

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

---

---

**NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY**  
**AUGUST 17, 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***

---

---

**NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY  
AUGUST 17, 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 – New Brunswick, New Jersey .....	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	1
Session Objectives .....	2
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1 <sup>st</sup> Group Discussion) .....	4
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2 <sup>nd</sup> Group Discussion) .....	8
Challenge Combination E, K, and U – Holistic Watershed Planning .....	9
Challenge Combination A, H – Corps Efficiency .....	9
Challenge J – Dredge Disposal.....	10
Challenge B – Watershed Approach to Water Quality.....	11
Challenge I – Port Modification Stressors .....	11
Challenge HH – Buyouts/Non-structural Approaches.....	12
Closing Remarks and Adjournment .....	12
Appendix A      Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges .....	A-1
Appendix B      Submitted Public Statements and Materials .....	B-1



# **REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY**

*The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in New Brunswick, New Jersey on August 17, 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 New Brunswick, New Jersey Listening Session. This session, hosted by the North Atlantic Division, was conducted on August 17, 2000 at the Hyatt Regency in New Brunswick. Approximately 64 people attended this meeting (not including Corps participants and the facilitation team) 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 Steve Rhoades, USACE North Atlantic Division (NAD) Commander, welcomed the audience to the listening session being held in the NAD. He commented that the Nation lacked consensus and the Corps was in at the forefront of developing a national consensus. General Rhoades went on to say that the Corps was not in attendance to lead the session, but a private facilitation group was obtained to orchestrate the session. Fourteen

sessions were being held around the Nation to listen to the concerns of the People. The intent was for the Corps to hear about the various challenges people around the Nation identified and potential solutions to these challenges. The information generated during the session would be compiled in a report, which would be provided to all registered participants and posted on the Corps' "national challenges" web site at <http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges> for others to review. Once all the sessions were complete, a national water resource challenge report would be developed and presented to decision-makers of the Nation to plan for future water resource needs. General Rhoades informed the participants he would be moving from one table to another to listen to all the participants and their concerns. General Rhoades then introduced Mr. Jim Creighton as the session facilitator representing the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd. General Rhoades felt the number of participants in attendance for this session was ideal, based on his experience at the Woburn, MA and Williamsburg, VA listening sessions. He stressed to the audience the objective of the session was to assist the Corps in understanding the water resource needs of the Nation. The needs would come from the participants' comments on issues/concerns they have encountered. General Rhoades finished by repeating the Corps was conducting the sessions in order to listen to the wants and needs of the participants and then to use the information to develop a national assessment. General Rhoades thanked everyone for participating and turned the floor over to Jim Creighton.

## Session Objectives

Mr. Creighton began by explaining the format of the workshop and his role as a professional facilitator. Mr. Creighton 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:

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

Next, Mr. Creighton outlined the issues he wanted the audience to consider during the day's discussions:

1. What are the key water resources challenges facing this region? (These are needs, problems, opportunities, etc. that if not addressed will negatively impact our prosperity, quality of life, and environmental sustainability)?
2. Why is it a problem? What impact is the problem already having or is it likely to have on our prosperity, quality of life, and environmental sustainability.
3. What actions should we take to respond to the challenge? What should be done about the problem?
4. Who should take these actions? What should the Federal government do to help address the problem? What can you and the organization that you represent do?

Mr. Creighton explained how small table groups would identify water resource challenges they felt were important and discuss these challenges in the morning portion of the session. He asked the participants to consolidate into full table groups. The first task assigned to the audience was to name a group spokesperson for each table. That person would be designated to report on behalf of the entire table. Mr. Creighton 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 and 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, all non-Corps participants would be given five red self-adhesive dots. The dots would be used to vote on the challenges that the participants felt were the most important. The reason for the voting scheme was to identify the most important challenges so they could be addressed during the afternoon portion of the session. The other challenges would be analyzed and discussed in the summary report, but because of time constraints, not all expressed challenges could be discussed in the session. During the afternoon portion of the session, participants would convene around the particular challenge each felt was important to them and address the challenges by answering select questions.

Mr. Creighton explained that the listening sessions were designed to get input from everyone. He stressed that the session was not a public hearing and that if anyone brought public statements, to please provide them to the session recorder for inclusion into the report. Also, Mr. Creighton noted that if a participant wanted to provide a written statement but did not bring one to the workshop, 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>). Mr. Creighton 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 Mr. David Lipsky, Personal Affairs Officer (PAO) from the Corps, who was present at the workshop.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Creighton noted that all of the information gathered during the session would be compiled in a report, which would be provided to all registered participants and posted on the above-referenced Corps' "national challenges" web site for others to review.

One participant impersonating politicians (Al Gore and Christy Whitman) stood and asked the participants if he could discuss ocean dumping. Mr. Creighton assured the participant he would have an opportunity to discuss his concerns after the format of the session was discussed. Another participant voiced her concern about very little involvement from the general public and was interested in how the Corps dealt with informing the general public about the listening session. She then asked Mr. Creighton to explain what plans/options the Corps had on relaying the session information to the general public for their opinion? Mr. Creighton responded by saying the Corps sent out 2000 invitations for each listening session. Additionally, all of the information from the session would be made available on the Corps website for anyone to review. Mr. Creighton realized that many people may have had difficulty getting off work during the day to attend the session, but said that evening sessions were not practical because of the duration of the session. The impersonator stood up and commented to the woman that public involvement was not important in the decision making of the session because the general public did not pay for him to attend the session. Mr. Creighton requested that the group refocus on the explanation of the session format and avoid deviating from the process. He realized the group had specific concerns they wanted to explain and assured the participants they would have an opportunity to discuss them. With that, he explained to everyone the use of the self-adhesive challenge "stickies," and that they could be used for listing additional comments on an individual basis, by posting them on the challenges (butcher pads) taped up around the room.

Mr. Creighton recommended people with the same agenda sit at different tables so to voice their views to participants unfamiliar with the information they wanted to share. 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 move around in order to create fill table groups, introduce themselves to the other participants at their table, assign a spokesperson for the table group, independently write down the challenges each felt the Nation faced, and then go around the table group and discuss the challenges.

