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

DALLAS, TEXAS
AUGUST 10, 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

DALLAS, TEXAS
AUGUST 10, 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 – Dallas, Texas 11
Welcoming Remarks..... 11
Session Objectives 33
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion) 55
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion) 88
Challenge A – Water Resource Infrastructure and Supply 99
Challenge R – Infrastructure Enhancement with Balance for Environment 99
Challenge K – Water Allocation..... 99
Challenge B – Consensus on Water Resource Priorities 1010
Challenge M – Corps Communication 1010
Challenge G – Future Planning/Funding for Water Resources 1111
Challenge AA – O&M for Industrial/Commercial Advancement 1111
Closing Remarks and Adjournment 1212

Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges A-1

Appendix B Submitted Public Statements and Materials B-1

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – DALLAS, TEXAS

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Dallas, Texas on August 10, 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 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 Dallas, Texas Listening Session. This session, hosted by the Southwestern Division, was conducted on August 10, 2000 at the Arlington Convention Center in Arlington, Texas. Approximately 128 people (not including Corps participants and the facilitation team) 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

Brigadier General Edwin Arnold, USACE Southwestern Division Commander, welcomed the audience to the listening session. He thanked the participants for taking time out of their busy schedule to participate in the session. General Arnold explained to the participants that the session was designed to address national and regional water resource challenges facing the people of the nation in the 21st century. A considerable number of participants were from

other government agencies to participate in the session. He acknowledged their presence as well as representatives from the industrial, environmental, and consulting sectors. The General assumed the participants felt the same as the Corps about the seriousness of the session and he encouraged them to share their ideas with each other.

General Arnold explained to the participants that the Corps has derived six general water resource challenges the nation faces in the 21st century. These six challenges were determined based on regional and national concerns. General Arnold told the participants he realizes they may have other issues, concerns, or comments not captured in these six challenges and wanted the participants to realize that is why the Corps was here to listen. Sessions like this one are being conducted across the nation to find out what is important to the people of the nation. Furthermore, the information compiled from the sessions will assist in the development of the COE National Strategic Plan.

General Arnold commented that the Corps recently has been focusing on challenges associated with infrastructure, environmental restoration, and various other projects. The General recalled a cartoon he cut out as a child that made light of the effects from Corps projects. It depicted poor treatment of nature, which causes a much more serious response today. The environment is an important issue for the entire nation and needs to be addressed. General Arnold gave a few examples of water resource challenges, such as flood reduction and clean water. A participant commented that approximately 80 percent of all diseases are waterborne. General Arnold responded by mentioning that the greatest advancement in the availability of clean water is not a scientific one, but rather an engineering feat. He was referring to the development in the purification process. Then the General described other important issues, such as water infrastructure needs and emergency response preparedness. Again, he realized some participants would want to discuss additional issues important to them.

Lastly, the General said the key to the future is to plan for the expected growth and protect the environment in the process. This type of progress requires long term planning for today and tomorrow and will take a cooperative effort to be successful. The information from the session will be compiled into a report describing the challenges facing that particular region and each session report will assist in the development of a national report. This report will be used in long-term decision making. One point General Arnold stressed is the Corps was not looking for work from this, but attempting to identify the challenges the Corps and related agencies would need to focus on. He concluded by saying the session was not about speeches, but about listening.

The General closed by noting that the listening sessions are geared toward learning how the Federal government is doing, and what they should be doing. All of the information gathered in Atlanta and elsewhere will be compiled in a report which will be posted on the Corps' "national challenges" web site at http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges.

General Arnold then introduced Mr. Dale Brown as the session facilitator representing the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd. (PMCL), and thanked everyone for coming and helping.

Session Objectives

After General Arnold's introduction, Mr. Brown began by explaining his role in the initial sessions. He told the participants of his involvement in previous sessions in St. Louis, Sacramento, and Phoenix. Mr. Brown explained to the participants that Corps members were asked to sit only one or two Corps members per table. He then introduced Mr. Mark Gmitro, the Project Manager from the COE, and Brady Smith from PMCL, the session recorder, as members of the facilitation team. Mr. Brown stressed that the goal of the facilitation team was to assist in the communication process. He then 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:

10:00-10:25 (A.M.)	Welcome
10:25-10:45	Overview of Workshop
10:45-11:40	Table Discussions
11:40-12:25 (P.M.)	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
12:25-12:30	Dot Voting
12:30-1:30	Lunch
1:30-2:10	First Small Group Answer Session
2:10-2:45	Second Small Group Answer Session
2:45-3:00	Break
3:00-3:45	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
3:45-4:00	Closing Remarks
4:00-5:00	Informal Discussions

After reviewing the agenda, Mr. Brown explained that the session was designed to determine the water resource challenges facing the nation. The listening sessions were designed to get input from everyone. Additionally, the goal of the session was to obtain the answers to the following four questions:

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. Brown assumed the answers to these questions would be applicable to the Corps, along with a variety of associated Federal agencies.

Mr. Brown urged the audience members to follow and trust the process, as it was carefully designed to gather the most information from each participant. He asked participants to provide any written statements to the session recorder for inclusion in the report. Additionally, Mr. Brown noted that if a participant wanted to leave a comment or provide a written statement, it would be possible to send such a statement as an e-mail attachment to the Corps web site (http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges). He reminded the participants that the Corps web site address could be found on the back of the water resource challenges brochure. Mr. Brown also explained that the purpose of these listening sessions was not to discuss specific Corps projects, and that if an audience member had concerns about a particular project, they were to speak with Ms. Lu Christie, Public Affairs Officer from the Corps, who was present at the workshop.

Mr. Brown recommended people with the same agenda to sit at different tables so to voice their views to participants unfamiliar with the information they wanted to share. He explained to everyone that self-adhesive challenge "stickies" could be used for listing comments and challenges on an individual basis.

The first task assigned to the audience was to name a group spokesperson for each table. That person would be designated to report out on behalf of the entire table. Mr. Brown went on to explain that at least one member of the Corps would be sitting at each table to listen to the discussions and assist the group if asked, but that they had been instructed not to serve as the spokesperson for the table.

Once the spokespersons had been chosen, two directions would be presented to the audience for them to discuss in small groups at the tables. The first direction would be to identify the water challenges that people at the table thought were important; the second direction would be to discuss why they were important. The spokesperson for each table was also instructed to create a crisp, concise six or seven word statement of each challenge as identified by the group, as well as develop a brief analysis as to why it was considered a challenge. As each spokesperson reported on the challenges generated at their table, a Corps staff member would capture a concise statement of each challenge and project it onto a screen for all to view. Another Corps member would write out the same statement on butcher pad paper and post it for prioritizing the challenges. Once all challenges were determined, the participants would be given five red self-adhesive dots. The dots would be used to vote on the challenges each participant felt were the most important. The reason for this was so that the most important could be addressed during the afternoon session. The other challenges would be analyzed and discussed in the summary report, but because of time constraints, could not be discussed in the session.

