

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

**SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
OCTOBER 24, 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.

November 2000

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

**SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
OCTOBER 24, 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

November 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

National Listening Sessions Meeting Notes – San Diego, California	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	2
Overview of Regional Sessions and Themes	3
Session Format	7
Theme Voting	8
Small Group Discussion and Related Report Outs	9
Regulatory Issues/Aspects of Water Resources Theme	10
Floodplain Management Theme	10
Water Quality Theme.....	11
Integrated Water Resources Management and Planning Theme	12
Corps Planning Processes Theme	12
Communication and Coordination.....	13
Federal Funding Theme	14
Closing Remarks and Adjournment	14
Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges	A-1

NATIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the National Listening Session in San Diego, California on October 24, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As stewards of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers conducted a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps held 14 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and September 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. The dialogue generated at the sessions is an integral part of the Corps' strategic planning process.

The cities where the regional listening sessions were conducted included 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 first of two national listening sessions scheduled. The session was held in San Diego, California and was hosted by the National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies (NAFSMA), as part of their NAFSMA 2000 Conference. The conference and accompanying listening session were conducted at the U.S. Grant Hotel in downtown San Diego. Approximately 94 people attended this meeting (not including Corps participants and the facilitation team) to share their views with the Corps. The second of two national listening sessions is scheduled for Washington D.C. on November 9, 2000.

The information collected from the 14 regional listening sessions and 2 national listening sessions will be incorporated into a series of reports assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. The reports 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 reports will provide a point of reference 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 Thomas Hodgini, USACE Deputy Division Commander of the South Pacific Division (SPD), welcomed everyone and thanked the participants for attending the session and the facilitation team for their support during the listening sessions. COL Hodgini took a minute to acknowledge the recent appointing of the Corps 50th Chief of Engineers, Lieutenant General Robert Flowers. He reminded the participants that the first Chief of Engineers was appointed in 1776. COL Hodgini informed the group that this was the first of two national listening sessions. He apologized in advance for the absence of General Van Winkle and explained that he was unable to get out of a prior commitment. On a different note, COL Hodgini assured the group that the facilitation team had been greatly assisting the Corps in providing a good forum that focused on the generation of useful information relating to current and future water resources challenges. The information gathered from the 14 previous regional sessions were being utilized as part of the forum at the national sessions. The intention was to see if the main themes identified by national session participants would be the same as those identified in the regional sessions.

COL Hodgini went on to explain that the Corps has been assisting the Nation for more than 200 years. He admitted the Corps still needed to hear about current issues and future concerns relating to water resources. Prior to conducting the listening sessions, the Corps identified six broad challenges they saw as important to water resources, our future sustainability and the potential growth of the Nation. The first challenge related to the marine transportation system. The Corps got involved in the navigation aspect of water resources in 1899. Next, COL Hodgini mentioned flood control as a challenge, explaining how the Flood Control Act of 1936 helped in the development of various lakes, levees, and reservoirs to prevent flooding. Furthermore, an Act implemented in 1944 included the aspect of recreation to flood prevention, with numerous parks being created along the floodplain. The third challenge presented relates to the environment, which came into focus in 1970 with the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act. Additionally, COL Hodgini commented on the issue dealing with water supply. The Clean Water Act of 1976 included the Corps in developing a sustainable water supply and addressing vacant brownfield sites. The fifth challenge identified by the Corps deals with water infrastructure. The number of old, outdated locks and dams are excessive. These structures require numerous repairs or newly built facilities, such as longer locks, to accommodate current and future uses on navigational waterways. The last challenge identified by the Corps deals with the issue of disaster response. COL Hodgini explained how the Corps has been involved in disaster response since 1882, with assistance and preparation being provided for hurricanes, tornadoes, and even earthquakes. COL Hodgini explained to the audience that the world is currently in the Information Age, with technology advancing at rates faster than any other time in human history. The sustainability of water resources is also affected by these advancements and requires actionary measures.

Based on the information obtained in the 14 regional listening sessions and review of the 536 water resources challenges identified at the sessions, 18 general water resources themes were developed. The objective of the national sessions was to focus on the 18 identified themes and determine if the national session participants agreed with the findings from the regional sessions. COL Hodgini reminded the participants that the regional sessions had a broad cross-section of

participation. Representatives came from other Federal and state agencies, environmental organizations, port authorities, private companies (e.g. consultants, legal professionals, tourism companies, developers, etc.), local interest groups (e.g. tribes, historical preservation groups, etc.), livestock/farming operators, journalists, homeowners, and the general public.¹ COL Hodgini continued by explaining to the audience how the challenges were identified by regional session participants. The information generated during this national session would be compiled in a report, which would be posted on the Corps' "national challenges" web site (listed on the back of the Join the Dialogue brochure) at <http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges> for others to review. Furthermore, a National Summary Report would be compiled from the information gathered at the 14 regional sessions and 2 national sessions, which would be used in the revision of the Corps Strategic Plan and by Federal decision-makers.

Finally, COL Hodgini introduced Mr. Dale Brown, the Listening Session facilitator and representative of the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd. and Mr. Mark Gmitro, from the Corps' Institute for Water Resources, who would be assisting the facilitation team. With that, COL Hodgini turned the floor over to Mr. Gmitro to present the 18 developed themes and related findings from the regional sessions.

Overview of Regional Sessions and Themes

Mr. Gmitro first explained the purpose of the listening sessions, reminding the participants the Corps wanted to engage in dialogue with as many participants/stakeholders as possible regarding current and future water resources issues. To assist in this, the Corps developed a website to increase communication and allow for information to be transferred relating to the Nation's water resources challenges. The application of this information would be to assist in the revision of the current Corps Strategic Plan.

Mr. Gmitro continued by explaining the format of the regional sessions (not including St. Louis and Sacramento).² Part of the initial portion of each session was spent on discussing the purpose of the sessions and the six water resources challenges that the Corps had identified prior to the initiation of any of the listening sessions. A short explanation was given regarding aging infrastructure, environmental restoration, emergency response, the marine transportation system, flood control, and smart growth. These were six challenge areas the Corps felt required additional attention, along with increased funding, in order to sustain the Nation's water resources needs for the 21st century. The Corps wanted participants to look at these six challenges to see if they agreed on their importance and welcomed additional challenges the

¹ The Corps did not set out to ensure equal representation, but focused on promoting participation. Because of this, the sampling of public opinion is non-scientific.

² Since this type of forum was new to the Corps, some minor adjustments occurred as the session schedule progressed. In the first two sessions participants formed the same table groups after the break/lunch. They were instructed to discuss the challenges they identified at each of their tables. After the first two sessions, the facilitation team, along with Corps coordinators, decided to modify the format slightly to allow for more detailed discussion. The number of challenges identified by the participants turned out to be more extensive than the session developers expected, which made the afternoon discussion portion unorganized and did not allow for sufficient time allotments for discussing each challenge identified during the morning portion of the session.

session participants identified that were different than these initial six. The regional session participants had been given an opportunity to discuss and write down the challenges they felt were important. These challenges were then presented by participants to the entire group and posted. After all challenges were identified, participants were given dots and asked to vote on the challenges that were of most importance to them. From this, a select number of “primary” challenges were chosen and time was devoted to more extensive discussion of these challenges.

During the more detailed discussion of challenges, the regional session participants had the option to move around from challenge to challenge if they had more than one they wanted to discuss. A Corps member was assigned the task of taking notes at each of the group discussion areas. After the designated discussion period, a spokesperson from each challenge group was asked to present the information to the entire group.

Throughout this whole process, it was the responsibility of the attending Corps members to be involved in the discussion, but most of all, to listen to what the participants had to say. The main objective was to gather information provided by the participants on water resources needs. It was assumed the best way to obtain the greatest amount of information from participants was to listen, not debate or be closed-minded about participant’s views.