## **Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1<sup>st</sup> Group Discussion)**

The participants were grouped into eight tables of approximately seven to eleven people per table. Each table discussed water resources challenges for approximately one hour. During this portion, General Rhoades went from table to table to hear the various levels of discussion from all the participants. Mr. Creighton reiterated the use of the butcher pads and the dot voting process. Then Mr. Creighton went around the room and asked the spokesperson from each table

---

<sup>1</sup>The public statements collected in conjunction with this listening session are included as Appendix B.

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 wrote each challenge on a separate piece of butcher paper, each of which were then affixed to a wall of the conference room. Mr. Creighton introduced Mr. Mark Gmitro, Listening Session Coordinator, Institute for Water Resources as the person projecting the challenges on the overhead screen and Brady Smith, Session Recorder, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd., as the session recorder. As a result of the morning discussion, the workshop participants identified 34 separate challenges:

- A. Corps - Streamline delivery services and partner with other agencies.
- B. Protect and manage watersheds/wetlands in order to protect water quality and management.
- C. Resolve inherent conflict between responsibility for development and environment protection.
- D. Revise Corps missions and policies – e.g. Include shore protection and environmental restoration and improvement in mission.
- E. System approach is preferred to independent project approach – long range regional plan or holistic ecosystem and multiobjective planning.
- F. Have project specific panels for peer review (scientific review and stakeholder board – initiated at federal level).
- G. Need to have ecological emphasis rather than economic emphasis.
- H. Provide internal flexibility in order to be leader for innovative solutions for regional issues.
- I. Stresses and consequences created by the national deepwater port race.
- J. Disposing of dredge material (where to put dredge material – difficulty of finding sites – project impacts – lack of alternatives).
- K. Special problems related to urban watersheds (environmental justice and brownfields).
- L. Land use management – disconnect between local planning and permitting (state and federal).
- M. Cooperation between Corps and EPA on environmental dredging.
- N. Greatly reduce the time required for project decision.
- O. Improve local partnerships – especially with external customers and key environmental organizations.

- P. Bring local municipalities into process early and ensure they know responsibilities and costs.
- Q. More safety awareness is required in ports.
- R. Responsiveness, respect for and receptive to local/state/public.
- S. Enhance cooperation and coordination to all Federal agencies (e.g., Corps play a leadership role in MTS).
- T. Need for new strategies for beach replenishment.
- U. Consider all cumulative impacts when assessing environmental impacts.
- V. Need a national water resource program.
- W. Actively seek opportunities for environmental projects.
- X. Create long term monitoring of completed projects to assess project success.
- Y. More stringent controls are needed over regulatory permitting – Corps needs to say no to projects.
- Z. Give consideration to using pre-existing historical structures for environmental restoration for educational purposes.
- AA. Improve funding for monitoring and research and monitoring techniques for utilization in adaptive management programs.
- BB. More emphasis on flow management and in-stream flow needs.
- CC. More emphasis on assessment on ground water supplies as it relates to surface water and development.
- DD. Marry environmental restoration with port construction projects.
- EE. Rational national maritime policy approach.
- FF. Attention to impacts of global climate change.
- GG. Lack of enforcement and make polluters pay.
- HH. Use of buyouts and other non-structural approaches.

After the last challenge was identified, Mr. Creighton advised the audience to fill out the “stickies” for any challenge of personal interest and stick it on the appropriate banner for that challenge. A transcription of the comments written on the “stickies” is provided in Appendix A.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Creighton 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 the main challenges would be addressed in detail during the afternoon 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 of most concern to the group in general. Sheets of adhesive dots were placed on each table. One participant asked how the individual challenges would be discussed and how they would be addressed on a national level? The participant feared the challenges not chosen would not get discussed in the report. Mr. Creighton explained to the participant how all the challenges are described in the report and will be included in a national database for analysis at the national level. 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 number of dots for each challenge was then tallied and the totals written on each challenge sheet. The dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

A	30	L	2	W	5
B	25	M	2	X	8
C	3	N	6	Y	4
D	11	O	4	Z	4
E	18	P	1	AA	4
F	5	Q	7	BB	1
G	11	R	11	CC	1
H	10	S	7	DD	6
I	24	T	4	EE	2
J	33	U	14	FF	1
K	13	V	7	GG	10
				HH	19

Some participants requested challenges U, E, and K be combined for discussion in the afternoon portion of the session. No objection came from the participants, so the three challenges were combined for discussion.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 (2<sup>nd</sup> Group Discussion)

After the combining of the specified challenges, the six challenges (or challenge combinations) with the most dots were selected for additional discussion. The six challenges most favored by the audience were:

E, K, U	(45 votes)	Holistic watershed planning
A, H	(40)	Corps efficiency
J	(33)	Dredge disposal
B	(25)	Watershed approach to water quality
I	(24)	Port modification stressors
HH	(19)	Buyouts/non-structural approaches

Mr. Creighton explained the format for the remainder of the afternoon.<sup>3</sup> The six main challenges were written on butcher pads positioned around the room (one challenge/combination 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. In the event they wanted to participate in a different challenge discussion, they were free to switch from one challenge to another during the discussion period. 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.

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. It was specified that the participants should assume they have the authority to implement changes they would like to see and should answer the following questions (within each group) during the small group discussion:

- 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

Participants then gravitated into groups around several of the butcher pads (one challenge/combination per butcher pad) and began deliberating with others in their group. A volunteer notetaker at each group took notes on the butcher pads for each of the six chosen challenges. The discussion session went from approximately 2:15 to 3:15. At the end of the discussion, Mr. Creighton asked the spokesperson for each challenge to restate the challenge,

---

<sup>3</sup> Approximately 75 - 80 non-Corps participants were counted after the lunch break.

provide a summary of the discussion, and the answers to the questions. The results of the discussions on the challenges are provided below<sup>4</sup>:

### ***Challenge Combination E, K, and U – Holistic Watershed Planning***

The discussion group informed the participants of the session they did not discuss challenge K because of time constraints.

#### What Action Should be Taken?

- Develop strategic planning objectives (independent of project specific authorizations) on a regional basis that emphasize:
  - systems based management
  - holistic ecosystem management
  - multiple objectivesPlanning should be at scale appropriate to issue (e.g. national ports, regional basins/watersheds, and local watershed redevelopment).
- Some changes in Federal authorization; resource allocation may be needed to make this happen.
- Use multiobjective policy goal as a criterion for prioritizing among Corps projects.
- Corps Regulatory and Planning Programs need to develop criteria to assess cumulative impacts on the projects in a watershed. If a process exists, then it should be implemented.
  - Administrative rules for permits and projects should require that when alternative project designs are identified (that satisfy multiple resource protection objectives), they should be required (or project denied if alternative design is unacceptable to applicant).
  - One of the benefits of system-based and community-based approaches is the identification of multiple resource protection and improvement actions within a defined geographic scope (watershed) and the allocation of responsibility for implementation among partners (Federal, State, local, and private). Army Corps could add value to these processes and better coordinate with other Federal agencies.