Finally, most of the day's activities would involve working in small groups in order to achieve the maximum interaction among the participants. Following these instructions, the participants were then asked to determine water resource challenges they felt are important, write them down (one challenge per stickie), and begin discussing them at their tables.

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

The participants were grouped into 19 tables of approximately six to ten people per table. After approximately an hour of discussion, Mr. Brown went around the room and asked the spokesperson from each table to give a concise statement of the challenge or challenges identified by the participants at the table. While one member of the Corps staff projected onto a screen each challenge as it was identified, other Corps staff members wrote each challenge on a separate piece of butcher paper, each of which was then affixed to the wall of the conference room. Mr. Brown recommended participants continue to fill out the stickies and affix them to the related challenges. The workshop participants identified 35 separate challenges:

A. Intelligently ensure adequate water resource infrastructure and supply.

B. Develop consensus on water resource priorities.

C. Technology and advances and real time data exchange.

D. Public education and communication.

E. Educating general public and government agencies on the value of our water resource systems.

F. Need to protect floodplains and water quality resources.

G. Coordinate planning and funding for future water resources.

H. Prevent coastal erosion, flooding, and pollution.

I. Provide sufficient funding for 404 program.

J. Improve awareness and communication to educate the public on the benefits of civil works projects and Corps responsibilities.

K. Importance of moving water from areas that are over-abundant to areas that are under-abundant.

L. Working through multiobjective water resource management desires.

M. Communication between Corps and property owners and what are the property owners rights. (What is jurisdictional?)

N. Restructure the permitting process and ignore the trivial and study the big problems.

O. All remediation from defense contamination should be turned over to the Corps.

P. Maintain and restore the environment and biodiversity.

Q. Scale of Corps projects matching available resources.

R. Upgrading aging infrastructure while balancing environmental protection, flood control, and what the public desires.

S. Maintaining clean water through effective government cooperation.

T. Cumulative assessment of environmental impacts.

U. Find nonstructural flood control methods.

V. Improve preparedness to minimize the destruction from natural disasters.

W. Management of inadequate water supply for irrigation and livestock.

X. Regional siltation basins and assessing dredging fees on a per acre basis.

Y. Improvement and efficiency of natural disaster response.

Z. Need for sustainable development in water resources development.

AA. Waterway development maintenance and repair to meet industrial and commercial advancement and progress.

BB. Better management of lakes and reservoirs.

CC. Adequate funding for water resource development and maintenance projects.

DD. Accurate non-flood releases from reservoirs to consider water rights.

EE. Providing for instream flow and inflows to bays and estuaries while ensuring water supplies for human needs.

FF. Texas policy on groundwater - possibly modify the rule of capture.

GG. Watershed planning with state agencies to improve (currently doesn't exist).

HH. Definition of desirable environment and quality of life.

II. Ensure effective mitigation for wetlands loss due to Corps projects.

After the last challenge was identified, Mr. Brown thanked the participants and reiterated that at any time during the day participants were welcome to fill out the "stickies" for any challenge of personal interest and stick it on the appropriate butcher pad posted for that

challenge, for as many challenges as they wished. A transcription of the comments written on the "stickies" is provided in Appendix A.[1]

Mr. Brown then explained to the group that each challenge identified by the audience was important to the Corps and would be included in the meeting report. However, due to time constraints, only seven challenges would be addressed in detail during the second portion of the session. Next, all of the participants were asked to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots in order to identify which challenges were to be focused on during the second portion of the session. Sheets of adhesive dots were placed on each table. Each non-Corps workshop participant then took five dots and affixed them 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. The group spokespersons then tallied the results of the dot voting.

The dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

A	51	M	32	Y	5
B	35	N	22	Z	16
C	12	O	7	AA	29
D	17	P	20	BB	3
E	21	Q	5	CC	14
F	26	R	49	DD	4
G	30	S	22	EE	10
H	6	T	13	FF	1
I	23	U	21	GG	2
J	11	V	5	HH	2
K	38	W	13	II	8
L	5	X	7		

The seven challenges most favored by the audience were:

A	(51 votes)	Water resource infrastructure and supply
R	(49)	Infrastructure enhancement with balance for environment
K	(38)	Water allocation
B	(35)	Consensus on water resource priorities
M	(32)	Corps communication
G	(30)	Future planning/funding for water resources
AA	(29)	O&M for industrial/commercial advancement

Before dismissing the audience for lunch, Mr. Brown explained that the seven challenges identified through the group voting exercise would be discussed in detail during the afternoon session.

[1] 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.

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

After the participants returned from lunch, Mr. Brown explained the format for the remainder of the afternoon. Approximately 110 to 115 non-Corps participants were counted after the lunch break. Mr. Brown noted the seven challenges chosen before lunch were posted on butcher pads, which were positioned around the room (one challenge per butcher pad). A one hour discussion period would be designated to allow for the challenges to be examined and for solutions to be developed. The participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail one of the challenges that interested them by sitting at the table next to the appropriate butcher pad. The facilitator asked for one volunteer to remain next to each butcher pad throughout the discussion and serve as the moderator and spokesperson for that discussion. This person would record the participant's ideas and suggestions for that challenge on the butcher pad. Mr. Brown emphasized that the notes written during this portion of the session would be used in the development of the report and to be as thorough as possible.

Before commencing, some questions were posed to the group, and the participants were asked to develop the answers to these questions during their discussions. The answers would then be reported out to the entire audience at the end of the second discussion session. The questions to be addressed during he small group discussions were:

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

Assume you have the authority to implement the changes you would like to see.

Audience members then gravitated into groups around several of the butcher pads (one challenge per butcher pad), reintroduced themselves, and began deliberating with others in their group. A volunteer notetaker at each group took notes on the butcher pads for each of the seven chosen challenges. The discussion session went from approximately 2:00 to 2:50 PM. At the end of the discussion, Mr. Brown mentioned that comment sheets were placed at each table for participants to give their feedback on the session and how the Corps can improve. Mr. Brown then asked the spokesperson from each challenge group to restate the challenge, provide a summary of the discussion, and the answers to the questions. The results of the discussions on the challenges are provided below[2]:

[2] 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.

Challenge A – Water Resource Infrastructure and Supply

What Action Should be Taken?

- Identify supply and demand through regional plans.
- O&M of existing facilities.
- Streamline Federal permitting process.
- Make water supply a Federal purpose for the Corps.
- Checks and balances for Federal agency promulgation of laws.
- Develop a dynamic strategic plan by the Corps District/Division for navigation, flood control, ecosystem preservation, water supply.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal, state, and local agencies.
- Corps at various levels.

Challenge R – Infrastructure Enhancement with Balance for Environment

What Action Should be Taken?

- Balancing environment.
  - Mitigation Banking.
  - Modify the 404 permit process.
- Determine the extent of problem and establish priorities/ownership.
- Public education awareness; support and involvement.
- Identify and assess impacts of alternatives.
  - Environment.
  - Financial/funding.
  - Economics (commerce and human needs).
- Define purpose and need of structure.
- Develop a process/plan to implement.
- Select alternative.
- Implement.