Mr. Gmitro explained that 14 regional listening sessions were held. The sessions were held in 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. Mr. Gmitro admitted that more sessions were preferred, but time and funding constraints limited the number of locations. The identification of challenges at the chosen session locations was fairly consistent, which assisted in the development of national water resources challenge themes. Mr. Gmitro added, the number of participants at each session varied, but the Corps did not intend to obtain equal (or random) representation, rather to promote productive participation. Overall, 1,245 participants attended the 14 sessions and they identified 536 challenges, with approximately 3,800 votes occurring for these challenges. All the challenges were studied and each challenge was sorted to fit under a select number of themes. The themes needed to be broad, but not too broad that obvious overlap existed. Based on the involvement in the sessions and review of the challenges, 18 general water resources themes were developed which Mr. Gmitro listed and described with related keywords.

Theme No.	Theme (to grouping challenges) with some related keywords
1	Regional planning (basin level planning; watershed planning; watershed management; multiobjective/systems/integrated planning; holistic approach to planning)
2	Communication and coordination (workshops and increased public forums; partnerships; stakeholder participation with COE; interagency coordination; public education by NGO’s and agencies; education of agency personnel, city council members, and government officials)

- 3 Regulatory issues (enforcement; streamlining permitting processes; mitigation banking; regulatory reform; Section 404 permits; 1125 permits; regional consistency)
- 4 Floodplain management (flood control, levees, ID/delineate floodplains; storm water run-off management; non-structural solutions; cost sharing; insurance program; this “theme” relates more to the planning aspect, rather than the emergency response aspect, which is a separate theme)
- 5 Marine transportation system (intermodal issues; navigation; deep draft: ports, harbors, and dredging; shallow draft: locks, dredging, and dams; navigable channels; sedimentation)
- 6 Environmental (comprehensive monitoring plan; immediate mitigation; improved water quality; NEPA advancement; environmental preservation; environmental restoration; wetlands; species, habitat; biodiversity; reduction of human interference; may also include concerns about “invasive species” or “exotic species” that impact on water intake systems)
- 7 Federal funding (erase O&M backlog; full funding; cost-sharing rules; allocations)
- 8 Water quality (more R&D; source water protection; non-point source (NPS) pollution run-off; use of wetlands; water quality issues may or may not be related to environmental/wetlands issues)
- 9 Emergency response (disaster response; hurricane; flooding; dam failures; FEMA-related activities; centralization of gage operating; local involvement)
- 10 Water supply (securing available water; water monitoring; water rights; interbasin transfer issues; water quantity issues; raw water supplies; potable demands; water withdrawals; related urban water infrastructure; water supply allocations and/or diversions; may also include concerns about “invasive species” or “exotic species” that impact on water intake systems)
- 11 Wastewater issues (mitigate contamination sources; storm water run-off; combined sewer overflows; sewer systems; septic systems)
- 12 Infrastructure issues (more generic; brownfields; independent technical review; streamline project approval process)
- 13 Data collection and information sharing (information clearinghouse; model updates; map updates; GIS, dissemination of new technologies and/or data)
- 14 Corps planning process (revision of P&G; include all groups of Corps; Project Study Plans (PSPs); feasibility studies; reconnaissance studies; partnerships;

- speed of planning/design/construction/implementation/operation process from inception to completion)
- 15 Policy issues (benefit categories; mandatory training; full funding; Corps reform, simplification, mission adjustment, procedural changes)
 - 16 Recreation issues (equal consideration for fish and wildlife; birding trails)
 - 17 Smart growth/sustainability/brownfields (growth management guidelines; urban growth boundaries; develop under-utilized lands/facilities)
 - 18 Coastal/shoreline protection (beach erosion; seawalls; jetties; streambank restoration)

Mr. Gmitro reminded the San Diego session participants that a list of the themes was provided at each table for review. Along with the list of themes was a list of instructions for participants to use during the discussion period. The instruction to the national session participants were as follows:

At each focus group:

- (1) Select a spokesperson.
- (2) Identify water challenges that are of interest to you. **Write each one down on the top part of a yellow sticky. On the bottom portion of the yellow sticky describe what the Federal government should do about the challenge.**
“Challenges” are water resources needs, issues, problems, or opportunities.
- (3) Discuss why they are important to you with everyone in your group and what the Federal role may be. (Note: We are looking for what the Federal role may be and not what the Corps role might be.)
- (4) Report out to large group. (Report should represent group’s view. If there is not consensus, all views should be presented. Consensus should not be sought.)

Mr. Gmitro reiterated the information gathered during the San Diego session would be compiled and a report would be posted on the Corps website. Furthermore, he reminded the participants that another national listening session was scheduled and information regarding the time and location of the session was also available on the Corps website. Mr. Gmitro was hopeful that additional discussions between the various agencies would occur once the listening sessions were completed. Mr. Gmitro finished by telling participants the information to date has already led to assisting in the development of the Corps Strategic Plan and that the additional information would also be utilized.

Some questions were asked regarding the information gathered from the previous sessions. A participant asked Mr. Gmitro what was the Corps doing to build relations with other agencies? Mr. Gmitro replied by saying that the water resources issues identified were real and global in scale. Therefore, many agencies would need to assist in dealing with the many challenges identified and possible mission modification would need to be implemented. Mr. Gmitro admitted getting all agencies involved would be difficult, but could be accomplished.

Another participant was unclear on the Corps involvement in the coordination of agencies. Additionally, one participant wanted to know the Corps role with water rights. Mr. Gmitro responded by saying many government agencies need to take on the role of solving problems that exist across the Nation. Mr. Gmitro commented the listening sessions were not designed as tools to get all the various agencies together, but would set the stage for those meetings and/or discussions to occur in the future. Lastly Mr. Gmitro explained the information from the listening sessions would be provided to other agencies for review and so they may identify potential areas of concern relating to their respective agency. Mr. Gmitro then turned the floor over to Dale Brown, the session facilitator, for further explanation of the session activities.

Session Format

Mr. Brown began by explaining his previous involvement in the regional sessions and took a moment to introduce the other members of the facilitation team. A participant interjected and asked if the portion of the instructions mentioned earlier dealing with “roles” (...discuss what the Federal role may be) could be expanded to include the potential roles of not just the Federal government, but also State and local entities. Mr. Brown agreed to this and told participants to include the other levels of government in the discussion if it was applicable.

Mr. Brown then proceeded to discuss the structure of the day’s Listening Session. He briefly outlined the proposed agenda of the current workshop for the audience. Although the agenda was intended to 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:

9:00-9:10 (A.M.)	Opening Remarks by COL Hodgini
9:10-9:30	Theme Presentation
9:30-9:45	Overview of Workshop
9:45-10:00	Dot-Voting
10:00-10:15	Form Focus Groups
10:15-11:30	Small Group Discussion
11:30-12:00 (P.M.)	Lunch
12:00-1:15	Small Group Report Outs
1:15-1:25	Closing Remarks by COL Hodgini
1:25-1:35	Closing Remarks by NAFSMA President

Mr. Brown pointed out that all of the previously identified 18 challenge themes were posted around the room on large butcher pad paper and an additional “other” theme was posted for participants that wished to post something different than what was identified. The participants were told that they would be given five self-adhesive dots, which they were to use by affixing the appropriate number of dots to the challenge theme(s) they felt were most important. They would have the option of voting however they wanted, with one dot on five themes or five dots on one theme. After all votes were cast, the top six to eight themes with the most dots would be considered as the main priority themes and designated for more detailed small group discussions. These themes would be spread out throughout the facility to allow for

small groups to form around them. The basis of discussion would be deciding what actions need to be taken and what would be the role of the Federal government. Each participant would need to select a theme for which they wanted to participate in the small group discussion. However, participants would be able to switch to other theme discussion groups if interested in various challenge themes. At least one participant would need to attend each group to serve as the spokesperson for the report-out of discussion.