#### Who Should Take Action?

- Federal and state agencies.
- Private and local involvement.

### ***Challenge Combination A, H – Corps Efficiency***

This discussion group incorporated Challenge H into their discussion after the small group discussion period began, therefore was not an inclusion by the entire group.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

### What Action Should be Taken?

- Consistency of Corps Project Managers
  - Keep same Project Manager for the life of the project; provide flexibility in promotion, compensating individual working the same position.
- Increase authority/flexibility if District Engineer to assist in making decisions (empowerment).
- Corps take leadership role in evaluating regional issues and regional decision making.
  - Subject specific task group.
- Change cost sharing policy related to studies (limit cost escalation for cost sharing partner) and Cost/Savings ratios.
- Give Project Manager authority to manage major projects; establish dedicated team (Passaic River Project).
- Reduce project study time (reconnaissance to feasibility to grant program) for construction.
- Continuity/change of District leadership.
  - Internal promotion of military officer in district (Civil Deputy to Military Deputy to District Engineer).
- Encourage individual thought and rational decision making (no cookie-cutter approach). More guidance, less regulation that is outcome-based, not process-based.

### Who Should Take Action?

- Various levels of the Corps ( e.g. Chief of Engineers, Secretary of the Army).
- Congress.
- Lobbyists.

## ***Challenge J – Dredge Disposal***

### What Action Should be Taken?

- There is a need to ensure a predictable volume of flow.
- We must actively engage with public on issues facts.
  - Use multimedia formats and coordination.
  - Be clear about costs and benefits goals.
  - Create local incentives.
- The Corps process must be modified to:
  - Modify PCA process (Corps) to reduce time.
  - Modify contracts (policy and institutional contracts).
  - Expand Corps interpretation of environmental benefits of beneficial use.
- Subsidize the creation of beneficial use of dredge material.
- Better coordination between Federal, State, and local agencies; “marry” up dredging contracts.
- Establish information point of contact about information on “acceptable” disposal options.
- Expand the use of multiple award projects.

### Who Should Take Action?

- Federal and State.
- Some local involvement.

## ***Challenge B – Watershed Approach to Water Quality***

### What Action Should be Taken?

- Partnering and coordination among Federal, State, and local agencies.
- Mentoring by lead agency.
- Preserve the wetlands.
- Minimize/control/treat stormwater runoff (“hard” and “soft” solutions).
- Upgrade water treatment plants.
- Enforce clean water laws.
- Implement more environmental restoration programs.
- Conduct studies to quantify cumulative effects.
- Corps needs to do a better job of bringing stakeholders together around the issues, early in the process.
- Corps needs to better educate the public about the environmental role and missions they have.
- Corps should take/have a leadership role in promoting watershed management.
- Federal role to create framework/standards.
- State and local role to tailor to individual watershed needs.

### Who Should Take Action?

- Federal and state agencies.
- Local entities.
- Corps coordination.

## ***Challenge I – Port Modification Stressors***

### What Action Should be Taken?

- Develop National Comprehensive Plan
  - Financial considerations (pro’s/con’s = life cycle analysis).
  - Environmental considerations
- Needs to be an owner of the process.
- Initiate an analysis to assess national long-term marine transportation requirements.
- Efficiently and effectively identify funding and support to meet national and regional economic and environmental needs.
- Involve major stakeholders.

### Who Should Take Action?

- Maritime Transportation System.
- Federal and State agencies.
- Private Industry.

## **Challenge HH – Buyouts/Non-structural Approaches**

### What Action Should be Taken?

- Budgetary implementations are a priority (higher the structural).
- Change procedure to develop benefit categories and assign monetary value to all benefits associated with buyouts (with appropriate time frames).
- Long term land use controls.
- Graduated tax relief when buyouts occur (buyouts incentives for actions that help reduce existing and future problems).
- Educate and quantify the value of open space to local communities, where quality of life considerations are given.
- End Federal subsidies to flood prone areas.
- Define a way and modify the benefit/cost ratio to quantify benefits of open space.
  - Apply artificial weight factor to these benefits of buyout.
- Credit communities for actions similar to FEMA's Community Rating System.
- Deny Federal highway funds for roads to local development into flood plains.
- Change regulations to permit long term projects to retreat from flood plains.
  - Tie to Flood Insurance Program.

### Who Should Take Action?

- Federal agencies (Corps, FEMA).
- State agencies.
- County and local agencies.

## **Closing Remarks and Adjournment**

In closing, Mr. Creighton reminded the participants to register if they were interested in receiving a copy of the report. He estimated the participants would receive the report in a few weeks. Additionally, the report, along with reports from other sessions, could be viewed on the Corps web site. Comments were also welcomed on the web site. Mr. Creighton then asked the participants to fill out comment sheets if they had not already done so and leave them with the Corps staff.<sup>5</sup> Lastly, he reminded the participants to write down any additional remarks or

---

<sup>5</sup> 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. These were collected by the Corps personnel as the participants left the meeting.

challenges on the stickies and to post them before departing. Mr. Creighton then turned the floor over to General Rhoades.

In closing, General Rhoades thanked everyone for taking time out of their normal schedule and felt he learned a lot from the participants. He acknowledged the Corps has many problems they need to address. He stressed the Federal role has a large effect on how the People govern themselves. The General continued by saying the session was important in determining the challenges the Nation faces in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. He said the discussion was important both locally and nationally and the local problems could be addressed while national priorities are being developed. He reminded the participants that the sessions would help in the development of national policy issues and their time would be well applied by incorporating the challenges in to a national database to formulate national issues of concern. With that, General Rhoades thanked the group and the workshop was adjourned.