Who Should Take Action?

- (The group did not directly address this item).

Challenge K – Water Allocation

What Action Should be Taken?

- Identify/review existing studies.
- Finish SB1 initiatives.
  - Regional plans to identify water needs.

- Resolution of water rights.
- Implement SB1 plans.
- Identify funding.

Who Should Take Action?
- State should take the lead in planning.
- Regional/local levels responsible for identifying needs.
- Federal: 404 permitting, funding, and design/construction assistance.
- Commercial solutions.

Challenge B – Consensus on Water Resource Priorities

What Action Should be Taken?
- Develop consensus during the decision process.
- Up-front communication needed that includes Federal, state, local, agencies, and private groups.
  - Frequent public forums (document proceedings) on issues such as watershed management.
- Public education.
- Identify needs by watershed.
  - Use national estuary program model.
  - Implement from the bottom up.
  - Identify resources and priorities of all stakeholders.
  - Ensure involvement of all stakeholders.
- Develop approach for specific definitions of watersheds.

Who Should Take Action?
- Federal, state, and local agencies.
- Private companies, individuals, and organizations.

Challenge M – Corps Communication

What Action Should be Taken?
- Laws people agree on.
- Reach consensus on rules.
- Corps take lead from EPA.
- Create checklist to determine tasking.
- Tailor laws to each region.
  - Implementation – problems are different in each area; framework to each state.
- Corps address property rights issues (union scenarios).
- Define navigable water of the U.S. as applied to present day conditions.
  - Consistent application.

- Problems within districts.
- Get rid of "Duck Rule" (gray areas in regulations; i.e., consistent application and isolated waters).
- Education of private sector, after laws have been determined.
- Proportional application of rules?
  - 1 acre vs. 100 acres (mitigation).
- Clarify jurisdiction between FEMA/Corps and municipalities.
- Efficient permitting process.
- Availability of accurate mapping.
- Sharing information.

Who Should Take Action?
- Main involvement from Federal agencies.
- State involvement.
- Some involvement from private individuals and organizations.

Challenge G – Future Planning/Funding for Water Resources

What Action Should be Taken?
- Establish a diverse forum (including private interest).
- Maintain local control.
- Emphasize watershed geology.
- Promote sustainable water resource management (conservation).
- Identify winners and losers (affected entities).
- Include environmental and engineering.
- Support programs on a regional level.

Who Should Take Action?
- Federal (including regional), state, and local agencies.
- Private industry.
- Community participation.

Challenge AA – O&M for Industrial/Commercial Advancement

What Action Should be Taken?
- More favorable cost sharing for dredging depths greater than 45 feet.
  - Currently 75/25 share for less than 45 feet; 50/50 share for greater than 46 feet.
- Adequately fund O&M budget in order to allow for beneficial use of dredged material or find separate funding for environmental issues (support beneficial use).
- Better education of public on benefits of inland and coastal water system (emphasize the positive; create balanced approach).

- Develop a long range plan for transportation of goods (DOT, Corps, others).
- Establish a national policy that recognizes the value of ports and waterways in promoting environmental stewardship, international trade and competitiveness and safety (emphasize national defense mobilization).
- Replace/upgrade deteriorating locks and dams.
- Provide consistent barge draft/dimensions for the Mississippi and tributaries.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal (Congress, Corps, and DOT).
- State, and local agencies.
- Private individuals/organizations (community outreach).

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

As a final order of business, Mr. Brown asked the workshop participants to fill out comment sheets if they had not already done so and leave them with the Corps staff.[3] Lastly, he reminded the participants to write down any additional remarks or challenges on the stickies and to post them before departing.

In closing, General Arnold thanked everyone for his or her involvement. Based on information the General heard from the participants, there was much to be done. General Arnold admitted that in the past the Corps did not take the current precautions when dealing with environmental concerns. One important challenge he heard was the streamlining of agencies and applying consistency. Additionally, participants voiced concerns for better education of agencies and the public on water resource challenges. Water use has become an issue and the proper allocation of water is important to the entire nation. General Arnold continued by saying only 20 percent of all rainwater hits land, the rest is over water. General Arnold felt the session developed some distinct themes. General Arnold heard a variety of concerns, some of which were Federal and others that were State concerns. He said the Corps would act as a catalyst in the assistance of other agencies/organizations.

General Arnold thanked Mr. Brown for the facilitation assistance and felt the participants stayed focused. Additionally, he told participants if some additional information comes to mind, it can be provided on the web site. General Arnold pointed out a few Division/District web sites for participants to view. The session was titled "Join the Dialogue" to depict the sharing of information and General Arnold assumed it was important to the people who participated. He realized participants had many different views, but all related to the same large objective. Because of this connection, the General urged the participants to continue the discussions after the session. The general reminded the participants that the Corps responsibility is to maintain the nation's water resources. He recommended this type of forum be applied in other regional and local meetings. The General stressed that many good ideas were generated during the session

[3] 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. The Corps personnel collected these as the participants left the meeting.

that could be addressed on a more local level. A participant asked General Arnold who has ownership of continuing the momentum? General Arnold replied that the information will be compiled and used in the development of a National Needs Report. Furthermore, this report would be presented to leaders and Congress, addressing the national needs described by the people. Lastly, General Arnold added that some challenges could be addressed at various state and regional levels, possibly before national actions are developed. General Arnold again thanked the audience for attending and for taking time out of their busy schedule. The workshop was then adjourned. The public statements collected in conjunction with this listening session are included as Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
Challenge A		
Intelligently insure adequate water resource infrastructure and supply.		
1	Provision of adequate water supply to growing urban areas.	The continued economic prosperity of our nation is dependent upon adequate infrastructure.
2	Instill a sense of urgency and ownership within the Corps.	There are many great employees at Corps, but individuals within the Corps end up holding up important projects. Corps employees do not have to face the people they serve, but we, the local sponsors do.
3	Meeting new drinking water regulations with present community budgets.	Cost to communities.
4	A reliable, continuous supply of water for all communities.	Health (safe drinking water); We are growing- greater demand for water in region; Agricultural demand is increasing.
5	Intelligently ensure adequate water resource infrastructure and supply.	Population; demand for goods, sewer, and water needs will continue to grow; adequately designed and maintained infrastructure is important to human health and environment; Our future relies on adequate water.
6	Provide clean water for Texas citizens/ water treatment (pollution).	Water is necessary for the development of the state.
7	Desalinization – projects.	Abundant supply of saltwater; Economical process to remove; Would solve lots of problems.
8	Adequate water and sewer systems for growth.	(1) Many people living in my area do not receive basic sewer/water services. (2) With tremendous growth, many of the small cities and municipalities don't have the expertise to administer programs, identify needs, and how to go about a process to improve services.
9	Maintain water quality and availability at reasonable cost.	Clean water is essential to human health; Population is growing/water supply is not; Cost of EPA requirements is great; Increased agricultural demand.
10	Brackish water- how to use to extend water supply. Texas Water Development Board funds many projects.	
11	Water supply/watershed management.	Municipal/Domestic; Industrial; Agricultural; Environmental/Ecosystems; Demands are increasing and no new