Mr. Brown added, during the small group discussion, each discussion group would have a sub-facilitator to assist in keeping the group focused, promote meaningful communication among participants, and take any needed notes. The first part of the small discussion period would be set aside to allow for written comments from session participants. These challenges were to be written on the self-adhesive yellow stickies sitting in each theme area. Once participants wrote out their stickies, they should affix them directly onto the butcher pad of related challenge theme posted around the room. The stickies would be included as comments relative to each respective theme and included as an attachment in the session report. These comments would also be reviewed by the Corps as part of the session study process. Mr. Brown stressed that these yellow stickies were an important part of the data collection effort and for participants to use them for capturing ideas.

Mr. Brown concluded by saying that spokespersons from each theme chosen would be responsible for presenting the discussions to the entire group, and should take notes during the discussion. Lastly, Mr. Brown asked the participants to stay on target and assist in making things happen.

Theme Voting

Participants were asked to post their five dot-votes on the 18 themes posted on the butcher pads around the room. With that, the participants went around the room and posed their votes. The following list depicts the results of the dot-voting conducted by the session participants.

<u>THEME NO.</u>	<u>THEME</u>	<u>DOT VOTES</u>
1	Integrated Water Resources Mgt. and Planning	37
2	Communication and Coordination	31
3	Regulatory Issues/Aspects of Water Resources	67
4	Floodplain Management	47
5	Marine Transportation System	3
6	Environmental/Ecosystem Health and Mgt.	19
7	Federal Funding	28
8	Water Quality	41
9	Emergency Response	3
10	Water Supply	12
11	Wastewater Collection	11
12	General Water Resources Infrastructure	9

13	Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination	19
14	Corps Planning Processes	35
15	Federal and Corps Water Resources Policy	20
16	Recreation	5
17	Smart Growth and Development	4
18	Coastal/Shoreline Management	7

Mr. Brown reminded participants to post additional yellow stickies with comments they may have thought of after seeing the voting results. Based on the available space and the number of participants, seven main challenge themes were chosen for further discussion. Mr. Brown asked the participants to raise their hand to show which of the seven challenge themes each participant would attend first. Mr. Brown then directed the participants to the area where their respective theme was posted. He then reiterated to the audience the discussion instructions and what needed to be addressed. Lastly, the participants were given a 15-minute break and were asked to reconvene at the theme they wished to discuss.

Small Group Discussion and Related Report-Outs

Based on the dot-voting results, the following challenge themes were voted on as the top seven themes:

(67 votes)	Regulatory Issues/Aspects of Water Resources (Theme #3)
(47)	Floodplain Management (Theme #4)
(41)	Water Quality (Theme #8)
(37)	Integrated Water Resources Management and Planning (Theme #1)
(35)	Corps Planning Processes (Theme #14)
(31)	Communication and Coordination (Theme #2)
(28)	Federal Funding (Theme #7)

Before commencing the discussions, Mr. Brown asked the participants to follow the set of instructions described earlier (select a spokesperson; identify water challenges; discuss why they are important to you and what the Federal, State, or local role may be; and report the information to the large group). He specified that the participants should assume they have the authority to implement changes. The participants discussed the seven challenge themes for approximately one hour, keeping in mind the instructions previously mentioned. After the challenge themes were examined and various solutions were developed, each spokesperson was asked to present the information.

Although participants were given basic instruction for discussing the themes, no set method was required for generating information. As a result, some of the groups focused on discussing the challenges associated with the theme and various solutions rather than what roles the Federal government (or other entity) had to fill in addressing these challenges. If the various roles were not directly identified, then no roles were assumed or implied. If information generated during the discussions is associated with a particular role of the Federal government or

other entity then it is included in Italics (e.g. *Federal government*). The information generated during the discussion of selected themes is provided below:³

Regulatory Issues/Aspects of Water Resources Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Need to obtain permits on a reasonable timeframe.
 - *Federal government*: Set policy and stick to (enforce) timeframe or change the process to be less adversarial, to promote meeting multiple uses.
 - *Federal government*: Increase staff, decrease permit requests (especially for small permits).
 - *Federal government*: Take the lead in changing the process and in coordination across agencies.
- Change the process to be less adversarial.
 - *Congress*: Clarify statutory authority or stay within requirements – Endangered Species Act and habitat protection are not readily handled under current statutes.
 - *Corps, States, and locals*: Look at the more collaborative model to address national and regional needs in a consistent way to meet common objectives.
- Place more trust in local government.
- Need balance between riparian/wetlands issues and flood issues.
 - *Federal government*: Align wetlands and flood damage reduction policies and regulations to accomplish a clear, common national goal in a way that meets flood and habitat needs (respecting regional needs).
 - *Corps*: Better integrate the Corps regulatory role with the national regulatory role – planners and regulators within the Corps.
- Mitigation needs for channels during maintenance (vs. construction).
 - *Corps (EM) and U.S. Fish & Wildlife*: Align regulations, have better communication, and strive for a balance related to individual interpretations.
 - *Federal government*: Achieve consistent national guidance.
- Need for recognition of regional and local differences in managing waters of the United States.
 - *Federal government*: Get out in the field to see real needs.
 - *Corps headquarters*: Give more authority to local districts.
 - *Corps headquarters*: Give more emphasis to regional general permits.

Floodplain Management Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- *Corps*: Manage floodway encroachment and d.s. impacts.
- *Corps*: Reward C.R.S. compliance.

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.

- *Federal government*: Need to look at the effectiveness of nonstructural flood control options.
- *Corps and local entities*: Make operation activities “fail-safe.”
- *Federal government*: Implement mapping based on future development.
- *Federal government*: Increase funding for floodplain property buyout.
- *Federal government*: Increase FEMA responsiveness to floods.
- *Federal government*: Update and maintain floodplain ordinances and mapping.
- *Federal government*: Provide adequate funding sources.
- *Federal government and local entities*: Develop real-time flood warning systems.
- *Federal government*: Need risk assessment process guidelines.
- *Federal government*: Apply a balanced approach (rather than forced) to the use of structural/nonstructural solutions.
- *Federal government*: Facilitation vs. regulation.
- *Federal government*: Consider regional variables.
- *Federal government*: Need long term coordination and assurances on destruction, construction, and O&M of projects (structural and nonstructural).
- *Federal government*: Address assumption of legal responsibilities without legal authority.
- *Federal government*: Resolve conflicts within Federal law, regulations, and policies.
- Integrate flood management activities with the Federal regulatory process.
- *Federal government*: Narrow funding gap on property acquisition (required vs. provided).
- *Federal government*: Encourage best management practices (BMPs) to minimize increased run-off from development.
- *Federal government*: Discourage development in the flood zone

Water Quality Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Allow for local control when dealing with source pollution.
- Develop unified/coordinated permitting process.
- Congress must clarify responsibility of MS4s with respect to TMDLs.
- Need to keep the “big picture”
 - Cost feasibility.
 - Technical feasibility.
 - Relative to water quality improvements.
 - Water, groundwater, solid waste.
- Coordinate research and development using best management practices (BMP’s) and information exchange.
- *State government*: Need more scientific basis for Clean Water Act 303(d).
 - Allow more flexibility for EPA to de-list.
 - Appropriate beneficial use.
 - Have State establish criteria for characterization.
- *Corps*: Water quality needs to be an objective for all Corps projects.
- *Federal EPA/DPR*: Address pesticide use and related toxicity.