## **APPENDIX A**

### **TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES**



**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
<b>Challenge A</b>		
<b>Corps - Streamline delivery services and partner with other agencies.</b>		
1	Military continuity in governing Corps District. Two to three years leadership too short.	
2	Amount of time to get project from concept to shovel. Emergency action: 5-10 years. Standard length projects 20-30 years.	Lack of continuity, change in personnel, changes in rules and regulations, temporary loss of local support.
3	There needs to be smoother communications between District & HQ with more interest in assisting District with regional challenges.	Again, the District is in a better position than HQ to understand local issues and to determine which problems are likely to be "show stoppers."
4	Need for stable leadership at the District level.	Turn-key in leadership affects continuity and stability of policies and projects within a District.
5	Normal Corps process for developing navigation improvement projects is too lengthy.	Corps is unable to meet needs of shipping industry in a timely fashion resulting in loss of business to foreign competitors. Streamlined process needed to reduce time to identify and implement improvements.
6	Ecosystem restoration & enhancement.	Will require Corps to change modus operandi: Traditional project development protocols – reconnaissance, feasibility, design etc., need more of "Just Do It."
7	Getting Congress to rescind the cost share arrangement for COE projects – Flood Protection and Environmental Restoration.	Much of the cost on feasibility studies and projects is the COE overhead, over which sponsors have little control. Having to notify chain of command and address national criteria, whether applicable or not, increases costs to all parties. If costs are too high, needed projects might not move forward.
8	Streamline regulatory review and project review.	A fast moving maritime transportation system climate requires a more flexible, region-oriented, expeditious response to insure that America can meet its requirements in a timely cost-effective manner.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
9	Improve partnership with local sponsors/agencies.	The Corps needs to move decision making further down the chain of command to take into consideration local concerns and expedite agreements/projects.
10	Use common sense (reduce) in requirements for historical/cultural documentation.	Excessive historical/cultural review delays or kills projects needed for public safety for the sake of what?
11	There is a need to reduce the amount of time it takes to get a project approved by the Corps.	The extended time it takes for approval of improvement projects puts ports in a disadvantaged position to respond to rapidly changing maritime trends.
12.	Streamline delivery of services to reduce project cost and utilize more flexible partnering arrangements.	Excessive costs can kill necessary projects because the sponsor can't afford them. These projects can be delivered with successful partnering if the COE relaxes its rigid dogma and teams with other Fed/State agencies to deliver a project that local governments can afford.
<b>Challenge B</b>		
<b>Protect and manage watersheds/wetlands in order to protect water quality and management.</b>		
13	Need to strengthen watershed-based study and regulations and overcome municipal and state boundaries to watershed-based planning. Integrated resources planning watershed coalition and interstate agencies can be of particular assistance.	
14	Clean water – issue of green vs. grey infrastructure. Recognition of role of natural systems in purifying water, enhancing flood control, etc. (Structural vs. non-structural approaches).	In order to provide for multiple water use – potable, industrial, agricultural, aquatic life, and recreation – it is important that water be clean. Issues encompass watershed, smart growth, and multi-objective.
15	Safe and adequate water supply - more money to east coast - COE should be more proactive with regard to local sponsors	Self-evident.
16	Give maximum protection to drinking water supply watersheds. Critical resource water designation for east of Hudson – (NYC) and highest protection for west of Hudson (NYC) watershed.	Water supplies 9 million people. NYC system cannot be replaced once it has been degraded. The long term health and well being of the region depends on what is done now.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
17	Stormwater management/nonpoint source water quality relationship.	Water quality problems relating to stormwater are a major concern.
18	Assessing, avoiding, and minimizing the environmental impacts from water resources projects, especially dredging projects, and managing and <u>compensating</u> for those impacts which are unavoidable (+ improve stakeholder interactions).	HR 4879 – amendments to WRDA of 1986. Major environmental effects from large-scale COE projects and significant public concerns with those effects.
19	Intestate river basin commissions – role of ACOE as water resources management partner.	Community-based forum that has proven effectiveness. Federal government has not provided its fair share of financial support (e.g., Delaware River Basin Commission).
20	Quality of water in the Croton watershed (Westchester and Putnam counties – part of NYC water supply).  Same issues in Catskill/Delaware watershed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 9,000,000 people drink this water.</li> <li>- Lack of confidence in the NYS/NYC political <u>will</u> to maintain the quality of the water supply is leading the EPA to demand construction of an enormously expensive (and dangerous) filtration plant in the Bronx.</li> </ul>
21	Protection of groundwater resources – recharge area protection/preservation.	Reduction of groundwater recharge reduces water supply availability; reduces stream base flow; increases water quality problems.
22	To provide high quality drinking water for everyone in the U.S. at a price that even the poorest can afford and that keeps our economy competitive, indefinitely.	Potable water is an extremely limited resource and most of it is already significantly polluted. Chemical treatment/filtration is increasingly expensive and in some respects, dangerous.
23	Many of the wetlands in the boroughs of NYC do not have stewards. How can government take responsibility for managing the wetlands that are "regulated" but have no specific management plan.	The areas are overgrown with invasive weed plants and become dumping grounds and eyesores. Rather than being neglected, ignored, passed off, they can be functioning as drainage and if possible accessible by public and create educational opportunities.
24	Improvement of sediment quality in NY/NJ Harbor/Watershed contamination input reduction. Watershed management.	
25	Control of flooding in older, densely populated areas (more recently due to rampant development).	Impacts of the lives and economics of people, their assets and businesses.
26	Non-point source pollution.	Resolution of problem is key to ensuring clean water system by preventing the contaminants from reaching the water,