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
		resources are being planned or developed to meet demands.
12	Cultural changes to reduce water use (addicted to green lawns).	
13	There is a need to re-invest in aging water resources infrastructure that provides water supply, flood protection, and water based recreation.	Public health and safety may be in jeopardy if there is no re-investing to upgrade these aging water resources infrastructures.
14	Development of clean water supply to meet future water demands.	Clean water important to health and safety, economic development, and quality of life; particularly because of increase of population and development in the Southwest.
15	Water transportation/distribution in Texas.	Equitable supply across the state; Fairly sharing any excess water with those who need it.
16	National Guard network for water distribution.	Solutions to water supply problem of drought vs. water rich areas.
17	How effective are our conservation measures (maximize wise use of scarce resource)? No follow up programs to measure effectiveness of demand decreases; efficiency increases programs.	Agricultural use is still a major component of water use; old systems (canals) are inefficient.
18	Water supply; dependable supply for cities/industries.	Drinking water; Economic development; Population growth; Recreational.
19	Provide dependable municipal and industrial water from a limited storage volume at existing lakes.	More and more customers are looking towards existing reservoirs to meet their raw water demand, which will frequently require reallocation of existing storage.
20	Rapid growth exacerbates drainage problems.	
21	Water quality of our water supplies; contaminated sediments in reservoirs.	
22	Expanded use of groundwater supplies, which are being depleted, affects surface water flows.	Supplies are interrelated; demand is interrelated- surface/ground.
23	Maintenance and coordination of water multiple use.	Corps projects represent competitive uses e.g. recreation, power, flood control; municipal and water supply all directly influence local and regional economics and thereby the quality of life of our people.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
24	Meet basic health needs of communities unable to fund maintenance/improvements in their water resources.	Every citizen deserves basic services.
25	USACE decisions on the permitting of marinas on Dallas area lakes that are stressing water quality by increasing the number of watercraft that use fuel additives.	(1) Recreational use of lakes is increasing; (2) Most lakes in N. Texas are multi-purpose (flood control, recreational, and drinking water); (3) Fuel additives in water is creating a public health threat for area residents using the lake as a drinking water resource/supply.
26	Ensuring adequate water for a growing human demand while not allowing water quality to degrade and sufficient water left over for a healthy environment.	Water is a finite resource with growing competing demands on it.
27	Development and maintenance of raw water supplies.	Health and economic development depends on water supply availability.
28	Water quality protection and environmental restoration.	Because most water resources have some dimension of human use, we must ensure they are safe and that the environment is clean. Therefore, degraded environments must be restored.
29	Acquiring water in water scarce areas; acquiring water rights.	West Texas has chronic water supply problems with each drought, most options include a legal battle with some other entity.
30	Take a broader look at Corps projects and permitting, and apply common sense. Consider "watershed" approach, not individual projects.	All of us spend too much time on small details, micro managing, etc. Lose sight of big picture, hurts decisions made.
31	Implementing water resource projects requires a substantial, long-term funding commitment at all levels of government. Private sector participation is increasingly important.	Water needs in Texas have been identified and well documented through current regional planning process (Senate Bill 1; SBI) and past state water planning. Funding for implementation has not been adequate.
32	Supply of water for transport of water to satisfy water management needs; consider non-structural.	
33	Develop adequate water (potable and sanitary) to meet the needs of our expanding regional population.	Inadequate water for population.
Challenge B		
Develop consensus on water resource priorities.		
34	Additional water resources must be pursued in an environmentally responsible	

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	strategy. Strategies must recognize the importance of meeting water needs of large population's large economies.	
35	There is no single "best use" for water.	Multiple demands on water supplies typically become "hot" topics when water shortages dictate prioritization of demands. Politicians often buckle to demands of the most vocal groups instead of studying to potential impacts of their choices.
36	Water availability/conservation.	Population growth requires more water; not enough water in some areas.
37	Local entities will likely finance and construct water supply units to meet 2050 demands. The challenge will be permitting these additional resources.	
38	Development of a public awareness of the competitive uses of water so that they can make informal choices of the tradeoffs.	Decision-making in the absence of public input almost always leads to a less robust and useful choice.
39	As large population center continue to grow and develop, impacts on existing flood control structures must be considered. Flood control infrastructure must remain adequate despite growth and development of communities.	
40	Trinity River Basin is the most populated basin in Texas. Currently 8 million; at 2050 it will remain slightly over 50% of the states entire population. Water supply for approximately 15 million people will need to be provided for.	
41	Balance environment and economic development.	It is economically necessary to balance costs of ecological restoration/protection and still meet water needs for growth in population.
42	Thinking 'outside the box' to develop cooperative measures to increase water supplies (not just reservoir firm yield).	We can no longer afford to take the most conservative approach; need to explore innovative, cooperative solutions.
43	Securing federal funding to support programs such as the beneficial use of dredged materials.	Current funding formulas and project evaluations disadvantage beneficial use alternatives.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
44	Securing funding to support the USACE's enforcement of permitting requirements aimed at protecting the nation's water resources, including wetlands.	Current funding and enforcement efforts do not appear to be adequate.
45	Environmental balance.	It is the right thing to do; must stop fighting of extreme groups both economic and environmental.
Challenge C		
Technology and advances and real time data exchange.		
46	Continued improvement of communication between the COE and other interested agencies and the public.	COE needs to continue sharing information on their operations with agencies and the public.
47	Forecasting future needs/conditions.	
48	Flood warning that is timely and accurate.	Communities are rapidly developing, often to close to streams, rivers and lakes. Lives and property are often lost due to inadequate or poor quality warnings.
49	Real-time exchange of project releases; hourly transmissions of hydro met data from data collection platforms; exchange of river forecast information; flood inundation mapping updates.	Provide more accurate river and flood forecasts and warnings; emergency response, preparation, and planning.
50	Loss of long term stream gages (USGS) (lack of funds to maintain full range of flow data);e.g. Tulsa reduced support to 40 stream gages in Oklahoma; currently rely on many other entities.	Need accurate stream flow information to evaluate risk.
51	A need for more dialogue between agencies to more efficiently share data and remove duplicated efforts as a means to cut costs.	This is a problem within our own agency. No communication results in the same problem or need being addressed several times at a significant cost, both in dollars and time. USGS, COE, and NWS should meet at local levels to coordinate.
52	Technology is exploding from internet, digital video, to aerial imagery. All levels of government should review their needs and consider supporting with $ technology- sharing initiatives.	
Challenge D		
Public education and communication.		
53	Public education and communication within each of 6 challenges named.	Until and unless the public understands why we do or do not do certain things, agencies will struggle to implement their projects.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
54	Public awareness.	Allows the public to become involved.
55	Public education on water supply needs.	
56	Get more citizens involved. In both groups, I was the only citizen; everyone else represented a local, state, or federal agency. This seemed to me to be a meeting of the various government agencies; USGS, EPA, and FEMA.	
Challenge E		
Educating general public and government agencies on the value of our water resources systems.		
57	Intergovernmental cooperation to deal with drainage issues.	The problems are too big (widespread) for any one entity to "attack"; problems cross jurisdictional and mission boundaries.
58	Educate general public and agencies staffers regarding all important water issues.	Make it factual; coordinate with all agencies for on education clearinghouse; all agencies share information and databases, i.e. GIS, etc.; improve efficiencies among regulatory and resource entities.
59	Increase Congressional awareness; Farm Credit Bank; Texas Water Development Board; stakeholders at local level know their regional representatives (i.e., Reg. Comm).	I'm thirsty.
Challenge F		
Need to protect flood plains and water quality resources.		
60	Placing reservoirs (lakes) in locations with minimum amount of environment impact or damage.	Too much of the river bottom- land in our area has already been destroyed or altered. We don't need to lose any additional acreage to improper placement of lakes.
61	Development in flood-prone areas needs to stop.	Natural flood plains provide numerous benefits, include flood control, water quality improvement; topsoil deposition, etc. Development in floodplains reduces benefits, and increases the financial cost to society (disaster relief, manmade flood and water quality controls, erosive loss of productive lands, etc.). Perhaps the development can realize that there can be financial value to restricting floodplain development (higher sales prices offset reduced developable area because of