- *Federal and State government*: TMDL source control over pollutants of concern, such as pesticides, copper, mercury, and sediments.
- *Federal government*: Conduct more monitoring plans and water quality thresholds.
- *Federal and State government*: Address conflicts regarding surface water and groundwater.
- *Federal and State government*: Minimize storm water permit burdens on MS4s.
- *Federal and State governments, EPA, and Corps*: Assure that treatment facilities do not become wetlands
 - Contradictory Federal mandates.
- *All entities*: Be sure that the Federal government is spending money and effort on appropriate and meaningful activities.
- *Federal, State, and local government*: Consider funding for O&M when dealing with BMPs.
- Have TMDL be guidance unless the numerical limits are in the permits.

Integrated Water Resources Management and Planning Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Develop cooperation among agencies when solving problems (i.e. overlap).
- Define watershed planning (different between stakeholders).
- Implement and follow-through on a developed watershed management plan.
- Resolve conflicting stakeholder interests.
- Provide resources for watershed planning.
- Manage multiple jurisdictions involving costs.
- Quantify watershed benefits to provide incentives (watershed involves many components).
- Need for Federal government to evaluate the need for infrastructure.
- *Federal government*: Provide resources (funding/manpower) through information program to encourage initiatives relating to watershed approach.
- Initiate initial collaboration (Federal summit) to discuss all policies concerning watersheds.
- *Federal government*: Collaborate the work of all Federal agencies through the states rather than reams of isolated policies.
- *Federal government*: Develop a Federal watershed planning guideline that integrates all of the Federal and State policies related to watersheds.

Overall, this group did not clearly match roles with the various challenges presented during the discussion period. Therefore, most of the identified challenges do not reference any type of role.

Corps Planning Processes Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Eliminate the arrogance of the Corps and include local input and involvement (additional experienced personnel outside of Corps).
- Allow for more flexibility regarding the roles of Districts and partners.
- Develop consistent interpretation of NED by Corps and NCRS.

- Need more than just NED tests.
- Increase the maturity of project management within the Corps.
- Establish agreement regarding construction management.
- Promote sound project management within the organization.
- Increase flexibility and authority at the local level.
- *Federal government*: Promote and facilitate both State and local roles.
- *Federal government*: Provide incentives as part of the cost-sharing process.
- Include sufficient maintenance after completion of projects.
- Implement an integration of disciplines.
- Use better/stronger control of construction contracts (varies by Districts).
- Use incentives and rewards for partners with competencies.
- Extend PCA related exemptions to local entities (not just State).
- *Corps*: Restructure the Corps to allow for better delivery.

Overall, this group did not clearly match roles with the various challenges presented during the discussion period. Therefore, most of the identified challenges do not reference any type of role.

Communication and Coordination Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Develop better communication between the Corps and non-federal sponsors.
 - Don't use regulations to deflect the needs expressed by local government.
 - Missed opportunities between Corps and local sponsors – areas of improvement.
 - Corps in the control mode and needs to allow for consensus building.
- Resolve communication breakdown between the Corps and other Federal agencies.
- Increase coordination relating to water resource planning projects.
 - Use project team to deal with multiple issues.
 - Include other Federal agencies, along with State and local entities.
 - Use national process.
- Communicate “good science” findings relating to the floodplain, public flood hazards, or the national needs assessment.
 - Help build consistent approaches from area to area (more successful).
- Use more effective, current electronic forms of communications (and most advanced technology) to share information with government officials and the public.
 - GIS technology or Internet technology.
- Apply a program that informs the public about new approaches and opportunities relating to the Corps (eliminate past discretion).
- Convey the findings from the listening sessions to other Federal agencies upon completion.
- Increase coordination with State and local agencies dealing with contracting for projects.
 - Involve State and local agencies earlier in the project.
 - Develop a list of preferred contractors.

Overall, this group did not clearly match roles with the various challenges presented during the discussion period. Therefore, most of the identified challenges do not reference any type of role.

Federal Funding Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Resolve insufficient funding issues.
 - Apply the political process.
 - Make projects “need”-based, not based on the project with the most controversy.
 - Increase education on Federal funding and the availability of funds locally.
- Need to apply a sliding scale approach to funding.
 - Based on community’s availability to pay.
 - Implementation of sound and prudent water resources regulations by communities.
 - Proactive approach by communities protecting water resources.
- Outdated NED process.
 - Total project costs must account for all other environmental issues affecting those communities and Federal agencies.
- Fiscal responsibility should be shared between local and Federal agencies for long term monitoring, environmental impacts, and O&M.
- *Federal government*: Develop a manual for Federal funding of water related projects.
 - Be more proactive in informing communities about available funding.
 - Use the same funding model across agencies.
- *Federal government*: Conduct gap analysis on all 18 challenges.
- *Federal government*: Fund all water resources programs using a “water resources appropriation bill,” instead of funding individual programs.
 - This will force interagency coordination at Federal level.
- *Congress*: Fully fund projects over project term, instead of seeking annual appropriations.
- *Federal government*: Recognize the funding need and appropriate fairly.
 - It should lessen the political process, implement a prioritization approach, and implement a fair cost-share approach.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

In closing, COL Hodgini commended the participants for providing such a large amount of quality feedback. Based on the information COL Hodgini heard, he recognized some similar analogies between stakeholder/agency relationships and his relationship to his family. Listening, being fair, and having a good relationship applied to his family environment and also applied to the water resources affiliates and their complex relationships. COL Hodgini commented on the large number of stakeholders that are highly experienced in the field of water resources and how they could be utilized in the management of the Nation’s water resources. He acknowledged that many conflicting ideas relating to water resources were voiced, but overall the participants listened and developed agreement throughout the discussions. It appeared the participants had

many concerns and plenty of challenges to discuss and could have elaborated more if time permitted. COL Hodgini realized the Corps and other Federal agencies needs to develop a course of action as a result of the listening sessions and acknowledged the Corps has gained a large amount of valuable information from the session participants. COL Hodgini stated he would relay the groups' feeling that the Corps credibility was at stake. Because of this, additional interagency communication would need to be conducted. Lastly, COL Hodgini thanked the facilitation team for their assistance and the participants for working hard to assist the Corps. With that, the national listening session was adjourned.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Theme 1		
Integrated Water Resources Management and Planning		
1	It is important that multiple organizations work together to develop solutions (rather than overlays).	Unless the watershed problem is integrated- the solution will not be developed as overlaying requirements are applied.
2	Provide necessary resources to local communities in the development of watershed management plans.	While many local communities (political jurisdictions) understand the advantages of watershed-level management, they lack a mechanism for coordination and technical guidance.
3	Problem: Watershed management is too broad a subject to get arms around; too many stakeholders with opposite goals to reach consensus on any subject. Need : Clear definition of what a “watershed approach” actually means. Opportunity: Watershed is an excellent way to define common interest.	The diametrically opposed agenda of development interests and resource agencies and activists can not be resolved as development interests have entitlement expectations and often don’t participate. Local planning authorities are extremely reluctant to implement recommendations of report.
Theme 2		
Communication and Coordination		
4	Communication and Coordination.	A formal invitation to each district of the Army Corps of Engineers, to have their Colonel attend each National Listening Session and/or the NAFSMA Conference (Break the mold).
5	Funding to solve flood control/protection is a politically driven issue. Programmatically how do we move this beyond politics into programmatic priorities. How do we establish a fair and reasonable system to identify programmatic flooding priorities- a “needs list.”	It is very difficult for the State Flood Protection Program – as a nonfederal sponsor -to get funding to match COE projects. I believe that a nationwide process of identifying flood control/flood protection needs will serve as a tool to communicate with local groups, state legislators. State administration-the magnitude of flooding problems in NYS.
6	Lack of credit because of no needs assessment. Distrust of Government- how to gain public support or officials? Development of a needs assessment similar to wastewater.	When the public distrusts the government (officials or technical people) it is hard to gain support for projects.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
7	To communicate effectively to variety of groups, individuals, in understandable terms. Perhaps in terms of performance measures, outcome, deliverables.	Public wants efficiency and accountability in government. Ability to communicate this is vital to continuing and/or restoring public confidence.
8	Past efforts by Corps and local agencies to protect against flooding seen as degrading environment, not protecting against flooding and exacerbating problems. (i.e. development in floodplain). Communicating sins of the past- where do we go from here?	We need to acknowledge this “baggage” to restore public confidence and market successes.
9	What are you going to do with listening session information?	Communicate with other Feds through summit; develop a “federal” action plan.
10	Federal Regs often blunt agency listening to local concerns/ideas (lose good ideas).	Partnership is not facilitated. Consider locals as equals!
11	Corp unilateral decisions without consulting our agency. (operate in a vacuum)	
12	Lack of coordination and communication with local agencies in the planning and implementing of federal/local water projects. Liberal use of words such as “partnering” etc. However, planning and implementation primarily controlled by Feds in a dictatorial manner, often leading to wasteful and/or disastrous results.	Purpose of programs should be to solve problems efficiently. Lack of meaningful coordination/communication with local/state agencies often leads to ineffective results.
13	Better coordination with federal agencies who potentially impact project, i.e. STGT W.	Funds and time are devoted to developing a project (usually the NED project) which will never receive support from other federal agencies. If F&W support could be obtained in very early feasibility stages, effort could be dedicated to developing a buildable project.
14	Communications between Army Corps Regions of different type of construction. I.e. working in one region and proven, but another region knows nothing about it or is not open or receptive to such an idea.	Current practices don’t work, communication between silos; each Colonel must come to NAFSMA conference.
15	Internet-lack of real-time info. To make effective use of internet to disseminate information among federal agencies and	Technology is allowing us instantaneous access to information. Communities expecting rapid access to information,

