# *U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS*
# *REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES*

**CHICAGO, ILLINOIS**
**AUGUST 2, 2000**

Views, opinions, and/or 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.

August 2000

# *U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS*
# *REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES*

## CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
## AUGUST 2, 2000

by

Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.
6352 South U.S. Highway 51
P.O. Box 1316
Carbondale, IL 62903
(618) 549-2832

A Report Submitted to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3868

under

Task Order #25
Contract No. DACW72-99-D-0005

August 2000

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regional Listening Sessions Meeting Notes – Chicago, Illinois ..... 1
Welcoming Remarks..... 1
Session Objectives ..... 2
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion) ..... 4
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion) ..... 9
Challenge H. - Commercial Navigation Improvements and JJ. - Locks and Dams are Getting Old and Need Replacing ..... 10
Challenge J. - Flood Control (Flood Damage Reduction) ..... 11
Challenge A. - Better National Coordination with Regional Solutions and EE. - Concerted (Greater) Regional Vision for the Great Lakes ..... 11
Challenge K. - Streamline the Time it Takes to Move a Project from Inception to Construction..... 12
Challenge HH. - Improved Partnerships and Shared Decision Making Processes ..... 12
Challenge II. – Thinking Beyond Waterways Toward Watersheds (Stewardship) ..... 13
Closing Remarks and Adjournment ..... 14

Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges ..... A-1

Appendix B Submitted Public Statement and Materials .....B-1

# REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

*The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Chicago, Illinois on August 2, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected Appendices are provided in this document.*

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As a steward of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has begun a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps is conducting 14 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and November of 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about pressing water resources problems, opportunities, and needs impacting their lives, communities, and future sustainability. This dialogue is an integral part of the Corps' strategic planning process.

The cities where Listening Sessions are being conducted include St. Louis, MO, Sacramento, CA, Phoenix, AZ, Woburn, MA, Atlanta, GA, Omaha, NE, Honolulu, HI, Chicago, IL, Louisville, KY, Dallas, TX, Williamsburg, VA, New Brunswick, NJ, Anchorage, AK, and Vancouver, WA.

This report summarizes the Chicago, Illinois, listening session. This session, hosted by the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, was conducted on August 2, 2000 at the Radisson Hotel O'Hare in Rosemont, Illinois. Forty-seven people attended this meeting to share their views with the Corps.

The information collected from the Listening Sessions will be incorporated into a report assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. This report will be shared with key decision-makers within the Army and Congress to help inform their discussions about water resources issues and future investment decisions. Additionally, the report will provide a point of departure for ensuing discussions with other Federal agencies to identify common water resources issues and missions most appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the Federal government. The information will also be incorporated into a revision of the Civil Works Program Strategic Plan.

## Welcoming Remarks

Colonel Mark A. Roncoli, the recently appointed Chicago District Engineer of U.S. Army Engineer District-Chicago, welcomed the audience to the Listening Session. The Chicago District is part of the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, USACE. Colonel Roncoli also introduced other District Engineers participating in the Listening Session: Lieutenant Colonel

Richard Polo, District Engineer, Detroit District and Lieutenant Colonel Glen DeWillie, District Engineer, Buffalo District.

Colonel Roncoli indicated that the purpose of this Listening Session is to get a better understanding of the nation's water resources needs. Colonel Roncoli highlighted the four banners at the front of the room entitled "America's Water Resources Challenges for the 21st Century" and the corresponding brochure. The banners and the brochure identify six water resource challenges that the Corps believes are critical issues for the 21st century. Therefore, these are 6 issue areas that could warrant further discussion and can be used as a starting point for discussions.

Colonel Roncoli stated that the Listening Session has not been convened to validate the Corps' initial thoughts. Rather, the Corps is conducting this Listening Session to hear what's important to the stakeholders (i.e., the participants of the Listening Session meeting). We are not here to "grow the Corps program or budget," but here to listen to issues related to water. These are "your rivers, your water, your environment, and your priorities." The results of this meeting will be compiled into a report. The report will be used to refine the water resource challenges and identify gaps in the water resource needs. The report will be available to both stakeholders and to decision-makers. Therefore, it is important to know "What are your thoughts regarding key issues facing our nation's water resources?"

Then, Colonel Roncoli turned the floor over to Mr. Jim Creighton, the Listening Session facilitator and representative of the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.

## Session Objectives

Mr. Creighton introduced himself to the audience and began by saying that the meeting was intended to be an interactive dialogue between the Corps and the public stakeholders, as well as among the stakeholders themselves. Mr. Creighton introduced Ms. Eva Opitz, the session recorder, who would be responsible for compiling a written report of the meeting. Mr. Creighton also introduced Corps staff from the Institute for Water Resources, Mr. Mark Gmitro and Ms. Donna Ayres, who would be assisting the facilitation team during the session. He also requested that any written statements from the audience be presented to the session recorder, who would include them in the written report of the meeting.[1] The audience was also invited to provide written statements in electronic form via e-mail to the Corps for inclusion in the meeting report.

Mr. Creighton noted that written summaries of each Regional Listening Session would be posted on the Corps web site (http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/challenges), and that concerns and issues raised at each Listening Session would be summarized into a single report on national water resources needs.

Mr. Creighton then proceeded to discuss the structure of the day's Listening Session. He outlined the issues he wanted the audience to consider during the day's discussions:

[1] The written statements submitted at the August 2, 2000 listening session are included as Appendix B.

1. What are the key water resources challenges facing this region? (These are needs, problems, opportunities, etc. that if not addressed will negatively impact our prosperity, quality of life, and environmental sustainability)?

2. Why is it a problem? What impact is the problem already having or is it likely to have on our prosperity, quality of life, and environmental sustainability.

3. What actions should we take to respond to the challenge? What should be done about the problem?

4. Who should take these actions? What should the Federal government do to help address the problem? What can you and the organization that you represent do?