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
		potential amenities in floodplain such as recreation, natural beauty, etc).
62	Protect floodplains.	To keep people from harm's way; partnership with Corps and FEMA and communities.
63	Recognize and protect the natural benefits of wetlands and riparian habitat.	Water quality and flood control.
64	Counties lack regulatory authority for land use planning (Texas).	
65	The geomorphologic impacts upon stream channels are not anticipated by developers and public regulators.	In the southwest, no considerations are given by developers to planning for impacts of their development upon rates and volume of runoff and the stream systems. Ordinances do not address this.
66	With increased water resource development for expanding economic development, how will environmental resources be addressed?	(1) Key F & W areas (bottom-land, wetlands, etc.) are rapidly being lost due to water development, timbering, etc.; (2) Competition of various resources makes mitigation of natural resource impacts very difficult (reduction of options/alternatives).
67	Protect wetlands (floodplain) from encroachment but mitigate impacts when protection fails.	Wetlands provide a filtering system for surface runoff, a flood storage capacity that lessens flood damages, and a diverse wildlife habitat that it is critical to other aspects of quantity of life.
68	Need proactive stance for floodplain management before reactive effort is needed.	Problems cost increases over time; after effective floodplain function is gone, very costly to reestablished.
69	(1) Water quality. (a) affecting usable quantity, (b) public health.	
70	Drainage; (FEMA revisions, flood insurance): COE slow to respond; rapid development.	
Challenge G		
Coordinate planning and funding for future water resources.		
71	Need to coordinate federal programs that impact water resources.	Some federal programs conflict with each other; USACE programs to protect and maintain floodplain doesn't "jive" in National Flood Insurance Program promotion of insurance for development in floodplains.
72	Federal maintaining and coordinating with water resource uses.	

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
73	Providing safe, sufficient supplies of water to communities while also meeting natural needs.	Communities need water to prosper and grow, but there are also natural needs to keep waterbodies and the environment healthy. The balance between man and environment continues to be complex, conflicting and difficult to achieve, but of greater necessity to achieve as society grows and our economy expands.
74	Funding for projects.	There is not enough funding to implement all proposals. Does that mean we must consider development more fully to prevent damage to avoid having to restore systems later.
75	Flooding from creeks and streams; flooding in rivers unchecked. Building homes in floodplain areas; upgrade existing flood control lakes.	Build up streams retention dams.
76	The defined funding sources and how the financial resources will be used; needs of environmental sustainability.	Citizens will be affected economically by the maintenance of the "water challenge."
77	More input and cooperation between federal, state and local agency and stakeholder groups.	
78	Not enough to go around; some have's and have-nots.	Regionalisms to share water resources and drive down costs.
79	Future water supplies: growth (demand) vs. adequate and clean supply. Water quality: finger pointing at agricultural producers. Funding sources.	Projected population growth may far exceed current supplies and even planned supply expansion.
80	Need better coordination amongst all federal and state agencies for dealing with environmental permitting/restoration issues. Need one stop shopping.	
81	Identification of funding mechanisms to promote and implement environmental restoration measures as a result of past development projects.	(1) Restoration requires large amounts of funding that is not normally available from traditional water resource development projects. (i.e., no source of income- water sales, taxes, bonds, etc.). (2) Restoration must be geared to require those who damaged the resource to pay, not natural resource agencies.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
82	Find ways to develop and maintain better information for decision-makers.	Speed of technology dates info quickly; rapid change places a premium on good info right to now; new technology is a great tool.
83	Increase coordination among fed/state/local interests in civil works project planning, i.e. input/buying for all aspects of project (beneficial use, sediment contaminants) look to agencies for assistance in developing best most economical/environmental sound projects.	
84	Develop collaboration between agencies to address water resource management. Part of this need is to specialize agencies and their area of responsibility.	There is duplication of studies and efforts. Given limited funding [federal, state, private], there is a need to work together for efficiency and effectiveness.
85	Expense to develop water supply resources.	Potable water costs may begin adversely impacting low- income households' ability to pay.
86	More input from partners and customers into coastal and navigational projects.	Impacts on economy, environment.
87	Projects that are politically motivated versus actually required.	Impacts environment and citizens.
Challenge H		
Prevent coastal erosion, flooding, and pollution.		
88	Addressing coastal erosion.	Loss of sediment to coastal habitats is creating major losses for beaches and coastal areas/wetlands across the Gulf.
89	Coastal flooding and restoration; beaches and wetlands; "beneficial use" dredge sand related to navigational waters; navigational channel; US funding for Texas.	Beach erosion (loss land, infrastructure, access, properties); pollution (local and non-point); denying recreational opportunities; sea level rise; COE needed as partners; no dune building or sand on beaches; vegetation projects.
90	Stream management-regulatory programs are after the fact.	Effort is needed to assist communities to prevent problems rather than being punitive when problems occur.
91	Shoreline erosion.	Land use; population shift; reactive; technology to respond.
Challenge I		
Provide sufficient funding for 404 program.		
92	Simplify and standardize the permitting process.	More efficient turn around on permit.
93	Provide sufficient funding for permitting and enforcement of Section 404 Program.	Current funding levels result in tremendous delays for applicants. In addition, lack of