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	among federal/state/local. Utilize Internet for current info.	leading to more rapid decision-making.
16	Coordination and participation by local/state agencies in the hiring of all contractors (including construction engineers and consultants) in the design and implementation of federal/local flood and water projects.	Involve locals in professional services procurement.
17	Lack of C & C results in outdated projects. Getting the Corps to work with local sponsor to address local needs (we participate-often the Corps doesn't acknowledge) (affects their time/money schedule). They are using outdated data.	To get a product (flood control system) that fits into the community with the least impact possible; taking into account economic feasibility.
18	Lack of adequate and effective coordination and consistency among federal agencies related to water resources, water quality and flood protection, endangered species etc., causing increased costs, inefficiencies, frustration among local agencies and public we all serve (overlap, priorities, agendas).	Limits exist related to costs and time to address issues. We need efficient and effective communication among federal agencies, among federal and state agencies and with the local agencies. Use project management team concept-civil works COE/EPA/USF&W-get on the same page-regulatory.
19	Interagency coordination of efforts; Army Corp, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, FEMA.	Maximize efficiency and effectiveness of efforts. Minimize negative impact on other developments (watersheds, water supplies, etc.)
20	Need interagency communication-lack of communication on project requirements and mitigation.	Frustrating to project proponents ; increased project costs; leads engineers to want to concrete in everything rather than try to preserve habitat that causes them headaches.
21	Involve other federal agencies in these listening sessions and determine appropriate roles for the federal agencies to help address.	Corps is not only federal agency involved in these issues. It is essential for the feds to get together to address issues.
Theme 3		
Regulatory Issues/Aspects of Water Resources.		
22	Leave land issues in the hands of local governments.	The Feds do not know all local issues, therefore the land issues are best resolved at local level.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
23	Recompilation of all laws having to deal with permitting and water resources.	For end users to be able to locate requirements under one single source.
24	Consolidation of all agencies involved in water resources and the environment (one stop).	There are too many agencies all doing their own thing and not coordinating with each other, i.e. EPA, FEMA, Bureau of Rec, Corps, Dept of Agriculture, etc.
25	Need permitting processes which promote habitat restoration, integrated watershed-wide project planning. Current permitting process promotes incremental project approaches; results in incremental, meaningless mitigation.	
26	Need for a coherent, integrated, 1-stop approach to permits in a reasonable time frame; opportunity for Corps leadership. (18 month for maintenance)	Ability to perform maintenance and complete capital projects. DO: Take the lead in reducing time to issue permits.
27	One time mitigation for flood control projects; no retroactive mitigation for maintenance.	Depletes local agency resources.
28	Inadequate and inexperienced Corps staff resources.	Ability to build and conduct O & M hinges on successfully negotiating the process, but staffing challenges can't respond or won't render decisions.
29	Lack of regulation of hydraulic impacts to wetlands and streams. “404 on regulates fill” not really designed to protect wetlands or streams or hydrographic modification.	Wetlands and streams habitat deteriorates due to land use far removed from “Corps Jurisdiction” and also by direct draining. Also vegetation impacts within riparian corridors.
30	Redundant and conflicting permitting requirements.	Increases paperwork when dollars are better spent in field. If we didn't spend \$100K on paper work for a small project, it could be used for project improvements.
31	404 permitting/401 water quality certification.	Permitting process: arduous, lacks common sense and flexibility: can conflict with integrated (or multi-objective) water resources planning efforts; interpretations vary among regulatory agencies; recognition that urban drainage is different from rural streams; an urban stream's beneficial use is primarily conveyance not habitat. Too fragmented: authority/responsibilities divided up

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
		between too many federal agencies. HQ-regions/districts.
32	Small- medium size projects: streamline paperwork with no other required regulatory approvals.	Facilitate project construction/implementation; reduce paperwork costs; build credibility.
33	Improve delegation of regulatory objectives to local agencies and speed up the permitting process (404).	Focusing all permit issues to limited staff resources of the Corps causes an obvious bottleneck. Trying to regulate to too small of acreage in 404 program causes too much resource to insignificant issue.
34	Establish programmatic 404 permits with local agencies.	Obtain a reasonable process for local agencies to achieve their mission while meeting the major objective of the 404 program.
35	Ability to maintain flood control facilities to its original approved design concept when mitigation has been provided.	Provide needed flood protection.
36	Maintain designed soft bottom flood control channels, or originally designed.	Provide needed flood protection.
37	Repair damaged or eroded flood control facilities with reasonable one-time mitigation requirements.	Provide needed flood protection.
38	Lack of understanding by Corp permits writers of regulatory requirements.	Lengthens projects timeline; causes mid - course changes; opens project to liability; destroys Corps credibility.
39	Regulatory approach is fundamentally adversarial in nature and discourages or prevents efforts between federal, state and local governments. The regulatory approach has shifted too much of power and influence to federal government while not providing financial assistance to pay for added costs incurred by local government.	Local governments are responsible to their constituents. They have limited resources. They have maintenance responsibilities for flood management facilities. Yet, Federal Regulations dictate how and if activities can be accomplished. There is no nexus between added costs incurred and the seemingly arbitrary regulatory requirements.
40	Need for nationwide permits for routine issues.	Simplify the permit process and reduce the time required. Provide for local approval for some minor permit issues.
41	Special interest groups dominate the regulatory process.	The regulatory process is now the tool of special interest groups to promote their issue and existence.
42	Need to recognize regional/distinctive differences when it comes to Federal	The state of Arizona has unique differences: desert environment; ephemeral waterbodies;