Mr. Creighton explained that the first two questions would be discussed during the first small group discussions, and the latter two questions would be discussed after all of the challenges had been identified. Mr. Creighton then outlined the meeting agenda with the participants. Although the agenda would serve as a general guide to the day's activities, the agenda could be modified at the facilitator's discretion as appropriate for the particular audience. The agenda was presented as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 10:00 -10:25 | Welcome |
| 10:25 - 10:45 | Overview of Workshop |
| 10:45 - 11:40 | Table talk sessions |
| 11:40 - 12:25 | Large group discussion (plenary) |
| 12:25 - 12:30 | Dot voting |
| 12:30 - 1:30 | Lunch |
| 1:30 - 2:45 | Small group discussion |
| 2:45 - 3:00 | Break |
| 3:00 - 3:45 | Large group discussion |
| 3:45 - 4:00 | Closing remarks |
| 4:00 - 5:00 | Informal discussions |

In order to develop the audience's ideas, Mr. Creighton explained that the Listening Session would involve a mix of small group discussions and large group reporting sessions. Rather than allow people to make speeches, the purpose of this format would be to hear all of the participants' ideas. Mr. Creighton advised the participants that if they had questions about a specific Corps project, they should speak with Ms. Lynne E. Whelan, a Corps Public Affairs Officer present at the meeting.

Mr. Creighton then explained the format of the Listening Session in more detail. To begin with, the audience was asked to fill in a few of the tables, which grouped the audience into 8 tables of approximately six to nine people per table. The participants at each table were asked to introduce themselves to one another and were instructed to elect a spokesperson for the table. In keeping with the theme of "listening" to the public, the Corps members who joined each table were instructed by the facilitator not to serve as spokespersons, although they would be allowed to take notes for the group if so asked by the other participants at the table.

The following instructions were shown on an overhead projector for guidance:

1. Select a spokesperson.

2. Identify water challenges that are of interest to you and write each one on the top part of a yellow sticky. Challenges are water resource needs, issues, problems, or opportunities.

3. Discuss why they are important to you. Write down the results of your discussion or your own opinion(s) on the bottom part of the yellow stickies.

4. Give a report to the large group.

The participants were asked to spend a few minutes to silently generate their own thoughts about ideas and challenges and why the challenges are important to them. After some quiet time, then the participants should go around the table and get one idea from each person. Then, the tables could have a free forum discussion. The participants were directed to discuss the challenges of importance to them, as well as the six challenges identified by the Corps. After the groups had sufficient time to develop their ideas, the spokesperson for each table would report out to the entire audience a succinct statement of each of the challenges that were identified at their table. These challenges would be recorded by a Corps staff member and projected onto a screen for everyone in the room to see. At the same time, other Corps members would write each challenge on a sheet of butcher paper, which would then be taped to a wall in the room.

Mr. Creighton explained that, while all of the concerns identified by the audience are important to the Corps, it would not be possible to discuss every one of them in detail. Therefore, each participant would receive five adhesive dots to affix to the challenges that concern them the most. In this way, the audience would vote for the issues of most importance to the group, which would then be discussed in more detail in the second round of table discussions.

After the votes had been counted and the challenges prioritized, in the afternoon session, the participants would gather around the challenges which interest them the most in order to develop "action items" to address these challenges. These action items would also be reported out to the entire audience. At the conclusion of the Listening Session, participants were welcome to linger and discuss their ideas or concerns with the Corps personnel in an informal setting.

## Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion)

After approximately one hour of group discussions at the tables, Mr. Creighton asked the spokespersons from the eight tables to take turns reporting each of the challenges that were identified at their table. Mr. Creighton asked that only one issue per table be reported during the first round, then he would go around to all the tables again as time permitted to capture

additional challenges identified by each table. Mr. Creighton also emphasized that, in order to avoid duplication and save time, once a challenge was reported out by one group, the other groups should not repeat that particular challenge. The participants identified 39 unique challenges, which are listed below:

A. Better national coordination with regional solutions.

B. Jetties.

C. National policy being applied to great lakes may not apply anymore.

D. What are the physical models and economic models? Do existing models still work?

E. Dredging vs. Restoration.
- What is the definition of sediment? Is it silt or is it more than that?

F. Commercial needs of smaller ports on the Great Lakes vs. U.S. Coastal ports.
- All the attention in the past has been paid to coastal ports (NY, NJ)-- What about us?

G. Exotic species (e.g., zebra mussels).
- Related to infrastructure problems, fisheries, permitting issues.
- National issue not just a state issue.

H. Commercial navigation improvements.
- The Nation's waterways are important enough to be continually improved. For example, on the St. Lawrence system, the Corps needs to retrofit the system to be economically viable. The Corps needs a role in improving this system. Other important issues:
  1. Need to do serious analysis of volume and business patterns and the effect it has on demand for trade lanes.
  2. Self-examination of Corps: Does the Corps perform spontaneous or continuous analysis of needs? Why preserve all of the pieces?
  3. Specify minimum project depth of harbors.

I. Water quality--bacterial contamination of waters.
- Urban rivers and coastal waters.
- Better understanding of causes of bacterial contamination of near coastal waters.
- What is the source? How do we get rid of it?

J. Flood control (greater level of service being demanded; dysfunctional cooperation among agencies; manner in which wetland restoration being used for flood control).
- Urban flooding vs. stream flooding.

K. Streamline the time it takes to move a project from inception to completion.
- Time is a barrier for non-Federal sponsors, demand for need and actual construction is disjointed.

L. Need for improved dissemination of new technologies in Corps projects.
- Public is not getting enough information on all alternatives.

M. Corps not responsive to requests for information.
- Don't know who to talk to.
- Lack of response between Corps and other agencies (need an ombudsman).

N. Halt the destruction of Great Lakes beaches with special focus on dune protection.
- Need is becoming urgent; sand moving out to the lake; need to maintain some level of sand to maintain some protection of the lake.
- Sand is for protection of beaches (recreation, aesthetics).

O. Expedite permitting process.

P. Education in schools on water issues.
- Long-term, not crisis-oriented.
- Issue of asset management, water education, in school curriculum.

Q. Nonstructural and environmental flood control approaches.

R. Corps needs to have a consistent message, approach, focus, and balance.
- Civil Corps vs. Building Corps vs. Regulatory Corps vs. Contractor Corps.

S. Corps to develop new policies for changing uses of waterways (particularly recreation).

T. Mitigation policy for wetlands.
- Imbalance of policy.

U. Enforcement responsibilities for 404 permits and Section 10.
- If Corps does not have money for enforcement, quit issuing permits.
- No more permits until enforcement staffing is adequate.