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
		rather than taking them out after they get in the system.
27	Protect and manage watershed/wetlands in order to protect water quality.	
28	Apparent lack of a well-coordinated approach to watershed planning (quantity and quality) between federal, state, county and local governments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Money is misspent.</li> <li>- Tools are misused.</li> <li>- In many cases – unqualified performing work.</li> <li>- Planning money goes to "stakeholders," qualified or not.</li> </ul>
<b>Challenge C</b>		
<b>Resolve inherent conflict between responsibility for development and environment protection.</b>		
29	Habitat protection/estuary habitat loss. How can an agency charged with permitting and regulatory development protect vital water habitat resources (especially when they don't keep cumulative impact records).	Overwhelming habitat loss, quality of life; public trusts.
30	Environmental impact related to flooding and what appears to be reckless development.	Environmental conditions affect our quality of life.
31	The Corps needs to do a better job of balancing regional environmental needs with project costs. Least cost is not always implementable.	We have been forced to table projects due to cost of more environmentally sound construction procedures demanded by local pressures (not legal requirements).
<b>Challenge D</b>		
<b>Revise Corps missions and policies- e.g. Include on shore protection and environmental restoration and improvement in mission.</b>		
32	Continue with the beach replenishment programs in spite of political moves to end these programs.	The beaches are the single most important resource of the coastal communities generating a significant amount of revenue through tourism and taxes.
33	To return to full federal participation in the funding of shore protection projects, including new construction starts and new studies. The federal role is currently authorized under the 1986 Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) and more specifically in Section 227 of the 1999 WRDA.	The public funds invested in these projects are returned many times over in federal tax revenues from the coastal tourism industry, an industry that is predicated on the maintenance of beaches. Further, the feds must take part in a fed-state-local partnership to protect coastal towns from storms.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
<b>Challenge E</b>		
<b>System approach is preferred to independent project approach-long range regional plan or holistic ecosystem and multi objective planning.</b>		
34	Systems approaches vs. project specific approaches.	Need to evaluate multiple objectives concurrently –water supply, water quality, and ecosystem health. Smart growth, shore protection, watershed efforts enhanced by systems perspective.
35	Comprehensive watershed management – from head waters to ocean.	Address issues through multiobjective management issues such as: (1) Federal, state, local and interjurisdictional responsibility for managing resources, (2) Addresses environmental issues: protecting aquifers/groundwater wetland protection, water quality, restoration and land use management
36	COE has great water resource planning capabilities-higher priority and publicity.	
37	Port and Harbor Development.	Although USACE is focused on water side, increasing depths, etc., need to look at land side infrastructure needs as well. Will improvements be needed to road and rails? What will increased activity mean to surrounding areas in terms of people and environment?
38	No comprehensive land use plan.	
<b>Challenge F</b>		
<b>Have project specific panels for peer review (scientific review and stakeholder board-initiated at federal level).</b>		
	NO COMMENTS	
<b>Challenge G</b>		
<b>Need to have ecological emphasis rather than economic emphasis.</b>		
39	Problem is failure to realize that environment has tremendous voice which sometimes must override the economics of a project.	Environmental health is critical to economic health and human health as well as wildlife, stream systems, and the ecosystems. Environment being destroyed at a rapid rate.
40	(1) Nye-Jamaica Bay: Poor flushing due to dredging over past decades, particularly construction of runways at J.F.K. (2) Restore natural contours to bay bottom and restore shoreline habitats that depend	Important to restore entire bay ecosystem not just part of it, using ecological principles not economic expediencies.

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
	on adequate tidal action, i.e., wetlands. (3) To expand current effort by ACOE to restore entire bay and not just part of it, i.e., current J. Bay restoration project.	
41	Water quality and environmental restoration should be given the same value as economic benefits of a project.	Currently, some Corps projects are being initiated that have a cost-benefit analysis that is not accurate and an environmental impact that should/could offset the economic benefits if they were equally considered.
42	Making the environment an equal concern as economic gains. Institutionalizing guarantees that projects are economically and environmentally justified. (i.e. straight forward policy, outside review of projects). Insuring that projects are constructed that are in the national, rather than solely private interest.	No other federal agency affects our nation's water resources like the Corps. It is imperative that the Corps planning process is made more transparent and trustworthy so that the American people are assured their tax dollars are being effectively and efficiently spent (protects long-term natural resource base).
43	How can project procedures/requirements be changed to provide or require a balance between commercial benefits and environmental benefits?	It is possible to construct projects which are seen as "desirable" by commercial interests and environmental interests. But a new approach is needed if this is to happen.
44	Lack of respect for citizens' views which has lead to a lack of trust for government agencies.	Government is of the people, by the people and for the people.
45	Public concern- streamlining often means public cut out and partners, generally business, get a bigger earn from Corps.	Cannot sacrifice public process, information and thoughtfulness for streamlining. Also, public input not really considered It just done for the record but not really valued, this must change.
<b>Challenge H</b>		
<b>Provide internal flexibility in order to be leader for innovative solutions for regional issues.</b>		
46	More specific issues: Piers- Remediation of pollution sources; restoration of imparted resource; management of sediments and point source pollution.	These issues are the challenges that impede all improvement to regional marine resources.
47	Inflexible Corps contracting procedures for dredged material disposal-need to adapt to future goals of beneficial use of dredge material; contracting must be more flexible – more money to deal.	Ocean disposal problems/issues – may not be an option in future too much environmental opposition. Alternatives will reduce contaminant loading on land/ocean from capping and closing

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
		landfills/brownfields. Win/win scenario to solve disposal issues and restore/remediate contaminated sites.
48	The Corps should be at the forefront of innovative solutions for regional problems. While this is spoken, it is not practiced.	The depth of support and experience of the Corps is a valuable asset that should be utilized.
49	There tends to be a large difference between public "persona" of Corps and actions at staff level.	Actions are always more important than words.
<b>Challenge I</b>		
<b>Stresses and consequences created by the national deepwater port race.</b>		
50	Ballast water management.	Non-indigenous species.
51	Strategic harbor development.	B/C investing time and money into inland ports and harbors which are already developed and require more havel time to reach and already serve a substantial regional node, when other ports exist that require less money to develop and are more strategically located (e.g. New/NS harbor vs. Norfolk).
52	(1) Need to reduce backlog of much needed civil works projects (water project resource)- Congress mandate of "no new starts." (2) Time frame/process to approve/authorized civil works projects is way too long. Must be shortened. (3) Opportunity exists to undertake environmental restoration projects as part of infrastructure improvements.	(1) Port/navigation infrastructure seriously inadequate to keep up with rapidly changing maritime transportation. (2) By the time a project is authorized/funded/constructed it may already be obsolete. (3) Without having an environmental restoration component of a civil works project, it will have less a chance of public acceptance.
53	Is a naturally shallow water harbor the best place for a deepwater port?	Trying to make them maintain such a port will lead to much dredging and associated problems with disposal.
54	(1) Balancing economic growth with environmental protection; dredging vs. environment. (2) Dredged material disposal alternatives, implementable and cost effective. (3) Environmental restoration/habitat protection-enhancement. (4) Addressing contaminated sediments and continuing pollution sources. (5) Most urban estuaries	(1-4) Goods and cargo need to be transported into region; jobs need to be protected; healthy environment means healthy population. We can have both a healthy port and environment. Ecosystem important to overall health of NY/NJ Harbor or any estuary. Flood control from wetlands, tourism, fishing, etc. (5) Nutrients: Need to control nutrients into

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
	have lost significant amount of wetlands and other aquatic habitat due to development related issues. Need to preserve these important habitats which have vital ecological significance. Also protect population from flooding and act as filters for contaminants.	estuaries and coastal waters. These cause problematic algae blooms and kill submerged aquatic vegetation.
55	The national "deepwater port" race that has the nation's port system competing for resources.	
56	Dredging to accommodate the deep draft vessels in ports- money, dredge spoils.	To keep up with trade and competitiveness, all ports must be able to support deep draft vessels-jobs, shipping.
57	Provide for the enhancement and sustainability of regional maritime resources- economic, environmental quality of life- in a non-exclusionary fashion. "finicky"	Without a master plan to accomplish this task all stakeholders will lose and our environment, economic property and quality of life are likely to degrade further.
58	Deepening projects: Corps is involved in a race to the bottom without looking at a need for and value of project for a specific reason. Also, are lots of manipulations on data take place; is not honest look.	Problem not being addressed because environment and tax dollars being wasted on project that will not provide for benefits. Need to look at national level what projects needed and where.
<b>Challenge J</b>		
<b>Disposing of dredge material (where to put dredge material- difficulty of finding sites- project impacts- lack of alternatives).</b>		
59	Challenge management of a large volume of sediments to be dredged for commercial and navigation purposes.	
60	Siting disposal site for dredged material.	Maintaining federal channel depths important for regional economy or increasing.
61	To provide continuing dredge disposal capacity at [all ports] the Port of Wilmington in an economically and environmentally sound manner.	This is critically important to ensure the long-term viability of the Port with related economic impacts for [surrounding regions] the State of Delaware.
62	Dredging harbor for Coast Guard Vessels.	Disposal of material becoming problem due to limited receptors. Moving material from disposal areas costly and its hard to find suitable uses.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
63	Lack of alternatives (non-ocean) for contaminated dredge material.	Channels must be maintained, ocean marine resources must be improved.
64	Ending all ocean dumping, including the use of questionable dredge material to cap contaminated sites such as the HARS. At the same time waterways and ports must be maintained, beneficial uses for dredge material must be developed.	The quality of our ocean water is one of the most important aspects of maintaining the tourist industry, the fishing industry, and recreational scuba diving. This must be balanced with the need to keep the ports and waterways maintained.
65	Port vs. estuary (dredging) pollution protection and trackdown; sprawl.	The proposed port improvements are not the only component of the NY/NJ Harbor. Plans for dredge to meet supposed port needs with only short-term solutions (disposal) and no enforcement actions for long-term solutions is not tenable.
66	Access for present and future ocean going vessels to port facilities for international commerce.	Participation in the world economy is impossible without this.
67	Channel deepening of Delaware River- disposal of dredge material – sites located in Southern New Jersey and Pennsylvania. To deepen channel to 45'.	To enable larger ships to navigate Delaware River; reduce costs of vessel operation.
68	Beneficial use of dredged material- Corps would do more to facilitate this opportunity in Mid-Atlantic.	Facilitate not only navigation objectives but also brownfields remediation, landfill closure, and ocean resource protection policy initiatives.
69	Rigidity of Corps policy contracting is problematic for innovative solution to dredged materials management issues.	Dredged materials management is no longer "easy" or "given."
70	Reliance on water disposal of dredge material/displaced dirt; no science- based standards for ocean disposal.	
<b>Challenge K</b>		
<b>Special problems related to urban watersheds (environmental justice and brownfield).</b>		
71	Restoration of urbanized watersheds to meet multiple objectives- water quality, floodplain management (disaster mitigation), and recreation.	Urbanization/degradation of watersheds have impacted water quality, put the human population at risk of flood disasters, have impacted natural habitat, have eliminated recreational opportunities, and have effectively disconnected people from their surrounding environment.
72	When addressing cleanup and restoration of urban rivers, how can the Army Corps	Decisions which effect the quality of water resources must not be decided in a vacuum-

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
	ensure greater waterfront access for low-income, communities of color?	the ability of communities' to access the water is essential.
73	How can the Army Corps better consider issues of environmental justice in their waterfront/water resources decisions?	Social-economic concerns are often left out of impact analysis resulting in disproportionate impacts (particularly as a result of cumulative impacts) in many low-income, communities of color.
74	There is a tremendous need to revitalize waterfront communities in and around New York Harbor. What resources do the Army Corp bring to help re-develop infrastructure, brownfields, restore water bodies and provide recreational opportunities?	Most of these communities are poor and of color. They are inundated with pollution facilities, truck traffic and lack of open space.
75	Urban watershed restoration.	Industrial (maritime) to residential; poor neighborhoods, improve water quality; floodplain management; water front access; community involvement.
<b>Challenge L</b>		
<b>Land use management- disconnect between local planning and permitting (state and federal).</b>		
76	Problem: Confusion about COE'S role vs. state and local governments. Should the Corps be in the business? There is little <u>national</u> interest in some Corps projects.	This is a core issue. Right now the tail is wagging the dog. Approval/denial decision; Corps has no land-use decision powers.
77	Land use planning is in local hands; regulatory is at federal and state level.	
78	Land use decisions at local level and regulation at federal/state levels prevents comprehensive land use planning.	Local development interests control land use decisions and Corps and state can only react within regulatory framework; comprehensive land use planning does not take place.
<b>Challenge M</b>		
<b>Cooperation between Corps and EPA on environmental dredging.</b>		
79	Lack of cooperation between Corps and EPA to fully implement Congressional authorizations. Specifically – Corps authorized to environmentally dredge contaminated water that contributes to harbor loading and effect dredge material management issues. Passaic identified as priority! Corps needs to work together	(1) Clean up harbor. (2) Decrease contaminant loading in harbor. (3) Reduce dredged material disposal costs. (4) True restoration based on economic revitalization of region; contaminate transport not just risk. Superfund can not handle all urban watersheds with many contaminants and many PRPS. WRDA 1999- if implemented