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	Regulations i.e. stormwater and TMDL program and how it ties to a one size fits all approach. This is more EPA’s issue, than the Corps.	federally imposed biological and physical criteria not appropriate when no fish in dry river beds; natural background is not appropriately addressed; state should have more say; state is going for primacy but are highly understaffed.
43	Regulations superceding/trumping one another. Recommendation to coordinate across federal agencies.	ESA superceding the CWA; need some sort of cost-benefit economic analysis that makes things reasonable; flood control should be a beneficial use-provide exemptions for eliminatory ES issues or habitat issues.
44	To apply regulations which are applicable to all geographic areas within U.S.; consider regional differences.	To avoid placing unnecessary and unequal constraints, costs, time on other geographic diverse watershed areas.
45	Lack of certainty surrounding 404 permitting because of ESA/CWA issues.	Projects are delayed, not done at all, etc.
46	Stormwater NPDES permits, what is required and reasonableness of the requirements. Different approaches and conflicts between the CWA, ESA, and NEPA.	IF stormwater is handled as a point source, it can lead to large expenditures of public and private funds without corresponding environmental benefits. Different approaches in the laws can lead to paralysis, inaction, or poor expenditures of funds.
47	Lack of balance between flood issues and riparian habitat issues along streams and rivers. Riparian habitat issues are highly emphasized to the detriment of flood issues.	Trying to maintain flood capacity in stream channels is difficult when ACOE only emphasizes riparian/wetland issues during permit process. Example of this is emphasis of planting willows in floodway (they grow big and choke channel)
48	Ability to maintain urban water courses in cost effective approach without expensive mitigation requirements.	Minimum funding available to maintain urban flood control projects. When obligated to provide retroactive mitigation for channel that hasn’t been cyclically maintained.
49	Incentive for all municipal stormwater agencies to participate in watershed solutions for flood control and water quality issues.	One community often can’t solve watershed problem by themselves.
50	Establish consistent water quality parameters on a watershed approach involving more than 1 state.	Protect source water from multistate watershed involving nonpoint agriculture nutrient pollution.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
51	The current regulatory process is “not” working. The greatest loss in wetlands occurred many years ago when the Federal government encouraged people to inhabit and farm land. Development of our major cities has had some impact but minor to the “farm” reclamation of wetlands. Currently the process is “confrontational” with the real burden to solve the problem falling on individuals and local governments.	The Federal Government should embark upon a 10-12 year program to acquire old reclaimed wetlands and restore them to high-grade wetland status. A program with appropriations of 3 billion per year will solve the problem nationwide.
52	Confrontation with its increasing negativity towards our national government. The system is severely broken and needs fixing. Regarding implementation of the 404 dredge and fill process needs to be Modified to allow regular maintenance of public infrastructure as that infrastructure was designed and constructed. The same should be applied to private infrastructure. I know specifically of cases where flood channels were not maintained because of Inability to properly maintain serious over bank flooding occurred with huge damages and significant human suffering. Corps Regulatory staff, generally is in total denial of this problem.	Corps Regulatory staff is doing more to discredit the Corps as a premier engineering establishment than any of her action or activity.
54	Recognize regional differences ephemeral water vs. perennial water with regard to values of national importance.	Arid climates are held to unreasonable standards.
55	Resource agencies (COE/USFWS/USEPA) all seem to lack the neutrality to fairly judge projects including maintenance requirements. Theses agencies have been infiltrated unduly influenced by environmental interests bent on stopping new development.	Public agencies/local government is hampered in its efforts to accommodate growth and maintain public safety infrastructure. Time delays are costly and puts public at risk. Need to get to a cooperative effort underway.
56	To be able to streamline permitting process.	To limit flood control project cost, scheduling.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
57	Laws open to interpretation by various ACOE officials.	Processing needs to be consistent with enforcement and process.
58	Coordination with other agencies.	Improve communication.
59	Federal permits for minor activities.	Too many required; time required to obtain them is excessive.
60	Excessive Federal intrusion into local matters.	Federal involvement brings nothing to the table when you are trying to resolve local issues.
61	How to provide adequate \$ to maintain exist infrastructure? Are regulations necessary to obtain adequate dollars now? Methods of paying?	Infrastructure aging without adequate \$ will greatly increase dollars required later.
62	ESA regulation: need more balance and economic sensitivity to response to listening; need better science; who bears the risk of scientific uncertainty? Now always operators, it seems not resources.	Shutting down water project operations that are multi-billion dollar economy and millions of people for questionable environmental benefit; look to multiple benefit decisions.
63	Lack of coordination between federal agencies on 404 permitting process.	Many federal agencies virtually ignore proposed projects until the 404 process or the “end” of the 404 process. Many federal agencies have money or personnel limitations on coordination; this is a very important issue to local agencies.
64	Conflicting priorities among the various regulatory processes.	The conflicts result in disagreements over project impacts and proposed mitigation features.
65	There is not good coordination among the various regulatory agencies- often conflicting regulations for same issue.	It is important because of high frustration among private and public sectors to deal with the regulations. Satisfying the conditions of one regulation conflicts with the conditions of other agencies conditions. If agencies can coordinate their regulations for the same issue, then the conflicts can be avoided.
66	Time frame required to obtain federal permits.	Lengthy permitting process can result in delays to implementing projects and lead to loss of public support and funding.
67	Permitting process related to you is very lengthy and quite often very frustrating.	Need for streamlining process of permitting and more nationwide rather than individuals especially related to flood control operations.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Theme 4		
Floodplain Management		
68	Establish reasonable property interest for project which includes environmental MTCE.	COE currently specifies easement interests which is often not adequate when acquiring project interests. Property owner left with fee title but no useable interest in property.
69	Development in the floodplain.	Difficult to protect, if elevated or flood proofed; emergency situation challenges. Federal role: regulation, information, enforcement?
70	Structural measures with properties still left in flood zone require action to secure.	If “John Doe” doesn’t close gate in floodwall: system ineffective. What about “Jane Doe” trapped on other side of wall, etc.?
71	Nonstructural measures are often ineffective in solving flooding problems.	While often ineffective, heavily pushed by federal government.
72	Encroachment in floodway fringe district often causes increased flooding downstream, because of more efficient channels and change in timing of peak flows.	Actions taken one at a time are each relatively insignificant, but are dangerous as the effects accumulate. Federal government role would be educational, encouraging “no adverse impact” floodplains through program and funding incentives, and role changes (ultimately) at federal level.
73	Effective floodplain management can actually inhibit qualifying/competing for structural projects needed in older, urbanized areas.	It is counter productive not to reward and communities who do a good job of floodplain management. CRS or other indices should be used to favor projects. Federal government should change criteria.
74	Upland development increases volume of water.	Federal role: Corps role; provide funding for open space dedications (easements, or purchases)
75	Accurate/adequate mapping of floodplains to regulate development. Take into account future watershed conditions.	To not continue to put people/structures in harms way.
76	The money to buy houses in the floodplain and restores natural floodplain.	Repetitive losses constitute so much money in losses.
77	Ability of uplands to absorb water after development has occurred is much reduced.	Role of Federal Government: don’t encourage development in the flood plain/zone. Encourage local cities to reduce volume of water through design techniques.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
78	Acquisitions of flood prone areas-what level of protection?	Federal role-assist in determination –how bad is problem – science of practical hydrology.
79	Uniform set of laws posed on regional needs.	Federal role: research of applicability and rule writing.
80	Non-structural flood control solutions impacted or considered habitat or habitat creating/inducing.	Environmental regulatory control and imposing of unforeseen requirements and costs and hampering maintenance and hydraulic level of flood protection. Federal and State requirements and conflicts of interest.
81	Impacts of non-structural flood control activities relative to long term maintenance/emergency spills/and responsibilities and liabilities.	Need entity to take responsibilities and provide long term funding and have legal authority. Federal perspectives and involvement to help.
82	Allow cities to do their own mapping and flood studies and not FEMA.	FEMA to provide funding to local government; cities have a better understanding of their communities to administrate.
83	There is a need to establish development regulations or guidelines to maintain buffers and provide for flood protection.	Fed’s to establish minimum requirements that are part of FEMA’s requirements.
84	Is the policy to provide flood insurance or minimize flood of property and structures? (FEMA)	Current policy does not seem to provide flood protection or adequate flood boundaries for development.
85	Delineation of floodplain needs to account for full development of watershed.	FEMA needs to modify policy when conducting flood studies. Stop looking at existing conditions and look at full watershed developments (current policy builds in flooding of structure by looking at existing conditions.)
86	Risk assessment of all measures; can we afford to have some things wet.	Cost vs. public acceptability; federal responsibility: assist in costs of studies and regional problems.
87	Inconsistent regulation and enforcement of rules of floodplains by local agencies (cities, counties, etc)	Provide maps but not oversight of local communities. Lots of finger pointing on who is responsible; local agencies allowing houses on stilts or floodproofed.
88	Need to show future conditions of flood hazard on FEMA maps.	When the flood studies are effective, they are almost out of date; the maps could be useful for longer. FEMA/States/CTC’s should be in charge.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
89	Need for updated flood hazard zones.	When hurricane Floyd hit, many citizens did not know they were in a hazard zone.
90	Common sense approach-regional-multifacilitated approach; combined structural, non-structural-environment sensitive.	Combined outreach-public acceptance-safety. Federal facilitator rather than regulator; also funds.
91	Funding	More problems than money available. Feds can provide some money grants. State and locals also must be responsible.
92	Small towns maintaining up to date local floodplain ordinances.	Staying in compliance with federal regulations and FEMA requirements. Feds: Continue to use NAFSMA to disseminate information. Internet great resource to keep small communities in the loop.
93	Small town staff lack of experience responding to major floods and getting FEMA response.	Save time, get federal assistance started. Federal Government continue to facilitate regional training for disaster response.
94	Tall levees are an eyesore.	Role of Federal Government: Don't encourage development in the floodplain zone.
95	Encroachment in the flood zone discourages use of floodplain as flooded area.	Role of Federal Government: Don't encourage development in the flood zone/e.g. insurance. Provide funding to buy properties in floodplain.
96	Need for more real-time flood warning systems for smaller watersheds.	With GIS technology and modeling, we now have the ability to forecast the flood levels and direct resources to where they are needed most.
97	Floodplain management: certain conflicts of interest when selecting structural verses non- structural solutions.	Unknown regulatory burdens. Federal agency conflicts of interest.
98	Integrate flood control activities with regulatory process	It is easy to say “environmental friendly” but not easy to incorporate all perspectives of what this means. Fed role: provide leadership in coordination of diverse interests; regulators.
99	One time mitigations only for maintaining flood control facilities.	Provide needed flood control facilities.
100	Maintain existing flood control facilities with reasonable one time mitigation requirements.	Provide needed flood protections.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Theme 5		
Marine Transportation System		
	NO COMMENTS	
Theme 6		
Environmental/Ecosystem Health and Management		
101	Watershed approach to restoration work.	Due to funding constraints there is a tendency to go for “band-aid” solutions that may only shift a problem or have a very local impact. A watershed perspective would provide better “long-term” solutions.
Theme 7		
Federal Funding		
102	Overlapping of fragmented Federal agency roles are not streamlined, coordinated; agencies with responsibilities within permit process approach their roles independently, redundantly; draws out mitigation planning, redesign.	
103	Challenge : Federal Funding	Abolish using NED plan as basis for cost-sharing between the Corps and local sponsor on flood protection project. NED plan is outdated and cannot fully comply with CEQA/NEPA requirements.
104	1) Local agency access to Federal funding is very difficult; the process is complete and often results in funding that is much less then needed.	
105	2) Unfunded mandates –often exceed the \$100M threshold. State and local agencies do provide actual costs for unfunded mandates, but their voices are not heard. There is a need to address the funding aspects more realistically. Unfunded mandates should be accompanied by funding strategies for state/local agencies.	
106	Federal government can help in two more areas :a) Federal role: assist state/local agencies in the financial planning efforts, thereby understanding the real issues behind implementing existing and new programs; b) assist local/state agencies in	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	projecting and planning for environmental costs associated with new regulations. This aspect is often the most unpredictable element of long-term planning.	
107	Federal Funding.	Problem: Political process. Need: Adequate resources. Opportunity: Define need and appropriations appropriately.
108	Federal Funding.	Problem: need to ask annually for money. Need: need to know what contributions by Feds will be for local funding plan purpose. Opportunity: Fully fund project up front their annual commitments. (i.e. trust fund)
109	Federal Funding.	Problem: not sufficient dollars. Need: protect life and property and for new and aging infrastructure. Opportunity: to prove to Congress the problem and need so dollars are forthcoming.
110	Federal Funding.	Allocation of Federal funding from state to locals. There are 2 phase 1 stormwater permits in Pennsylvania: Philadelphia and Allentown. In 1999 the Philadelphia Water Department requested \$2.4 million, with a \$1.3 million match for 10 projects and received \$0.
111	The funding guidelines do not follow the intent of programs. Example: challenge 21 requires non-federal sponsor to provide land. One of the best forms of mitigation is acquisition. The 35% cost share is easily met and exceeded by the local government.	Challenge 21; FMA and HMGP cost sharing strategies are inconsistent – it is all federal money! Consistent methodologies like “sliding cost share” should be consistent to all federal agencies to encourage locals to take responsibility.
112	Federal Funding	ESA and environmental constraints have changed the way that flood protection measures can be implemented. NEPA and CEQA process make traditional design not feasible. Cost-sharing formula needs to be changed to cope with the modern date design to deal with environmental effects design.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
113	Corps too rigid on funding NED plan only (and what is included). Sometimes NED plan is not even feasible –physically or more often environmentally.	Be more flexible and not force the local government to pay difference between NED and LPP if the NED is not feasible physically or environmentally.
114		Funding on LPP should be examined and approved based on community’s need. “NED” is not the project that community would accept.
115	Federal Funding.	Corp’s FC projects are not planned, designed and implemented on watershed perspective. Mitigation to offset cumulative environmental effects often falls on local sponsor’s obligation.
116	There are no incentives for aggressive floodplain management. There is an opportunity for the federal government to “slide” the cost share based on the communities actions.	Communities are taking the attitude that the feds will bail them out when problems arise. Pursuing this opportunity will hopefully make more communities more responsible.
117	Federal Funding.	Preferred funding for watershed partnerships on projects that include: federal, state, local and community representatives, and are designed to address environmental community and economic concerns.
118	Federal funding	Monitoring requirements for mitigating environmental effects are required for 10/20/100 years. The cost-sharing obligations need to be addressed in the GPM and implement in the PCA.
119	Federal funding.	Prefer funding to economically challenged areas. 1) Define economically challenged. 2) Identify target areas, cities, counties watersheds. 3) Apply counter measures to improve: water quality, community involvement, economics.
120	Water funding centralized sources.	State of Ohio EPA has organized a group of Federal funding agencies for water funding which may be used as a model in other states by local governments.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Theme 8		
Water Quality		
121	Mitigation banking offers more regional, larger-scale (rather than incremental) benefits to habitats. Need to facilitate creative, cooperative mitigation bank planning in advance of individual project needs; need to work with conservancies, federal agencies, state F & W agencies.	
122	Not a COE objective.	With several restoration projects underway water quality improvements could be readily incorporated if it were a COE objective.
123	Lack of scientific information on what the effect of certain BMPs are.	Without scientific information, money may be wasted on measures that are not as effective, perhaps not effective at all; coordinated research results.
124	Clear direction on what the standards/criteria are as far as water quality treatment.	Without direction, the results we try to attain can be arbitrary.
125	Clarify whether discharge or conveyor is responsible for attainment of numerical levels.	
126	Do treatments facilities become receiving waters.	
127	Water quality; need for research and development of BMP (best management practices) that economically produce water quality.	There are many groups working on developing BMP that will help obtain water quality, but there is not a central agency that has the funding to develop and test the BMP. Also the Corps could become the lead for collecting data that could be used by stakeholders.
128	Coordinated research of treatment BMP.	Currently municipalities may be burdened through the court system with doing what amounts to basic research.
129	Water quality. 1) Federal participation/communication with regional boards, locals. 2) Monitoring plans and water quality standards established by the Corps. 3) Funding of O&M of established BMPs.	1)Lack of research conducted by Feds. 2) Baseline conditions funded by Corps would help determine impacts. 3) Failures of BMPs primarily due to lack of maintenance.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
130	Need proven BMPs in order to meet stormwater runoff numerical effluent limitations (Tahoe Basin) for nutrients, sediments.	Cost-benefit analysis necessary? Research on BMPs?
131	CWA- 303 (d) listings not always scientifically based.	Once listed as water quality limited, TMDL required.
132	Stormwater quality characterization. Proposed positive solutions-EPA consideration of reduced monitoring parameters, Phase I & Phase II cities partnering, metropolitan area permits.	Millions of dollars are being spent by Phase I municipalities to meet permit requirements, including excessive monitoring. Primary problem appears to be microbiological (i.e. dog, cat, bird, etc. fecal material).
133	1) Reducing copper loads from brake pads. 2) Reducing toxicity from pesticides. 3) Reducing indirect impacts resulting from new runoff.	1) Brake pad composition difficult to regulate at local and regional level. It is reportedly the source of significant copper loads to receiving waters. 2) Toxicity in urban creeks exists wherever there is development.
134	Water quality.	Identifying and prioritizing pollutants of concern in surface waters. Then identifying the source of said pollutants. Development of low cost, effective BMP's to reduce the pollutants.
135	Water quality; TMDLS.	TMDL's are the current focus of environmentalists and regulators. Feds are 20 years behind in development process. Now attempting to pass obligation for baseline monitoring to local government on a crisis basis.
136	Water quality; regulations.	Litigation has taken precedence over solutions and is soaking up resource. Congress must clarify municipal NPDES requirements to trump litigation then provide resources for solutions.
137	Water quality; surface water vs. ground water.	Many solutions regulators and environmentalists propose for surface water quality may have adverse effects on ground water quality. Answers are needed before said solutions are implemented.
138	Water quality; coordination.	The multitude of regulatory agencies do not coordinate/communicate. Drives up a cost of compliance and increases time line for

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
		action. Often contradictory requirements making compliance impossible.
139	Water quality; TMDL process is troubling to local governments who may be stuck with costs and may not be able to impact water quality.	Water quality is important to our citizens but governments don't have an overview way to deal with issues collectively. Federal role- help with information exchange and coordination.
140	Water quality. Regulatory agencies tend toward numeric limits that may not only be unachievable but also may not impact water quality.	We need to be sure that we're spending our money and our efforts in the appropriate and meaningful activities.
Theme 9		
Emergency Response		
	NO COMMENTS	
Theme 10		
Water Supply		
	NO COMMENTS	
Theme 11		
Wastewater Collection		
	NO COMMENTS	
Theme 12		
General Water Resources Infrastructure (not otherwise classified)		
	NO COMMENTS	
Theme 13		
Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination		
141	Problem: Stretching regulatory roles beyond statutory authorization/jurisdiction- results in poor credibility and legal battles and lack of certainty. Need: Agencies to conform to statutory role or secure appropriate, clear authorization.	
Theme 14		
Corps Planning Process		
142	Capabilities of local sponsors.	Many local sponsors have considerable capability to implement flood management practices. USACE should develop policies and programs that allow local implementation of federal projects.
143	Maintenance of projects.	Environmental permitting and mitigation requirements should be completed and issued for long-term operations and

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
		maintenance activities when a project is being designed and implemented.
144	More flexibility with PCA's.	Currently exemptions are allowed to the states regarding obligation of future legislative appropriations when these are inconsistent with state constitutional or statutory authority. USACE should seek changes to allow qualified local governments the same exemption that states receive.
145	Corps planning process. Construction: Contract documents need to strengthen control over contractors.	Corps contract documents “Legal Boiler Plate” must be revised to reduce many of the contractor rights and privileges; especially time extensions, completion time and “extras”.
146	NED vs. LPP. Often the NED is not implementable and not permitable by regulatory agencies. However, it is still the basis of cost sharing.	The federal project should be capable of going to construction and should be the NED. That project should be the LPP and the same as NED as long as there's a demonstrated federal interest.
147	1) Modernize construction management. 2) Blend multidiscipline approach. 3) Strong project manager.	
148	Corps planning process. Contractor control- more Corps control over contractor, especially completion dates.	Contractors control the construction process. Extras, time extensions, differing site conditions, all work to benefit the contractor and to the detriment of the project.
149	Corps planning process. District offices need to have more decision-making authority.	Headquarters must relinquish some of its control over district level offices. Almost every decision must be reviewed and approved by headquarters.
150	Inadequate effort at reconnaissance level study.	Inadequate time and money to determine federal interest adequacy. Corps could rank problems/challenges in watershed either break down into several areas or increase money to scope of problem.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
151	Although local agencies are responsible for 35% of cost, and long-term O& M , they have limited (or no) control over construction phase.	Local agencies feel that contractor has too much project control. Perhaps Corps baseline contracts and specifications need to be revised to 1) limited contractors control/power and 2) delegate more authority of local agency (at least 35%).
152	Need to delegate decision-making authority down to lowest level of competence – empower lower level managers.	Corps project managers lack authority to make decisions. Thus the entire process is dragged down.
153	Redefine NED project to account for environmental limitations.	NED projects don't account for concerns of other federal players, i.e., conflicts with Endangered Species Act can easily deem NED worthless/unbuildable.
154	Local agencies have core competencies which could be utilized by Corps to streamline process.	Corps uses a regimented program which overlooks expertise of local agencies and their potentially valuable contribution. Meanwhile they still pay 35%. Corps needs to treat local agencies as 50/50 partner.
Theme 15		
Federal and Corps Water Resources Policy		
155	Local and state capability as a whole, falls well below its potential. This is primarily to a benevolent federal government assuming responsibility for state and local issues. What I have heard today is a vision that perpetuates this view.	Most often the problems we solve have been created out of ignorance or in some cases with full knowledge at the local and state level. This to a large extent has resulted in rampant acceleration of flood damages, that is out of control and financially penalizes taxpayers that live in communities actually trying to address their problems.
156	The federal government needs to focus on preventing problems, not just correcting problems.	The Corps has in place programs to build projects to correct existing flood control problems. FEMA, theoretically, has in place a program to prevent future flood control problems (e.g. NFIP). Why then does the Corps build projects to protect property that was developed after a community has adopted NFIP maps. The prevention program is not working. It must be stronger.
Theme 16		
Recreation		
	NO COMMENTS	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT SAN DIEGO NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION

[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Theme 17		
Smart Growth and Development		
157	Before more federal regulation is applied to development, existing unintentional federal incentives for sprawl must be addressed. 1) subsidy of interstate and system 2) clean up of polluted site stuck with current owners.	Do not add more regulation until you undo the unintentional drivers federal action has caused.
158	Smart Growth and Development.	Corps and federal government to stay out of local and state issues.
Theme 18		
Coastal/Shoreline Management		
	NO COMMENTS	