V. More research on beneficial uses of dredging materials.

W. National clearinghouse for information and data.
- People are not aware of research underway and completed.
- Good information is available, but not being disseminated.

X. Better manage diversion of water so we can maximize use of drinking water.
- Communities could use Great Lakes water, but cannot get it because of allocation formula.

Y. Stream conveyance.
- Improved maintenance of stream conveyance system through ecologically-sound methods.

Z. Combined sewer overflows.
- Storm water runoff and sewage combined to go to wastewater treatment.
- Sewage back up into rivers and people's homes – too long to rectify problem when identified.

AA. Pollution in general.
- Use of nontoxic materials during operations and maintenance.
- Toxic issues.

BB. Cut costs by rewriting dredging disposal regulations.
- Need interagency coordinations.

CC. Promote alternatives to large scale retention basins.

DD. Impact of highway construction and road repair on water quality.
- Promote utilization of Best Management Practices (BMPs) among agencies.

EE. Concerted (greater) regional vision for the Great Lakes.

FF. Multiobjective planning approaches for shoreline and streambank restorations.

GG. Streamlining of procedures must balance commercial and environmental interests.

HH. Improve partnerships and shared decision-making processes (multiple players working on project).
- Clearly articulate relationship with project sponsors.
- Who has ownership?

II. Thinking beyond waterways toward watersheds (stewardship).

JJ. Locks and dams are getting old and need replacing.

KK. Water supply (potable demands).

LL. Use of containers from overseas on internal waterways (Great Lakes and rivers).

MM. Water diversions vs. water withdrawals in the Great Lakes.

After the group spokespersons had finished reporting out the challenges identified at their tables, Mr. Creighton asked the audience members to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots, in order to identify those challenges that were of most concern to the group. Each non-Corps workshop participant then took five dots and affixed them on the butcher pad beside the

challenge or challenges of most interest to him or her. The five dots could be distributed in any way the individual saw fit, such as one dot per challenge or all five dots on a single challenge.

In addition to the dot voting, Mr. Creighton encouraged the participants to further elaborate on any of the specified challenges by completing the yellow self-adhesive stickies identifying a specific challenge and specifying why the need is important. This allowed individual participants to voice their concerns, ideas, or comments regarding the water resource challenges identified by the audience. The yellow self-adhesive stickies could then be placed on the butcher pad listing a specific challenge. These comments have been transcribed in a table and are included as Appendix A.[2]

During the lunch break, the facilitation team then tallied the results of the dot voting, and the dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 14 | N | 3 | AA | 6 |
| B | 7 | O | 1 | BB | 1 |
| C | 1 | P | 4 | CC | 2 |
| D | 8 | Q | 8 | DD | 0 |
| E | 0 | R | 2 | EE | 12 |
| F | 2 | S | 2 | FF | 3 |
| G | 9 | T | 8 | GG | 1 |
| H | 31 | U | 6 | HH | 13 |
| I | 5 | V | 3 | II | 11 |
| J | 22 | W | 3 | JJ | 12 |
| K | 14 | X | 4 | KK | 0 |
| L | 1 | Y | 4 | LL | 3 |
| M | 4 | Z | 1 | MM | 1 |

The eight challenges receiving the most votes were:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H | (31) | Commercial navigation improvements |
| J | (22) | Flood control |
| A | (14) | Better national coordination with regional solutions |
| K | (14) | Streamline the time it takes to move a project from inception to construction |
| HH | (13) | Improved partnerships and shared decision making processes |
| EE | (12) | Concerted (greater) regional vision for the Great Lakes |
| JJ | (12) | Locks and dams are getting old and need replacing |
| II | (11) | Thinking beyond waterways toward watersheds (stewardship) |

Mr. Creighton also felt that Challenges H and JJ (combined vote of 43 dots), and A and EE (combined vote of 26 dots) could be combined for the afternoon discussions, due to their

[2] The authors of this report made every effort to accurately transcribe the handwritten comments from the "stickies" generated by the listening session participants; however, some comments may contain errors due to illegibility or incoherence of the original text.

similarity. These possible combinations were brought to the attention of the participants after the lunch break for their agreement.

## Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion)

After the lunch break, Mr. Creighton told the participants the results of the dot voting. He also recommended the combining of Challenges H and JJ and Challenges A and EE. There were no disagreements to the combinations. However, an issue was raised that the number of votes to Challenge H (commercial navigation improvements) and JJ (lock and dam aging infrastructure) (a combined vote of 43 dots) demonstrated that the audience of the Listening Session might have been heavily weighted toward "commercial interests" rather than "environmental interests." Mr. Creighton replied that the meeting had been open to all interests. However, another comment was made that because the Listening Session was conducted during the day during the workweek, private interests may have been less likely to be able to attend.

Mr. Creighton explained the meeting format for the remainder of the afternoon. He noted that the challenges that received the most votes were written on butcher pads positioned around the room (one challenge per butcher pad). The participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail two of the challenges that interested them by sitting at the table next to the appropriate butcher pad. Two back-to-back sessions of approximately 30 to 40 minutes each would be held; after the first discussion period, the participants were asked to get up, choose a different challenge, and begin a discussion at that table. In this way, participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail two challenges of particular concern to them.

Mr. Creighton had one Corps staff member stand next to each of the challenges written on the butcher pads, in order to record the ideas generated by the small group discussion on the respective challenge. The facilitator also asked for volunteers from the audience to report out the results of the afternoon discussions. Before commencing the first discussion period, Mr. Creighton instructed the audience to assume that they actually had the power to actually implement their ideas.

The following instructions were shown on an overhead projector for guidance and were reiterated by Mr. Creighton:

1. Select someone from your small group to be a spokesperson. A Corps person will record the main points on the easels.

2. Assume you have the authority to implement the changes you'd like to see. Discuss within your group:

    a. What actions would you take?
    b. Who should do it?
        i. Role of Federal government.
        ii. Role of state or local governments.

iii. Role of private individuals or organizations.

3. Agree on what the spokesperson will report out to full group.

Mr. Creighton asked the participants to very specifically respond to the two questions (i.e., What action or actions should be taken with respect to each challenge? and Who should take such action(s)?) It was also specified that at any time you feel the desire to write something down, use yellow stickies or tablets of paper to write down your thoughts. Then hand them to the notetakers or facilitator.