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
		effective enforcement places non-applicants at a competitive advantage over permit applicants.
94	Identifying known "hot spots" or sensitive areas through mapping; GIS.	Better identification gives better solutions.
95	Create consistency within districts/regions to aid development parties in staying within the rules.	Corps of Engineers overload with workload and can't provide information on the rules in a timely manner.
96	Timing; just getting things done; floodplain and regulatory issues; new permitting process effects many more projects.	
97	More funding is needed for permitting issues (404) to effectively implement the Clean Water Act regulation but to be fair and timely to allow completion of projects.	COE permitting functions have too many permits/projects, and not enough staff to serve the applicants in timely fashion. Creates major bottleneck and frustration for applicants, where time is money.
98	404 permitting process is inconsistently applied and unclear; challenge would be to ensure that 404-permit process is consistently applied and there is adequate coordination among agencies.	Some projects get permitted that shouldn't – sends a message to others; difficult to budget adequate time and money in planning process with cities etc.
99	Establish reasonable criteria for de-listing threatened and endangered species.	USFWS must de-list species when sound science shows such species are not or are no longer in peril. This is currently costing millions of dollars for little to no benefit.
100	Section 404- horribly underfunded. Still overworked and a good program is at risk of becoming a public relations nightmare.	Time is money; delays accounted in permit review are costly.
Challenge J		
Improve awareness and communication to educate the public on the benefits of civil works projects and Corps responsibilities.		
101	Need better cooperation between Corps lakes and watershed communities.	The lakes can't be independent from the watersheds the are in.
102	Public awareness of benefits; more federal funding for infrastructure-civil works-congressional awareness.	Need public support for civil works so public can influence Congress to increase funding.
103	Corps communication with sponsors and public on slow moving projects.	

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
Challenge K		
Importance of moving water from areas that are over-abundant to areas that are under-abundant.		
104	Increased distribution of water from existing lakes through pipelines to points at need.	Much water is already impounded but not being used.
105	Drought planning	Each city needs to plan for drought conditions so water will be available.
106	People don't move to where the water is. In many cases, there is plenty of water in a state, just not in the right places. Lack of infrastructure to move water from water rich areas to water poor areas is a big problem.	Limited water supplies leads to an area's economic demise.
107	Water transportation and storage systems are inefficient and inadequate.	Fresh water is a valuable resource, and needs to be efficiently stored and transported.
Challenge L		
Working through multi objective water resource management desires.		
108	To please recreational lake users and provide water to metropolitan areas as a water supply at the same time.	Informing general public as to use and expectation of lake usage and pleasing all concerned.
109	Working through multi-objective water resource management desires.	
110	Multi-objective management.	"Win-Win" scenario are key to finding support for large capital projects.
Challenge M		
Communication between Corps and property owners and what are the property owners rights (What is jurisdictional).		
111	More specific definitions of the waters of the U.S.	Better definitions give better solutions.
112	Creating an objective mitigation process for areas impacted.	Knowledge of mitigation may determine value of land and inferred property rights.
113	How do Zone A FEMA's apply with 404 regulations.	Never been studied therefore creating a floodplain.
114	What are waters of the U.S.	Consistency in definition and enforcement's.
115	(1) Identification of restrictions to property development consistently and quickly. (2) Property owners rights (what are my rights) (3) Who has authority to approve permits.	(1) Establish challenge for land development (2) Misinformation leads to conflicts (financial, etc.) (3) Timing, misinformation.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
116	Better communication between Corps of Engineers and private sector.	Sharing of information allows smarter development.
117	All projects regardless of size must follow same linear feet and acreage requirement (404).	404 regulations should be based on size and overall impact of projects.
118	Mitigation for waters of U.S. and wetlands- 404 process.	Very subjective and inconsistent.
119	Definition and consistency with the new 404, NWP.	Would like clearer definitions and for the mitigation applied evenly, regardless of company size and worth. Set standards and/or ratios for mitigation. The process is currently too slow and too subjective.
Challenge N		
Restructure the permitting process and ignore the trivial and study the big problems.		
120	Quicker processing of permits-404.	Discourages development cost.
121	Avoid allowing one entity to frivolously block issuance of water rights to other entities.	
122	Reduce the ability of Federal agencies to make rules related to water quality and the environment without significant oversight or direction.	USEPA, FWS, and others are making and enforcing rules which significantly restrict or eliminate the ability to construct much needed water projects.
Challenge O		
All remediation from defense contamination should be turned over to the Corps.		
123	All remediation from defense contamination should be turned over to COE.	To set priority on remediation technique's used for clean up, funding, efficiency and responsibility. Individual militaries not equipped in this regard. Reduce water supply contamination.
Challenge P		
Maintain and restore the environment and biodiversity.		
124	To preserve the environment processes and bio-diversity.	The sustainability of all life; environment has been stretched to limits.
125	Balancing needs of future human population growth with environmental protection.	Reaching a level where difficult decisions will have to be made about growth and water supply; people are very concerned protecting recreational and water quality values as well as wildlife habitat.
126	Provide a sufficient amount of clean water for healthy fish population to meet demands of sport and commercial fisheries.	Economical health; enjoyment; human consumption (health).