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
	with EPA to follow through with charge of comprehensive restoration. Corps needs to obtain cooperation with Region II Administration –per 33 CFR Chapter 26 water pollution and prevention – environmental dredging.	can be a solution for/towards restoration of harbor.
<b>Challenge N</b>		
<b>Greatly reduce the time required for project decision.</b>		
80	Lack of continuity in leadership at district level of Corps.	Lack of leadership results in lack of accomplishment.
81	Reduce the time required for a project to move from conception to final approval.	Today's typical delays use damaging to all involved parties. A new and innovative approach is possible, and needed.
<b>Challenge O</b>		
<b>Improve local partnerships -especially with external customers and key environmental organizations.</b>		
82	Conflict within COE (and other regulatory agencies) that have water resource development and mission and regulatory mission.	Not enough consideration is given to environmental considerations-too many permits issued.
83	How can the Corps improve its relationship with those who see no benefit- only possible harm – from Corps projects.	Too much time, money, energy is spent, by too many people, on issues that could have been resolved easily and well, given a better dialog with people having concerns.
84	How can a meaningful dialog-and a subsequent Corps response- be reached between Corps leadership and those interested in preserving and protecting the environment affected by Corps projects?	Without dialogue, and reasonable response, projects cannot serve the best interests of the sponsors, the Corps, and the affected public.
<b>Challenge P</b>		
<b>Bring local municipalities into process early and ensure they know responsibilities and costs.</b>		
85	Comprehensive watershed management planning <u>involving the local municipal level</u> . Often the local level is the last to be involved in developing project plans.	Watershed management must be coordinated with local needs and resources in order to relate water supply, water quality, storm water, flood control management, wastewater discharge management- also, addressing each element separately will not work.

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
<b>Challenge Q</b>		
<b>More safety awareness is required in ports.</b>		
86	Keeping ports modern, up to date (in depth, aton, and management personnel).	Safety of both recreational boaters and commercial traffic. Efficient operation is key to safety of life and environment.
87	Increasing vessel traffic- commercial, recreational, sightseeing, commuters, swimmers, high speed ferries, kayaks, etc. Abandoned piers/marinas.	The traffic is increasing and the size of the waterways isn't. Debris from abandoned areas creates navigation hazards.
88	Need to gain public understanding and support for dredging/deepening projects.	Public support is critical to allowing important deepening/dredging projects to move forwards.
89	The increased channel depths of national ports will result in additional volume and more diverse cargo entering our ports.	An increase in port safety awareness will be needed in the future in preparation for larger vessels carrying this additional and more diverse cargo into U.S. ports.
<b>Challenge R</b>		
<b>Responsiveness, respect for and receptive to local/state/public.</b>		
90	Public participation and required response from Corps.	When the public comments on a Corps project (Philadelphia District), the Corps tends to refuse to respond to the concerns of the public. How can this be remedied so that the public feels a part of the process?
91	Need to better explain rationale and basis for Corps permit decisions.	Corps must establish credibility with public and elected officials to insure integrity and acceptance of permit process.
92	Level of toxins in water and its effect on wildlife/fisheries/habitat and human health in relation to these factors.	Imperative to begin with the basis – protect/conservate resources, monitor sites and their effects and relationship to environment = human health; brownfields; lack of public education/how it impacts them; how they impact/contribute.
93	To inform the public when a potential project sponsor meets within the Corps with the purpose to initiate a Corps project.	The public or affected community often learns of a project only after it is far along in the process. All stakeholders should be involved at the start so that all issues are on the table and dealt with.
94	The Corps does not easily or consistently respond to state mandates/policies/laws.	Cooperation between state and Corps is essential for smooth operations and the state tends to be more aware and sensitive to local needs/concerns.
95	Army Corps permitting process is	Too many polluting facilities are approved

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
	perceived to be unresponsive to community needs and not protective of health and the environment. It is a rubber stamp agency.	in localized low-income communities thereby increasing cumulative impacts on public health and the environmental community input in decision making is imperative.
96	Wetlands, and destruction, continuous problem, need is to protect them; mitigation not appropriate response.	Corps problem: actions at a reduced rate, need to have protection now, mitigation not appropriate.
97	Lack of public process in Corps projects and decision making. Public being excluded by lack of opportunity to comment, no public hearings during work week (like this).	Public needs fair opportunity to be heard; more comment periods; heard and meet on evening and weekends, getting brought into process earlier.
<b>Challenge S</b>		
<b>Enhance cooperation and coordination to all Federal agencies e.g. Corps play a leadership role in MTS.</b>		
98	The Corps should work closely with NRCS and VS Fish and Wildlife Service on environmental restoration projects and PL83-566 planning.	Avoid duplication of effort-streamline procedures-maximize effective local involvement.
99	To assume the leadership role in decision-making which involves multi-agency participation.	Someone has to do it. Currently challenges to projects from other federal agencies (EPA, NALTS, etc.) are either simply absorbed into the permit action without change or left unresolved.
<b>Challenge T</b>		
<b>Need for new strategies for beach replenishment.</b>		
100	Accumulation of sand on Wildwood New Jersey beaches.	Stormwater outfall lines on beach need extensions. Clogged outfalls causing flooding on streets affecting transit and causing property damage.
101	Too much sand pumping.	Kill beach replenishment.
102	Beach replenishment at Coast Guard training center and Cape may city beaches.	Funding resources of city, state, and federal government used for beach replenishment not available for other uses.
103	COE beach replenishment is the problem.	Let local's pay.
<b>Challenge U</b>		
<b>Consider all cumulative impacts when assessing environmental impacts.</b>		
104	(1) Water supply issues associated with over development. (2) Impact of construction in rivers/streams on navigational channels and their	(1) Excessive demand for water negatively impacts rivers and watersheds. (2) Federal/state permits are being issued without a long-term view of their potential

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	cumulative impacts on both navigation and water quality.	impacts on river corridors. Length of time to construct and (funding and process) water supply. Non structural flood control mechanisms. Permits: environmental restoration with maritime interests. Corps role vs. state/local government. Coastal protection/storm protection; ecological restoration focus; dredge disposal capacity in an ecological and environmental sound manner. Water quality – non point source pollution; water resources development programs; basinwide planning-establishes roll and missions.
105	Non point source pollution group problem. Opportunity-are of most effective solution which is initiate that at same time resolves issues of drought flooding erosion, etc.	Ground problem that has to be a state impact and problem is folks investing in ineffective short-term solutions that don't address cause which is stormwater runoff. Need to focus on stormwater so prevent the problem in first place.
<b>Challenge V</b>		
<b>Need a National water resource program.</b>		
106	Change the weather so that there will be an adequate but not excessive amount of rain during darkness hours every week.	Wilderness, droughts, floods would be eliminated.
107	Sufficient, safe, potable water supply for present and future needs.	Health and quality of life requires this.
108	Protection for people and property subject to catastrophic flooding.	Tragedy results without this.
109	Systems to safely manage wastewater.	Proper public health is impossible without such.
110	Develop nationwide federal water resources development program.	Limited federal funding requires more cooperation between competing agencies; reduce competition between interest; better define federal/state/local roles/missions; focus on "true" national interests; allow for a more comprehensive approach.
<b>Challenge W</b>		
<b>Actively seek opportunities for environmental projects.</b>		
111	Wilmington combined servers frequent overflows are a serious source of water quality degradation in the lower Brandywine Creek and lower Christina	Many old cities around the nation have this problem. Currently remedying the problem is very costly and difficult. ACOE expertise and equipment would be ideal to address the

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
	River (and affect the Delaware river water quality in that reach).	problem (as part of the new ecological restoration and water quality improvement mission); benefits to recreation, tourism, economic development waterfront revitalization).
<b>Challenge X</b>		
<b>Create long term monitoring of completed projects to assess project success.</b>		
	NO COMMENTS.	
<b>Challenge Y</b>		
<b>More stringent controls are needed over regulatory permitting - Corps needs to say not to projects.</b>		
112	Permitting procedure or lack of COE response to public comments and needs.	COE has shown that if you want a permit and have the time and money the permit to fill wetlands, waterfront construction without water dependency, dredge, etc. will be approved.
113	Permitting by Corps is non-responsive to environmental considerations and community needs.	
114	Non jurisdictional dams become regularly permitted and used for flood control. We need to stop runoff before starts using infiltration and best management practices. People not effective and actually exaggerate problems.	Opportunities now are to focus on infiltrate and best management practices before waters, go in and do their damage.
<b>Challenge Z</b>		
<b>Give consideration to using pre-existing historical structures for environmental restoration for educational purposes.</b>		
115	Can the Corps get involved in a specific project involving educational, wetlands, and environmental preservation to build a once existing facility on the federal/tidal wetlands.	It would be important to tie in the history of patch settlement and commerce in Brooklyn of the 1720's and help bring positive uses to an area where kids use the environment for destructive/negative use.
<b>Challenge AA</b>		
<b>Improve funding for monitoring and research and monitoring techniques for utilization in adaptive management programs.</b>		
	NO COMMENTS.	
<b>Challenge BB</b>		
<b>More emphasis on flow management and in-stream flow needs.</b>		
116	Dam/stream flow/impoundment management.	Older dams creating important local water supply reservoirs are not being monitored/managed and threatened

<b>COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION</b>		
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
		downstream areas as well as loss of water supply storage.
<b>Challenge CC</b>		
<b>More emphasis on assessment on ground water supplies as it relates to surface water development.</b>		
117	Potable water.	Need safe drinking water, at affordable price.
118	There is a need to study groundwater resources to better understand the relationship between ground and surface water flows and determines the carrying capacity of land.	Important in planning for type and density of development.
<b>Challenge DD</b>		
<b>Marry environmental restoration with port construction projects.</b>		
118	Port development.	Should evaluate need for deep water port development and look of green port design.
<b>Challenge EE</b>		
<b>Rational National maritime policy approach.</b>		
	NO COMMENTS.	
<b>Challenge FF</b>		
<b>Attention to impacts of global climate change.</b>		
120	Actually better if the Corps stays out of this one.	Or we will have (you guessed it), more levees, floodwalls, channelization, and so on (and cost mega bucks).
<b>Challenge GG</b>		
<b>Lack of enforcement and make polluters pay.</b>		
121	Make polluters pay-lack of enforcement.	Laws don't work.
<b>Challenge HH</b>		
<b>Use of buyouts and other non-structural approaches.</b>		
122	Stormwaters: Problem is historical emphasis on structural approach that is: (1) not effective, (2) has serious environmental ramifications, (3) temporary solution that's not addressing problem of building in floodplain or the source of the stormwater, opportunities best management and practices of infiltration.	Growing problem, more people are getting hurt by ineffective control solutions and environmental devastation they bring. Opportunity now to invest infiltration and best management parties that address flood and environmental protection and issues of drought and non point source pollution.
123	Dams- ? more common at ? the ? to keep down. ?? and ? and small no ? dams. [CAN'T READ]	Need to invest in floodplain restoration; structural solution to flood is no good; Dams and associated environmental destruction not appropriate for restoration.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT NEW BRUNSWICK LISTENING SESSION**

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

<b>ID#</b>	<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Why challenge is important?</b>
124	Problem: there is confusion about COE's role vs. state/local governments. There is little national interest in many Corps projects.	Get COE out of many local projects. Because COE cannot regulate land use; it reacts to locally caused problems.
125	More use of nonstructural flood damage reduction (particularly removal of structures) measures on the part of the Corps.	They are a more permanent solution; less adverse environmental impacts; create opportunities for environmental restoration; in the long run less costly for all; greater ability to address other needs.
126	Reducing flood losses.	Since 1930's Nation has spent \$100 billion a year in flood reduction measures, yet still about \$4 billion losses a year. Need to look at other alternatives aside from structural measures, i.e., look at acquisition, relocation, prudent zoning in levee protected areas, etc.
127	Flow management in rivers. Competing needs for waste assimilators, fisheries, recreation and industrial uses in American rivers place competing demands on surface water. There is a need and opportunity to study these demands in order to determine appropriate reservoir management and permitting.	The issue is critical to maximizing or use and enjoyment of rivers and to protect water supplies, control flooding and manages droughts.
<b>OTHER</b>		
128	Corps needs to put a firewall between initiating/studying projects executing projects.	
129	Problem – the Corps of Engineers is the problem.	Reform the Corps.
130	Dismantle the ACOE, give responsibilities to EPA and interior.	
131	Response to natural disasters/flood reduction, etc.	The economic, health, safety issues affecting areas in disaster is important.
132	Pay actual attention to all this feel –good P.R. type of stuff that the Corps does and then files it in the trash.	
133	HTRW-non federal cost-clean up is costly.	Flood control projects can be delayed due to high cost. Cost sharing is needed; suggest 50/50 cost share.



## **APPENDIX B**

### **SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS**