Following these instructions, the participants gravitated into groups around the butcher pads and began deliberating with others in their group. A fairly larger than average group congregated around the Commercial Navigation Challenge (combined H and JJ). There were no participants who chose to further address Challenge K ("streamlining the time it takes to move a project from inception to completion"). Therefore there were 5 group discussions. After about 40 minutes, Mr. Creighton asked the participants to move to a different table to discuss another challenge of importance to them. However, very few participants decided to move to another challenge and, therefore, continued to focus on discussion in their originally selected challenge. Following the second discussion period, Mr. Creighton asked the spokesperson for each challenge to report the results of the discussions for their respective challenges. The results of the discussions are provided below:[3]

### *Challenge H. - Commercial Navigation Improvements and JJ. - Locks and Dams are Getting Old and Need Replacing*

What Action Should be Taken?

1. 29½foot draft depth on Great Lakes and interconnecting channels (some members would like to see more discussion on this issue).
2. Deepen commercial harbors to 26 feet 3 inches.
3. Bring entire Great Lakes system (including Canada) to a minimum depth.
4. Implement draft Corps Upper Mississippi Navigation Study (i.e., improve Lock 19-26 and lower two locks on Illinois River).
5. Corps to reinstitute/update cost modeling/studies to support projects and economic/ environmental benefit-cost ratios (include environmental aspects).
6. Develop a comprehensive national system analysis to determine if economic benefits warrant analysis.
7. Twin the POE lock.
8. Modernize the Great Lakes system to accommodate containers (52-foot draft as in coastal).
9. Interconnect Great Lakes with inland transportation.

[3] The challenges are listed in the order of priority from the dot voting in the first group discussion, rather than in actual order of presentation.

Who Should Take Action?

1. Regarding the 29½ foot draft on the Great Lakes and interconnecting channels, the Federal government should fund it and build it from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) (current cost sharing is 65% Federal and 35% local).
2. Regarding bringing the entire Great Lakes system (including Canada) to a minimum depth, the role of state or local governments is to share costs.
3. Regarding the need to modernize the Great Lakes system, the role of private individuals or organizations is to assure economics justify the project; need input from various constituencies.
4. Regarding the improvement of efficiency of the Upper Mississippi Navigation System.
   a. The role of the Federal government is to modernize the locks between Locks 19 and 26 and the lower two locks on the Illinois River. The Federal government should fund 50 percent and build it.
   b. The users should fund 50 percent of the costs.
5. Regarding the Corps reinstituting/updating cost modeling/studies support projects, the Federal government should do it, with input from state/local/individuals/organizations. The states and private interest should be part of the review process.

One person in the group discussion on this topic had the issue of recognizing the relationship between supply and demand. This person felt that the group discussion was too focused on supply side issues, without any adequate discussion of demand side issues.

### *Challenge J. - Flood Control (Flood Damage Reduction)*

What Action Should be Taken? Who Should Take Action?

1. Corps should have greater role in educating public and other agencies on watershed issues.
2. Corps should be more accessible to the public.
3. Greater Federal oversight authority concerning watershed issues (local decision making is not taking care of issues adequately).

### *Challenge A. - Better National Coordination with Regional Solutions and EE. - Concerted (Greater) Regional Vision for the Great Lakes*

The group wrestled with concept of regional vision and coordination. Perhaps it exists and we don't recognize it. Regional vision should address the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes should be our regional vision. Identified issues:

1. Great Lakes are not getting their share of the national pie (more money goes out of Great Lake states than comes back).
2. The Heritage River Program can be used as a model to focus regional vision.
3. The vision consensus is hard to achieve.
4. Regional vision/coordination would:

a. Provide guidance and direction.
b. Assign responsibilities/roles.
c. Provide consistency.
d. Minimize competition of regional issues.
e. Help articulate common needs and objectives.
f. Need an advocate/champion.
g. Provide platform for prioritization and negotiation.
h. Provide menu for legislation.
i. Provide means to link local advocates/increase political clout.

Some examples of regional vision:

1. Great Lakes Commission "Declaration of Indiana" (example maritime organization that agreed to a set of common principles).
2. Environmental Protection Division's 5-year strategy.
3. Great Lakes Ecosystem Charter.
4. American Heritage Rivers.
5. Great Study of the Mississippi River.
6. Great Lakes Regional Waterways Management Forum.

What Action Should be Taken? Who Should Take Action?

1. Congress should establish Great Lakes Shoreline Caucus
2. The Caucus should:
   a. Establish regional vision statement (use existing visions).
   b. Establish regional "omnibus" legislation (packaged approach of legislation that addresses a number of issues).
   c. Articulate benefits of regional plan (economy, jobs, ecosystem, habitat improvements).
   d. Build coalition (local, users, and interuser summit).
   e. Develop business plan (dynamic).
   f. Use internet as an organizing mechanism.
3. All have a role to play.... none should be left out.

### *Challenge K. - Streamline the Time it Takes to Move a Project from Inception to Construction*

No one participated in a group discussion on this topic.

### *Challenge HH. - Improved Partnerships and Shared Decision Making Processes*

What Action Should be Taken? Who Should Take Action?

1. Explain Corps process (including expected timeframe).
2. Clarify roles (local, COE).
3. Clarify rules for sponsorship/partnership.

4. Show value added to state and locals.
5. Need greater Corps flexibility.
6. Need feedback to locals during study.
7. Need uniform application of policy.
8. Clarify Federal interest up front.
9. Review budget allocation process (capital vs. operations and maintenance).
10. Open up models and assumptions.
11. Need local input to strategically overview regional use and development.
12. Need better integration of non-Federal benefits/users.

Basic issues revolved around specifying the role of the partner. This depends on the type of project and whether the project is being pushed by the Corps or by a sponsor. What does it mean to be a partner? Is it one of advice; one of cost-sharing; or one of shared decision making? The amount of time it takes to bring project through to fruition is a detriment to partnership relationships. What needs to be done depends on role of partners.

The fact is that there is a problem (conflict) between projects that come from Corps versus projects that come from legislative mandates (e.g., WRDA 2000).