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
127	Maintain and/or restore bio-diversity while meeting society's water demands.	Maintain a healthy –pleasant-environment for people to live in and enjoy. Maintaining the health of people.
128	Water resources contaminated by long-term historical releases of hazardous materials often have concentration levels of certain "chemicals of concern" that pose identifiable potential "risks" to human or wildlife health.	It is difficult to correlate "potential risk" to actual habitat injury in order to measure the extent of the injured resource (i.e. does risk = injury?).
129	Endangered species act.	Loss of use; cost.
130	Maintaining and restoring wetlands that provide important habitat for the large number of wildlife species that depend on them.	Water quality-human health; bio-diversity.
131	Assessment of "restoration" of habitat injured by some human action such as an oil spill is often difficult to measure or predict the success of.	Environmental restoration in the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) program is achieved by seeking claims against responsible parties (RP) through negotiated settlements with the RP. This is a lengthy process in which there is continued residual habitat urgency due to the "INCIDENT."
132	Maintain and restore environment and biodiversity.	Human health (wetland); human enjoyment; economical health; sustainability of all life ; natural systems stretched already.
Challenge Q		
Scale of Corps projects matching available resources.		
133	Scale of proposed Corps projects doesn't match the scale of the resources available; funding flow isn't continuous; local sponsors should have more control (more influence in the type of project to be built).	Nothing gets done.
134	Flood damage reduction measures driven by numbers; not people. Issues have to consider development/economic growth potential when formulating projects.	
135	Sharply reduce projects with primarily private beneficiaries, including agricultural drainage projects and re-nourishment projects for private beaches.	Prevent wasteful expenditure of tax dollars; prevent "Mission Creep" within the Corps.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
Challenge R		
Upgrading again infrastructure while balancing environmental protection, flood control, and what public desires.		
136	Infrastructure needs: aging treatment and distribution systems.	Clean water controls health and economic growth.
137	Planning and construction of new infrastructure to meet regional water resources needs of the 21st Century.	Proper planning is essential to maximizing available dollars.
138	Infrastructure funding.	Funding of COE projects; predictability; dredging; formula.
139	Aging dams do not meet today's design and safety criteria.	People like to live close to water. Often homes, businesses and other improvements are in harm' s way in the event of failure.
140	Maintenance of existing infrastructure, including water supply, flood control, hydropower, ports.	Protect our existing investments.
141	Replacing, as well as maintaining, existing infrastructure should be treated less strictly than new projects.	Delaying of these projects threatens health, safety and welfare.
142	Dam safety: development encroachments into floodplains, flood control, public water supplies.	Areas of high development may be creating their own dam safety problems by allowing business, homes, etc. into floodplains. More development means more opportunities for flooding. More development also means more stress on existing water supplies and waste treatment systems.
143	Maintain and reconstruct the aging water related infrastructure.	Locks, canals, reservoirs, pipelines, pump stations, etc. are mostly approaching 50 + years of age, near or beyond their useful life. At the same time, population and the need for these facilities are becoming more critical.
144	Aging flood control structures- many of these structures are approaching their 50 year design plan (development above and below flood structure).	Today some of these structures protect homes and industry- where when built they only protected open land and roadways.
145	Rehabilitation of failing water, waste water; drainage infrastructure.	Need funding for all, spread nationwide; environmental restoration remains important; reasonable regulations re: construction; gain public support and understanding.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
Challenge S		
Maintaining clean water through effective government cooperation.		
146	Renovation of flood and siltation control features.	Decrease siltation being created by filled structures.
147	Preserve water quality in flowing streams.	Water uses are diverse but all uses depend on suitable quality Corps could provide resources for assessment, monitoring and implementation.
148	(1) Responsibility defined for local, state, and federal government (more control to local government). (2) More responsibility given at the COE district level as opposed to HQ.	(1) Most water issues are local in nature- clean water, water supply; (2) Issues vary from area to area; (3) Levels of government need to be compatible to be effective.
149	Coordination of federal state and local programs to prevent conflict and impact to environment.	Conflicting programs are costly- example NFIP and USACE conflicts over floodplain fill.
150	Re-develop brownfields on and near waterways.	Leads to improved water quality, puts property back on tax roles, creates jobs, reuses existing infrastructure, preserves greenspace.
Challenge T		
Cumulative assessment of environmental impacts.		
151	Environmental degradation-loss of native plants, habitat wildlife.	Healthy environment is critical to human survival.
152	Full analysis of primary, secondary, and cumulative impacts assessments of Corps projects involving wetlands.	"Piecemeal" permitting and analysis of civil works projects in isolation does not adequately assess environment impacts.
153	Cumulative assessment of environment impacts- ranking and prioritizing of impacts before planned and on-going water projects.	Environmental water concerns are multiple as are the impacts- effective remediation of environmental damage must include on understanding of all (cumulative) issues.
154	Ensure independent cost/benefit review of all Corps projects with a cost greater then $25 million or projects that are controversial.	Ensure that environmental benefits/costs are on par with economic costs/benefits; environmental and economic benefits must be co-equal goals.
Challenge U		
Find nonstructural flood control methods.		
155	Methods to address flooding.	Efforts to address flooding must be done in a manner that also ensures ecological functions are not compromised.
156	Reduce flood property damage by reducing impediments in the PMF flood elevations within inland waterways. This	(1) Reduces dollar amount of flood damages ($4 billion /year); (2) restores riverine environments; (3) Aids in natural

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	will aid in restoration of riverine habitats and the environment by doing non-structural projects.	process of cleansing water increasing water quality; (4) Improves air quality by increasing sinks for CO2.
157	Flood control.	Important for clean water.
158	Affordable, environmentally friendly flood control.	Flood damages rise every year, costing communities and governments lives and dollars.
Challenge V		
Improve preparedness to minimize the destruction from natural disasters.		
159	Response control to natural disasters.	National disasters devastate a person material property but also reduce their spirit. Prevention, assistance, quick help is essential for recovery.
160	Storm water quality improvement and long term maintenance of qualities obtained.	Local entities, industries, developers, engineers and citizens have not or will not recognize that there is a real, serious problem. The bottom line (profit) rules the head and heart. Resistance is rampant.
161	Improve to minimize the destruction from natural disasters.	Economic return; reduce damage to improved property; prevention awareness programs for communities; traumatic events effect everyone.
162	Flood control for N. Hidalgo County.	(1) Economics-limiting growth, reduce damages to improved property. Recently revised flood maps have impacted 9500 acres of land with potential property damage $750 million range.
163	Getting people out of the way during flood events; flood warning/evacuation infrastructure; effective public education.	
Challenge W		
Management of inadequate water supply for irrigation and live stock.		
164	Prevention of agricultural and rural impacts on watersheds and water quality; in addition to restoration of impacted watersheds.	While emphasis is on "clean-up" and many efforts address urban and industrial impacts, there appears to be a lack of holistic effort targeted at agricultural and rural impacts.
165	Meeting the water need for agriculture.	Crop and livestock production (food and fiber).

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
166	Agricultural community facing great problems in trying to survive with crop production, livestock needs in drought situations. Need new water sources built in rural communities to better serve rural needs.	
Challenge X		
Regional siltation basins and assessing dredging fees on a per acre basis.		
167	Desilt the older reservoirs to maintain water supply storage volume.	Few new reservoir/dam construction efforts, therefore sediment/silt has reduced the overall available storage for water supply. Water qualities can be impacted by shallower reservoirs.
168	Quantifying regional impacts of erosion on downstream rivers, lakes and harbors.	Generating the impacts can tell us what the fix would be.
Challenge Y		
Improvement and efficiency of natural disaster response.		
169	Need for a stream gaging program that address all agencies (federal, state, local) needs. If federal funding continues to be pulled, a more aggressive educational sales pitch to local governments for partnership on gage funding.	USGS/COE gage funding continues to be pulled and is not being supplemented by municipalities in many areas. In those areas that implement their own gage network, data collection is not always uniform.
170	Move FEMA to the Corps. Stronger working partnership between FEMA and Corps.	The Corps is well set up to mobilize work force, contract administration, emergency action, and quick response capability to lead FEMA activities. Such consolidation would produce more government efficiency and better service to citizens.
171	Improvement in efficiency of natural disaster response.	Important to respond quickly to minimize loss.
Challenge Z		
Need for sustainable development in water resources development.		
172	Transferring financial responsibility to state/local public entities for projects/programs need to be combined with an education component that provides information in the importance of continuing the funding for local interests, i.e., stream gauging stations.	Local funds are at all-time level of competition between various demands. Projects/programs that were funded by federal agencies often escaped notice-until local funding is required. Then the need may not be understood enough to generate local support.
173	Water quality and quantity.	Rapid expansion of population to many parts of the U.S. must be met by sustainable U.S. water policies.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
174	Upgrading aging infrastructure and balancing environmental protection, flood control and public desire.	Risk of loss of life and property; quality of life decreasing in some areas; maintenance of wildlife habitat important; wetland values in preserving water quality and flood control important.
175	Flood protection, response to natural disaster and repairs to damaged environment reflect the need for sustainable development.	We can not define a universal objective for sustainable development, but a fuller accounting for environmental costs and susceptibility to natural disaster is warranted.
176	Require that navigation and port study accurately measure demand and market share; link vessel draft to actual cost of port maintenance.	Prevent wasteful spending of limited tax dollars to serve narrow private interests.
177	Research development (water).	To develop new resources.
Challenge AA		
Waterway development maintenance and repair to meet industrial and commercial advancement and progress.		
178	Navigation – national management of coastal waterway development and maintenance.	
179	Disposal areas for dredging.	To insure maintenance of navigational channel; cost.
180	Transportation (port) infrastructure.	Efforts to ensure a competitive U.S. shipping industry must also take into account coastal ecosystems.
181	Providing for needed waterborne transportation facilities without damaging aquatic ecosystems or unnecessarily impinging on water-related recreation.	Multiple uses of the coast are desirable.
182	Waterway development to meet industrial and commercial advancement and progress.	Economy of the coastal areas and industry development will suffer and not advance.
183	Waterway maintenance and repair.	To be able to continue commercial industrial and commercial recreational use.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
Challenge BB		
Better management of lakes and reservoirs.		
184	Better management of lakes and reservoirs.	(1) Timing and flows from reservoirs after storms to prevent scouring and flooding around lakes and downstream; (2) communicating with lakeside property owners to understand variations in lake levels; (3) freshwater inflow needs of bays and estuaries.
185	Assistance with implementation of innovative water supply projects, particularly desalination.	Desal offers opportunities to create new water supplies without "goring anyone's ox." While somewhat more expensive, it is publicly popular and, perhaps, politically acceptable.
186	Retaining stormwater for domestic use.	Future water shortages, retention ponds, reservoirs.
187	Manage recreational benefits of reservoirs versus water supply needs.	Water suppliers pay full cost of reservoirs but recreational interests feel they have a right to dictate how supplies are operated.
188	Management of inadequate water supply for irrigation and livestock feed.	Maintain economical food supply and support agricultural economy.
Challenge CC		
Adequate funding for water resource development and maintenance projects.		
189	Design water saving toilet that really works, maybe one that re-uses water.	To save water.
190	More local control to water management issues.	Unfunded mandates- states and local do not have funding to implement federal mandates.
191	Adequate and equitable funding for water resource development and maintenance projects.	Reconstruction; new construction.
192	Funding for projects when there are government caps on programs.	There seems to be a much larger need then there is money.
193	The length of time and cost of performing environmental requirements.	With limited budgets, the environmental position seems to suck up all the money.
194	Future infrastructure planning.	To meet population growth demands of our water resources.
195	Broad perspective to environment: emphasis the do's not the don'ts. This will synthesize the integration of at least 4 of the objectives in the pamphlet.	Make the 6 major goals easier to achieve.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
Challenge DD		
Accurate non-flood releases from reservoirs to consider water rights.		
196	Accurate reservoir releases for water supply to satisfy (consider) water rights.	Drought demands versus water rights accounting versus total supply available; requires accuracy.
Challenge EE		
Providing for instream flow and inflows to bays and estuaries while ensuring water supplies for human needs.		
197	Movement of water to the regions of greatest need from regions of lesser need.	Water is not uniformly distributed by nature, water rich areas have a marketable asset which can benefit their area while solving a problem for a water poor area.
198	How to balance the zeal of environmentalists against the practical needs of living spaces, water supply and other uses.	Environmental organizations often do not recognize the human and economic impacts of their demands. EPA and other enforcement agencies set standards that defy common sense and are not based on appropriate science.
199	Providing for instream flows and inflows to bays and estuaries while ensuring adequate water supplies for human uses.	Public trust with the American people.
Challenge FF		
Texas policy on groundwater- Possibly modify the rule of capture.		
	NO COMMENTS.	
Challenge GG		
Watershed planning with state agencies to improve (currently doesn't exist).		
200	Update TP-40 and HYDRO 35 to a single consistent publication that uses the 45 years of weather data since their original analysis.	This is a basic input for hydrologists.
201	Keeping urban development out of the 100 year floodplain.	Avoid flood damages, cost of restoration or eventual remediation, and preserve the natural floodplain for water quality buffers, valley storage, and natural habitat.
202	Keeping the floodplain maps- FEMA FIRMS current.	Many firms used for actuarial purposes are woefully out of date. Urbanization since the original detailed studies has increased flood levels significantly. Need to base flood levels on fully urbanized watersheds.
203	Planning (watershed) with state agencies in Texas (TWDB, TNRCC).	Federal (USACE) and state (TWDB, TNRCC) agencies do not coordinate studies to reduce duplication of effort.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
204	Water resources for Texas – Senate Bill 1 process is defining solutions- solutions are very expensive. Funding must come from multiple agencies: local, state, and federal.	Water for Texas is vital.
205	Flood control: Recognition and incorporation of true; environmental benefits into a new project of remediation of an existing project.	Today's public, demands sustainable developments sensitive to environmental needs.
Challenge HH		
Definition of desirable environment and quality of life.		
206	Balancing human needs with environmental preservation.	Rapid-growth-needs places demands on determination of environmental needs; slow determination of environmental needs slows growth.
207	Water use: handling competitive uses such as recreation, power, municipal and industrial water supply; flood control; local vs. regional.	These are interactive and mostly competition related; stewardship. However, these bear directly to local and to regional economies and to the quality of life and well being of our people.
208	Definition of "desirable" environment; "quality of life."	This definition controls actions to be taken on all the other challenges.
Challenge II		
Ensure effective mitigation for wetlands loss due to Corps projects.		
209	Protecting the nation's wetland and other water related aquatic habitats while allowing for some human uses, particularly in coastal areas.	It's a public trust with the American people.
210	Ensuring effective mitigation for wetlands lost due to Corps projects.	The "no-net loss" or "net gain" policy on wetland loss must ensure both acreage for wetlands lost as well as fish, wildlife, habitat values are the same or better.
211	Give credit for the environmental enhancement resulting from the construction of a reservoir or channel.	Project sponsors must overcome all of the supposed "negative" environmental impacts of a project. Such a view does not consider the very positive benefits available through a project.
OTHER		
212	Historically shipping industry has been subsidized by federal taxpayers, yet it's an industry that's highly profitable and self-sustaining.	Federal funding is limited and should be used for community "customers."
213	Limit permitting of deep-water ports based on impacts of future/other deep-	Current "race to the bottom" is/will cost taxpayers billions of dollars plus destroy

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT DALLAS LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	water channels in region.	water resources. There isn't enough shipping trade to warrant these costs/impacts.
214	Review Corps BCR procedures for consistency in agency mission.	There are examples where benefit-cost ratio (BCR) procedures won't help in needed flood buy out or environmental restoration projects.

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS