plexus Scientific Corporation, Earth Resources Technology

Other Buffalo District Upcoming Opportunities (Over $150K)

► Numerous Dredging Projects
  • Sandusky, Conneaut, Maumee Bay, Maumee River, Cleveland
  • $500K+
Other Buffalo District Upcoming Opportunities, cont’d

- Harpersfield Dam – Geneva, OH
  - Prevent Sea Lamprey from entering the upper reaches of the Grand River
  - $1M - $5M, sealed bid, set aside status TBD

- Buffalo River CDF Repair
  - Dike Repair, Phase 4 ongoing work
  - $1M - $5M, sealed bid, SBSA

- Lake County Pump Station
  - Rehab/Repair
  - Possible FY 18, $1M - $5M, sealed bid, SBSA
Other Buffalo District Upcoming Opportunities, cont’d

- **New Wetlands Restoration and Related Projects SATOC**
  - Small SATOC for miscellaneous work throughout District footprint
  - $2M ceiling, SBSA, BV RFP anticipated

- **MMD Emergency Access Stairwell Rehab**
  - $250K - $500K, Strategy TBD, possible MATOC T.O.
OTHER DISTRICTS’ OPPORTUNITIES SAMPLING:

- New Dredging MATOC, Detroit District, FBO Code: W911XK Lakes Dredging
  - $1M - $5M, sealed bid, set aside status TBD

- Greenup Lock & Dam, Greenup KY, Huntington District, FBO Code: W91237
  - $1M - $5M, sealed bid, set aside status TBD

- Barkley Lock, Replace Electrical Operating System for Lock & Emergency Dam, Nashville District, FBO Code: W912P5
  - $1M - $5M, sealed bid, set aside status TBD

- Charleroi Lock & Dam Stilling Basin Extension, Pittsburgh District, FBO Code: W911WN
  - $10M - $25M, sealed bid, Full and Open Unrestricted
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UPCOMING OUTREACH EVENTS

- May 22, 2018, **Chicago District Vertical Construction Business Opportunities Open House**, Chicago IL

- June 6, 2018, **Louisville District Business Opportunities Open House**, Louisville KY

- August 23, 2018, **Dynamic Networking for Small Business (DYNET)**, Erie, hosted with Buffalo District and Northwest Commission PTAC (Joint Pittsburgh-Buffalo networking event), [www.dynetworking.com](http://www.dynetworking.com)
UPCOMING OUTREACH EVENTS, cont’d

- **May 22, 2018**, **Chicago District Vertical Construction Business Opportunities Open House**, Chicago IL

- **June 6, 2018**, **Louisville District Business Opportunities Open House**, Louisville KY
  Session 1  0:930 – 12:00: [https://einvitations.afit.edu/inv/index.cfm?i=390922&k=016842007955](https://einvitations.afit.edu/inv/index.cfm?i=390922&k=016842007955)
  Session 2  1:00 – 3:00pm: [https://einvitations.afit.edu/inv/index.cfm?i=392957&k=016840007E50](https://einvitations.afit.edu/inv/index.cfm?i=392957&k=016840007E50)

- **August 23, 2018**, **Dynamic Networking for Small Business (DYNET)**, Erie, hosted with Buffalo District and Northwest Commission PTAC (Joint Pittsburgh-Buffalo networking event), Find out more: [www.dynetworking.com](http://www.dynetworking.com)
UPCOMING OUTREACH EVENTS, cont’d


- Other events
  
  - 31 Oct – 2 Nov 2018, National Veteran’s Small Business Engagement & Federal Small Business Engagement (formerly the S.A.M.E Small Business Conference), New Orleans, LA. NEW FOR 2018 This event is now combined with the VA’s National Veteran’s Engagement event at the same time and place. More to come on the SAME website as it becomes updated. [http://www.samesbc.org/](http://www.samesbc.org/)

    - Expects 5,000 attendees!
News you can use...

New DOD Class Deviations

NOTES ON DEVIATIONS – Deviation is published when “they” want to get it out there for use before the FAR/DFARS/AFARS, etc. case is finalized and actually promulgated into the regulations. This happens sometimes with NDAA type items.

Some agencies publish to their lower-tier agencies with specific instructions, so not always implemented immediately regardless of what the Deviation says. (This is sometimes true of Dept. of Defense…) Be cognizant to whom the deviation applies and expect a short delay in implementation.
New DOD Class Deviations

- Enhanced Debriefing Procedures, 2018 NDAA, March 22, 2018, Class Deviation 2018-O0011
  - Effective immediately. **APPLIES TO DOD AGENCIES ONLY**
  - In addition to content published in the 2016 or 2012 DOD Source Selection Guide, Appendix A, as applicable.
  - Additional debriefing rights
    - Unsuccessful offerors have right to submit additional questions within 2 business days following their debriefing; agency has 5 business days to respond in writing to the questions
    - Debriefing is held open until agency responds.
    - Does not alter the type of information permitted to be disclosed during debriefing.
New DOD Class Deviations

- Enhanced Debriefing Procedures, cont’d
  - Changes the timeline for automatic stay of performance (FAR 33.104(c))
    - If protest is filed at GAO within 5 days after agency delivers its written response additional questions submitted by unsuccessful offerors OR
    - On the prior timeline of 10 days after the date of award or 5 days of a required debriefing, if no additional questions are submitted.

  - Substitutes DFARS 252.219-7003 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (DoD Contracts) – Basic and Alt’s
  - Changes to whom the subcontracting plan reports are submitted
Small Business Subcontract Reporting, Cont’d

► Substitutes DFARS 252.219-7003 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (DoD Contracts) – and changes portions of Basic and Alt’s I & II of 52.219-9 clause.

► Subcontracting plan reports are submitted to -
  • ISR goes to KO at procuring agency, even if contract admin is DCMA
  • SSR goes to DOD (9700) and no lower.

► Authority to acknowledge receipt lies with –
  • ISR – contracting officer who receives the report in eSRS
  • SSR – SSR coordinator @ DOD level.
New DOD Class Deviations

- Small Business Subcontract Reporting, Cont’d
  - Changes portions of basic clause for Alt III - for task & delivery orders against IDIQ’s.
    - eSRS is not set up to take electronic ISR for task orders – directs the submission of the SF 294 Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts outside of eSRS.
    - Individual Subcontracting plan reports are submitted to -
      - SF 294 submitted IAW instructions on the form. Typically the procuring contracting officer. SSR goes to DOD (9700) and no lower USING eSRS.
    - Authority to acknowledge receipt lies with –
      - SF 294 contracting officer who receives the report based on instructions contained for submission of the form.
      - SSR – SSR coordinator @ DOD level using eSRS.
New DOD Class Deviations

- Small Business Subcontract Reporting, Cont’d
  - Changes portions of basic clause for Alt IV. When incorporating a subcontracting plan when doing a modification to an existing T.O. (e.g. T.O. goes over the threshold requiring a subcontracting plan)
    - Sets forth the content requirements of the Plan (15 elements and subelements)
    - Still do the SF 294 Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts outside of eSRS.
    - Individual Subcontracting plan reports are submitted to -
      - SF 294 the procuring contracting officer of the contract.
      - Assume the SSR goes to DOD (9700) and no lower USING eSRS.
New DOD Class Deviations

Micro-purchase Threshold, Simplified Acquisition
threshold, and Special Emergency Procurement
Authority – Class Deviation 2018-O0013, April 13, 2018

- Applies to DOD acquisitions of supplies & services
  funded by DOD Appropriations ONLY.

- DOES NOT APPLY TO USACE CIVIL WORKS FUNDS.
  - May not apply to other DOD agencies as well if they do not use
    DOD appropriations. Do not assume.
  - Impacts FAR/DFAR etc clauses that reference the thresholds by
    name (e.g. SAT, Micro-purchase Threshold, Contingency
    Operations)
  - Various threshold changes. Micro-purchase goes to $5K – but
    not for USACE Civil Works
New DOD Class Deviations

- Micro-purchase Threshold, Simplified Acquisition threshold, and Special Emergency Procurement Authority, cont’d

- Various threshold changes.
  - Micro-purchase goes to $5K – but not for USACE Civil Works. Higher for contingency operations as specified in the deviation.
  - Simplified Acquisition Threshold goes to $250K – but not for USACE Civil Works. Higher for contingency operations also.
  - USACE CIVIL WORKS will not be able to take advantage of the changes until the FAR is completely updated officially. (Who knows when that will be?)
  - This could get confusing when replying to a solicitation or performing a contract that has clauses referencing requirements at or above SAT…Know your agency and if it applies to them.
OTHER TIDBITS

▪ How do we assign NAICS CODES to procurements?
  ▶ NAICS assigned must be **closest description** to the work being done or the item being bought.
  ▶ Official website is https://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/
    • Keyword search or NAICS group/code if known
    • Data returned gives illustrative examples, and exceptions.
    • Must cross reference to the SBA’s Table of Size Standards. Contains footnotes – must read them.
    • Services go back to the manufacturing NAICS for the item.
    • NAICS 42, 44 & 45 are prohibited for use.
OTHER TIDBITS

- How do we assign NAICS CODES to procurements? cont’d
  
  ► If more than one NAICS might apply, SBA Regulations require agencies to assign the NAICS code that represents the highest dollars of the project. Often the case with service or construction projects.

  • Ex. A “Facilities Maintenance” scope of work might consist of Groundskeeping and Janitorial services. If Groundskeeping is the majority of the tasks/dollars, NAICS for groundskeeping must be assigned.

  • Not to be confused with Facilities Maintenance NAICS 561210 which encompasses a whole lot of NAICS and other business lines together...used when an agency is privatizing everything.
How do we assign NAICS CODES to procurements? cont’d

► Doesn’t matter what the “Title” of the project is – it’s the underlying work.
  • Ex. Dredging is dredging. Doesn’t matter if it’s called “environmental dredging” – the NAICS is 237990*

  ▶ * size standard is LOWER than regular 237990.
  ▶ Dredging only falls in the description for 237990, not any type of environmental remediation (562910), which covers mostly land-based activities and water treatment.
■ QUESTIONS?
Sponsors!
Thank you!