Bottom line is that the Corps needs to be more sensitive in communications with the local sponsor. The Corps should concentrate on issues that have national benefits. It was stated that the Corps should stay out of water supply issues and brownfields (based on the Corps historical mission).

### *Challenge II. – Thinking Beyond Waterways toward Watersheds (Stewardship)*

In order to balance costs and benefits that occur, it was recommended that various jurisdictions be united. Authorities should be granted so jurisdictions can enter into agreements; these authorities must also deal with state boundaries (e.g., IL/IN). One over-riding question is: How can the Federal government (i.e., Corps) more fully utilize the benefit of working on a watershed scale?

<u>What Action Should be Taken? Who Should Take Action?</u>

1. Eliminate source that causes continual need for dredging, through watershed planning (has roles for Federal, state, private).
2. Reinvigorate the watershed authority (Federal government role).
3. Increase funding for RAP authority (Federal government role).
4. Promote creation of multijurisdictional authorities (Federal and state roles).
5. Include (4) (above) as a non-Federal sponsor requirement (Federal government role).
6. Develop comprehensive education program to teach everyone about watersheds, specifically developers, engineers, and others about best management practices (Federal, state, and private roles).
7. Corps should examine how it evaluates project impacts to the public resources, both individually and cumulatively (Federal government role).
8. Preserve beaches through proper management (Federal, state, and private roles).

9. Do not view beaches as "bottom land" – beach has a purpose, just as do wetlands (Federal, state, and private roles).
10. Corps should provide resources to local communities to deal with local issues such as combined sewer overflows and other environmental infrastructure (Federal government role).
11. Liberalize, through "ability to pay" provisions, the non-Federal cost share requirement, including waiver (Federal government role).
12. Treat Great Lakes at same level of importance as other coasts (Federal government role).
13. Consider "bundling" of several authorities to promote watershed stewardship (Federal government role).
14. Level the playing field – hydro, freighters, land representation on control boards, who regulate lake levels (Federal government role). (There was some additional comment on this issue: One participant said that the International Joint Commission can only regulate lake levels by maybe 1 to 2 inches, but beyond that it is mother nature. However, another participant felt that there is more control of human activity than might be expected).
15. Send Section III Report to every community that has a jetty (Federal government role).
16. Study how best management practices in watersheds would reduce dredging (Federal government role).
17. Corps should examine the way it measures environmental impacts.

## Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Mr. Creighton asked the participants to complete and hand in a comment (evaluation) form before leaving the meeting.[4] He then invited the audience to remain in the room at the conclusion of the Listening Session and converse with the Corps staff, who would be available to talk with them in an informal setting. Mr. Creighton encouraged the participants to further elaborate on issues related to any of the specified challenges by completing the yellow self-adhesive stickies and then posting the stickie on the respective challenge. He reminded the participants to provide any written comments or statements brought with them to the session recorder. Any other comments could be submitted to the previously mentioned web site. He also indicated that the report on the day's Listening Session should be published in a couple of weeks.

Mr. Creighton then turned to Colonel Mark Roncoli to give the closing remarks. Colonel Roncoli gave special thanks to the facilitation team. He thanked the participants for coming and sharing thoughts about what the Corps should be doing and what the nation should be doing. He indicated that many of the thoughts that came out of today's session were likely to be similar to thoughts brought out in other regional sessions. Colonel Roncoli said that this is not the end of "listening." We (the Corps) are interested in listening on a continual basis. He indicated that there was a contact sheet provided by the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division and Districts (both Commanders and Public Affairs Officers). At the conclusion of his comments, Colonel

[4] In order to obtain feedback for internal use by the Corps on the effectiveness of the Listening Sessions, Corps personnel placed comment forms on each table for the participants to complete. Corps personnel collected these as the participants left the meeting.

Roncoli thanked the participants again for their participation and the Chicago, Illinois Listening Session was adjourned.

# APPENDIX A

# TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| **Challenge A** | | |
| **Better national coordination with regional solutions.** | | |
| 1 | Flood prevention/mitigation.<br>Avoid hazard zones (discourage development), | Prevent private property loss; prevent public and private costs of flooding; $ public costs of head engineering. |
| 2 | No integrated waterways management plan. | Commercial /Trade to double or triple in next 20 years, increased demand for economic development of city's ports by city planners, larger ships built. Not all progress plans are compatible. Need "systems" approach to ensure future integrity of waterways/infrastructure. |
| 3 | Wetland permitting.<br>Process not coordinated with state agencies (DNR, etc…). Permits issued without concurrence/issuance of state permit or certification. | Confuses applicants, frustrates applicants and state agency personnel. Leads to wetland violations and loss of state and federal agency credibility. |
| 4 | Non-point source pollution. | Greatest cause of water pollution/degradation due to nutrient loading, sedimentation. Reduces effectiveness of existing dams, etc… and leads to resource loss. |
| 5 | Coordinate programs. | Use most bang for the buck logic to do the smart work. |
| 6 | Fostering greater cooperation. | Using the American Heritage Rivers as a model to foster greater cooperation & regional planning for use, maintenance etc. of our waterways. |
| 7 | Make information easier for general public. | Frustration on public's part blames Corp for all problems. |
| **Challenge B** | | |
| **Jetties** | | |
| 8 | Jetties (and seawalls) | Poorly planned-they cause shoreline erosion, similar effects for streams and rivers. |
| 9 | Review computer models to upgrade source code assumptions in a PUBLIC way. | Models are failing to predict what actually is happening to the sand supply to down drift beaches. |
| 10 | Redesign jetties to let sand filter through down drift, to save the beaches. | 200 million cubic yards of sand are trapped at jetties on east coast of Lake Michigan. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| 11 | Make public, the computer estimate volume of sand losses at jetties for trapping, shoaling, dredging, river sediment. | Beachless, sandless shores are the result of false assumption. |
| **Challenge C** | | |
| **National policy being applied to great lakes may not apply anymore.** | | |
| | NO COMMENTS. | |
| **Challenge D** | | |
| **What are the physical models and economic models? Do existing models still work?** | | |
| 12 | COE economic models are flawed related to cost benefit analysis of commercial water way projects. | Models do not reflect "real world" needs of commercial navigation. |
| 13 | | Many of the same design principles of the 50's and 60's are still applied to today's more modern and re-designed shipping industry. |
| **Challenge E** | | |
| **Dredging vs. Restoration.** | | |
| 14 | Adequate funding for the locations and approval of sites to place dredge spoil. Adequate funding for dredge operation. | To keep navigable waterways operational as intended. Without timely dredging- delays are incurred, risk of groundings increase transportation costs increase due to lighter drafts. More cargo is forced to highway and rail. |
| 15 | Restoration of damage environment/prevention of future problems. | Systems are changing-need to restore old systems. |
| **Challenge F** | | |
| **Commercial needs of smaller ports on the Great Lakes vs. U.S. Coastal ports.** | | |
| 16 | | Too much funding goes to Mississippi & Coastal! Everyone needs to understand the importance and economic value of the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence system- what issues are important to Great Lakes? We need to keep this system sustainable well through this century. |
| **Challenge G** | | |
| **Exotic species (e.g., zebra mussels)** | | |
| 17 | Water production- control of exotics (i.e. Zebra mussels); what is the plan to keep this under control? EXOTICS (zebra mussel etc..) | Proliferation of exotics in water supply effect H2O production costs; what are the treatment options for carriers (benefit/costs?) |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| 18 | Freighters – Dumping of Bilge and sometimes trash.. How do we hold these ocean salties accountable? | Exotic species and trash that will effect the ecosystem in a negative way. Zebra mussels-beaches-ruffe/sports fishing and food chain. |
| 19 | To control the proliferation of invasive species throughout the Great Lakes water basin | If invasive species are allowed to proliferate unchecked, serious environmental and economic damage with result-putting Great Lakes region at a distant economic disadvantage vis-à-vis other region of the country. |
| **Challenge H** | | |
| **Commercial navigation improvements.** | | |
| 20 | Corps has too much mileage and needs to (a) scale back its current mileage (b) better justify some of its expansionist ambitions. Needs to do what railroads did in the 1980's. | There's 732 miles on the Missouri (3rd longest piece not country intracoastal) for 8.3M tons/0.8B TM- is it worth it? |
| 21 | Dredging | Return of cruise ships to the Great Lakes. The Detroit River a major corridor. |
| 22 | Maintenance of vital infrastructure necessary for the continued efficient operation of our waterborne transportation system- e.g. Soo Locks, Cuyahoga River in Cleveland. | Our country's economy depends on this. |
| 23 | To maintain our navigation system and provide for future growth. Lakes need to be maintained, some need to be replaced. | The amount of cargo that moves by water is to great to consider shifting to other modes; we need all the transport modes; we can't handle (on a practical basis) the water portion by rail and trucks nor do we want the increased cost. |
| 24 | Increasing the size of ships that can use the St. Lawrence Seaway. | Bigger ships = increased cargoes. |
| 25 | To ensure that Great Lakes waterway system is maintained and upgraded to support increased shipping needs. | St. Lawrence Seaway and its system of locks is aging, as well as the Great Lakes lock system. If they are not properly maintained and/or upgraded, water commerce could be squeezed, and shippers may be forced to switch to other, more congested modes, such as rail or truck. |
| 26 | Nation's water highway system. | Important system for moving people and goods in an efficient friendly manner. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| 27 | As the Saint Lawrence Seaway system ages, and other port systems build for larger and deeper vessels, and new vessels, How can the Corps help retrofit the system to continue to be economically competitive and how can the Corp assist it dealing with the ballast water, explain species issue. | |
| 28 | Ensuring the most efficient and effective use of waterways for all interests. | |
| 29 | A serious natural study of future growth at ports (see Viderman: VZM/transystems) so we do address strategically. | The statement under the photo opportunity is spurious. |
| 30 | Current port/channel capacities designed to support ship designs from 1930's | To remain competitive with railroad market/etc; must look at dredging/developing to much deeper draft transport 29.5' project depth) |
| 31 | Provide and maintain water transportation capacity. | Economically and environmentally efficient transportation mode. |
| **Challenge I** | | |
| **Water quality – bacterial contamination of waters.** | | |
| 32 | Sufficient clean water both for human consumption and alternate uses of our water resources. (i.e., canoeing) | |
| 33 | (1) Water quality-especially bacteria, (2) Better public education and awareness, (3) Impacts of roads and water quality, (4) Use conflicts-recreation, boating and shipping, (5) Need for newer approaches to development and river bank restoration. | (1) Increased recreational and open space use of river; people want better water quality, (2) Public unaware of newer approaches to river improvement, (3) Highway construction not using BMP's that improve water quality, (4) Increased use by non-motorized boats conflict with barge uses, (5) Local government and engineering firms favor less river – friendly approaches. |
| 34 | Bacterial contamination of near coastal water (lake/river) | Health risk. |
| **Challenge J** | | |
| **Flood control.** | | |
| 35 | Lock conditions in Chicago area (triggered by l or 2 day rain event) caused flooding in citizens' basements. | Citizens have concerns about development and environmental considerations. What is the Corps' involvement in local flooding/development? |
| 36 | Flood control correlated with urban planning. | Safety of the population. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| 37 | Brownfields, hazardous waste, etc. | Flood control in an urban setting requires excavation in some historically industrial locations. This will most likely mean working in brownfields or handling hazardous waste. |
| 38 | Flood control needs to be examined. –200 fatalities in 5 years is nothing. | The root cause isn't being examined, namely improper use of floodplains. |
| 39 | Flood control. | New economy demands greater level of service. |
| 40 | Select projects based on a benefit-cost basis. | Flood control is not cheap! Looking only at $ eliminates a lot of projects from being built. Other issues must be considered. |
| 41 | Provide flood protection along our urban waterways. | In an urban setting, this becomes very expensive and costs vs. environmental vs. public impact needs must be addressed. |
| 42 | Water quality improvement violations-enforcement flooding urban development. | Reduction of future problems. |
| 43 | Environmental restoration. | This is a driving element for us to provide both flood protection and improve the environment. |
| 44 | (1) Problem: sediment deposit & erosion.<br>(2) Need: Control sediment movement & erosion<br>(3) Opportunity: Enlighten developers | (1) Because sediment is causing pollution and flooding everywhere, (2) Because flooding is happening everywhere, (3) Because less sediment and erosion control more flooding and pollution. |
| **Challenge K** | | |
| **Streamline the time it takes to move a project from inception to completion.** | | |
| 45 | Cost effectiveness-Corps needs to deliver scope-schedule-budget. | Perception of cost effectiveness directly relates to support of programs. |
| 46 | To streamline the time it takes to move a project to construction. | The extended time it takes to move a project forward is a barrier for a non-federal sponsors, and their participation. |
| 47 | Streamlining regulations and process. | Ability to react more quickly to challenges and get projects completed saving time and money, lose memory of event. |
| **Challenge L** | | |
| **Need for improved dissemination of new technologies in Corps projects.** | | |
| 48 | Technological review of process: tried and true technology, new emerging technology, obsolete/unable to apply. | Support ACOE efforts; however in order to inform constituents of why a certain technology was chosen and why others were ruled out. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| 49 | Technical leader-HEC, experimental waterways. | Government and universities have unique ability to direct resources into research and development of new technology and methods. |
| **Challenge M** | | |
| **Corps not responsive to request for information.** | | |
| 50 | Corps need a real public involvement strategy which extends beyond "project sponsors" to the public. | |
| **Challenge N** | | |
| **Halt the destruction of Great Lakes beaches with special focus on dune protection.** | | |
| 51 | Beaches have a purpose that is similar to wetlands. For sure beaches are not bottomland. We must halt the destruction of beaches. | The healthy life of the Great Lakes is much dependent on the maintaining a standard of beaches. Beaches have many purposes, including and not limited to cleansing, endanger species, ultimate protection, dune building, cobblestone, less sediment in protected areas etc; bays, harboring river basins etc. |
| **Challenge O** | | |
| **Expedite permitting process.** | | |
| 52 | This may help developers – should say give public notice and chance to respond. | |
| 53 | Corps can't rehab structures built by others (i.e.), must reconstruct a structure that is about to fail. | That flexibility would greatly reduce overall project costs. |
| 54 | Expediency of permitting water resources projects (not responsive enough). | Permits impact water supply projects/intake development. Permit application-review process causes interminable delays in municipal waterworks projects in Great Lakes. |
| **Challenge P** | | |
| **Education in schools on water issues.** | | |
| 55 | Water conservation/reuse. | While water is plentiful, we should do all we can to reuse/conserve. |
| 56 | Water conservation/use and reuse education. | |
| 57 | Public Education. | The public needs to be better educated on how our infrastructure operates and on the benefits or impacts of what our flood control projects will provide. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| 58 | Market the advantage of waterways. Get the facts out about the importance of waterway transportation: (1) low cost, (2) fuel efficient, (3) low emission production, (4) reduce highway congestion, (5) gives shippers a choice. | |
| **Challenge Q** | | |
| **Nonstructural and environmental flood control approaches.** | | |
| 59 | There seems to be a lack of Corps appreciation for non-structured flood control approaches and environmental initiatives (at least in the Chicago District). | Environmentally friendly projects and solutions are becoming much more common and are, in many cases, more beneficial than the traditional structural approaches. The Corps seems to be behind the times in this regard(Des Plaines Phase I). |
| 60 | Wetland conservation and mitigation. | Answer to flooding and water quality problems. |
| 61 | Flood damage reduction. | We continue to face millions of dollars a year in flood damages. |
| 62 | Establishment of Eco-friendly treatments. | Fish and wildlife habitat; erosion control. |
| **Challenge R** | | |
| **Corps needs to have a consistent message, approach, focus & balance.** | | |
| 63 | Understanding Corps policy (historic, current) vs. Corps action; dredging, beach nourishment, do they initiate. | It's often tough for non-feds to figure out the role and mission of the Corps. |
| 64 | Corps can always quote same regulation that says they can or cannot do a project depending on whether they like the project or like you; Conflicting regulations depending on who you talk to. | Many good projects not completed. |
| 65 | Mission creep. | Limited resources and expanding mandates. |
| 66 | Balancing industrial development with preserving in some cases, the last vestiges of pristine wildlife areas. | Protect environment for heritage and health of nation while encourage business development that will propel us forward in world economy in healthy fashion. |
| **Challenge S** | | |
| **Corps to develop new policies for changing uses of waterways.** | | |
| 67 | To develop new policies and guidelines that address the changing use of many waterways from a primary commercial use to recreational use. | Conflicts between commercial and recreational users are growing! |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| **Challenge T** | | |
| **Mitigation policy for wetlands.** | | |
| 68 | Mitigation policies seldom followed up on or most developers get away with murder of our ecosystem. | |
| 69 | 404 authority does not mean saying "Yes" to all projects; 404/401 is intended to protect water quality not to facilitate development. | |
| 70 | Permitting –COE as regulator. | Balance environmental protection with economic growth-creates conflicts. |
| **Challenge U** | | |
| **Enforcement responsibilities for 404 permits and Section 10.** | | |
| 71 | Scientific based, non-subjective delineations are needed in our area. Also proper documentation (Green Bay, WI). | |
| **Challenge V** | | |
| **More research on beneficial uses of dredging materials.** | | |
| | NO COMMENTS. | |
| **Challenge W** | | |
| **National clearinghouse for information and data.** | | |
| 72 | How to elevate water issues in Great Lakes to a regional/ macro level ; no single entity is taking on responsibility to be the clearinghouse (single point). | Need to strike balance for all stakeholders, share knowledge and eliminate redundancies. |
| 73 | Sea wall inventory. | Limelines-cost need for repair/restoration. |
| **Challenge X** | | |
| **Better manage diversion of water so we can maximize use of drinking water.** | | |
| 74 | Great Lakes diversion issue; how to increase diversion/ balance for H2O production with takeouts for recreation. | Less water available for drinking water supply at cost of recreational benefits or commercial hauler/shipping benefits. |
| 75 | Controlling urban sprawl; Corps to join dialogue. | Continual –our mitigation from existing centers places in creased burdens/demands on water distribution systems, which in turn, overly politicizes allocation and control issues. Also concerns over uniform standards of water treatment among various communities. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| **Challenge Y** | | |
| **Stream conveyance.** | | |
| 76 | (1) Maintenance of stream conveyance-through a better maintenance activity on streams (especially on forest areas and at crossing structures) in order to diminish the flooding potential. (2) Environmental friendly restoration methods promoted on streams. Public information on the new available methods. | Flood protection and water quality. |
| **Challenge Z** | | |
| **Combined sewer overflows.** | | |
| 77 | Elimination of combined sewer/storm drains/overflows. | Numerous combined sewer/storm drains allow urban runoff and hazardous waste enter the lakes and rivers. |
| **Challenge AA** | | |
| **Pollution in general.** | | |
| 78 | How to safeguard water quality with movement of hazardous material. (through minimum amount of transport of HAZMAT) | Accidental spill of HAZMAT could have large drinking water/treatment impacts if not responded to in timely fashion/or planned for. |
| **Challenge BB** | | |
| **Cut costs by rewriting dredging disposal regulations.** | | |
| 79 | Dredging disposal regulations must be altered to control cost. Federal and state agencies must coordinate efforts better. Maybe restrictions must be lessened to accommodate dredge disposal. | We are running the cost up to the federal government for dredging because of agency conflicts and jurisdictional assignments. This only cost the state and federal taxpayers more, but less gets done. |
| **Challenge CC** | | |
| **Promote alternatives to large scale retention basins.** | | |
| | NO COMMENTS | |
| **Challenge DD** | | |
| **Impact of highway construction and road repair on water quality.** | | |
| | NO COMMENTS. | |
| **Challenge EE** | | |
| **Concerted (greater) regional vision for the great lakes.** | | |
| 80 | We need a regional vision for the Great Lakes. | Without a vision we have no focus; we need a vision for the Great Lakes that reflect regional interests. Once a vision is established planning efforts can be executed that link to our vision. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| **Challenge FF** | | |
| **Multiobjective planning approaches for shoreline and streambank restoration.** | | |
| 81 | Affording restoration opportunities on structures engineered for storm damage and erosion control. | Affording universal access to opportunities at waters edge. |
| **Challenge GG** | | |
| **Streamlining of procedures must balance commercial and environmental interests.** | | |
| | NO COMMENTS. | |
| **Challenge HH** | | |
| **Improve partnerships and shared decision -making process.** | | |
| 82 | Break down the barrier between the Corps and local communities around the Great Lakes Basin. To this end, the Corps needs to become "partner" in locally-owned projects, rather than framing projects as "Corps Projects". | There is often much local resistance to approaching the Corps. |
| 83 | For the Corps to clearly articulate its relationship with its sponsors- from cost sharing, to project development, to construction management, project advocacy (ownership of a project plan). | It's difficult to figure out the Corps role in the multitude of projects and activities in which it is involved. |
| 84 | Partnership: Federal/state/industry/special interests. | Will require changes to the COE planning and construction process. |
| 85 | Interagency cooperation local, state, government, grass roots organizations. | Sharing of information and technology and efforts. |
| **Challenge II** | | |
| **Thinking beyond waterways toward watersheds.** | | |
| 86 | Building the capacity of Great Lakes communities (AOC's) to effectively design and implement watershed management plans. Beyond 'waterways' toward 'watersheds'. | As PAC's around the basin move forward with their remedial action plans, it becomes increasingly necessary for communities to think beyond remediation and become stewards of their waterways. |
| 87 | Habitat restoration | Years of sprawl manipulation of systems without regard to long term impacts has reduced quality and quantity of habitat. |
| 88 | Water supply-source protection. | Protecting recharge areas, wetlands and buffers to ensure a safe and adequate source of drinking water. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| 89 | Improve water quality on a watershed basis (TMDL's). Could be a problem or an opportunity. | The community is becoming more environmentally aware and expect better water quality. This translates into the need to eliminate/minimize sanitary sewer overflows during wet weather. This is very expensive. |
| **Challenge JJ** | | |
| **Locks and dams are getting old and need replacing.** | | |
| 90 | Lock and dams | Full accounting of economic and environmental costs. Are the locks and dams needed? Can they be removed? |
| 91 | Aging infrastructure-locks and dams need replacing; Bulging IWTF | Major component of our transportation system and portion of foundation of commerce health. Support for SOO Lock. |
| 92 | Planning and construction process is slow. | Transportation modes must be able to respond to demand for transportation services within a reasonable time frame. The current COE process is inadequate. |
| 93 | Transportation-Rebuilding and improving the inland waterway lock system to meet the potential growth as well as current freight needs. | Freight will move one way or another. We don't want to be limited to one long haul freight mode because of cost consequences to the shipper, nor do we want our roadways overloaded with truck freight. |
| 94 | Transportation is passe' ; taken for granted by the US electorate. How to reverse that? | It's a problem because we still really don't have one DOT and, in effect, all modes are declining, (see the Corps paper as % of ENP expended). Not important to the agency I represent, but to me it is as a professional. |
| 95 | Eliminate as much barging as possible. | Locks, dams, construction and maintenance destroy habitat, water quality, and cause flooding. |
| 96 | Meeting the transportation demands for the 21st century and beyond: economically and environmentally. | Exports, imports cost of living, jobs. |
| **Challenge KK** | | |
| **Water supply (potable demands).** | | |
| 97 | Water management plan must take into account population expansion/economic growth and income provisions to safeguard natural resource. | It's natural resources that the public takes for granted. May not be a 'problem' today, but if ignored, or inadequately addressed, environmental impact on waterways will have serious repercussions. |

| COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT CHICAGO LISTENING SESSION<br>[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting] | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ID#** | **Challenge** | **Why challenge is important?** |
| **Challenge LL** | | |
| **Use of containers from overseas on internal waterways.** | | |
| 98 | Bringing container ships into the Great Lakes and creating the infrastructures to accommodate containers. | Containers are key to increased profit/productivity. |
| 99 | Encouraging world class competition on the Great Lakes; Opening up the Great Lakes for greater amount of commerce; Connections to Ohio River. | Allow US to compete more fully in world economy. Small size of St. Lawrence seaway prevents larger ocean- going vessels from entering Great Lakes. |
| **Challenge MM** | | |
| **Water diversion vs. water withdrawals in the Great Lakes.** | | |
| | NO COMMENT. | |
| **Additional Comments** | | |
| 100 | (1) Lack of resources for USACE , (2) More money for education, research enforcement, (3) To promote water quality, flood control, green space, protection, of water resources for future generations. | Save money in the future as well as improving the environment. |

# APPENDIX B

# SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS