

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

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
AUGUST 13, 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

**WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
AUGUST 13, 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 – Williamsburg, Virginia	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	1
Session Objectives	3
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1 st Group Discussion)	5
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2 nd Group Discussion)	10
Challenge X - Need for Adequate Supply of Raw Water and Unified Action between Federal, State, and Local Agencies	11
Challenge G - Lack of Total Watershed Management (from Headwaters to Ocean).....	12
Challenge R - Safety of, and Protection of, Source Water for Drinking Water	13
Challenge K - Improving Coordination Between Stakeholders	14
Challenge I - Preservation of Wetlands - as it Affects Water Quality.....	14
Challenge HH - Coming Up with Funds to Replace Aging Infrastructure	15
Challenge II - Planning Ahead to Ensure that Infrastructure is in Place to Support Commerce	16
Closing Remarks and Adjournment	17
Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges	A-1
Appendix B Submitted Public Statement and Materials	B-1

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Williamsburg, Virginia on August 13, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected Appendices are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As 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 Williamsburg, Virginia Listening Session. This session, hosted by the North Atlantic Division (NAD), was conducted on August 13, 2000 at the Williamsburg Hospitality House in Williamsburg, Virginia. Sixty-two people (not including Corps personnel 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 (BG) Steve Rhoades welcomed the audience on behalf of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and, in particular, the North Atlantic Division. He offered the audience sincere thanks for attending the session. He also welcomed the District Commanders from the COE Baltimore District and the COE Norfolk District.

BG Rhoades indicated that the Listening Session and its participants were giving the Corps of Engineers the opportunity to better understand what's important to the citizenry regarding the nation's water resources. He stated that a key function of the Corps and all Federal agencies is to listen and be responsive to those we serve. This is one of many listening sessions the Corps is hosting across the nation.

BG Rhoades specified that the primary goal of the Listening Session is to learn what you believe are the important water resource challenges facing this region and the nation as a whole. The Corps has spent a good bit of time thinking about this partly to fulfill requirements from Congress as part of the Government Performance Review Act, but more generally as part of its own long-term planning.

According to BG Rhoades, the Corps' initial conclusion is that the nation has not paid sufficient attention to its water resources needs for at least two decades. As a result, we're headed for problems. The Corps sees at least six key challenge areas that require additional emphasis and investment. These are described on the four banners at the front of the room entitled "America's Water Resources Challenges for the 21st Century" and in the corresponding brochure entitled "Join the Dialogue." Everyone in the audience should have a copy of the brochure.

However, BG Rhoades stated that the Corps didn't invite the participants to support or validate the Corps thoughts. The goal is to understand the participants' thoughts. The Corps only proposed the six identified challenges as a starting point. Are they important to you? Are there other challenges? What might be the appropriate role of the Federal government in addressing them?

BG Rhoades indicated that we need to focus on national and regional issues. He indicated that there is no national consensus on the most important water resource issues. We need to better understand the regional issues. During today's Listening Session, the Corps will restrain themselves and not be an advocate for issues, rather they are here to listen to others' ideas. The North Atlantic Division of the COE covers a region from the Canadian border to the North Carolina border. He recognized that there were different issues and different interests even within the region. BG Rhoades specified that the focus at the Listening Session should not be on any singular project. During today's session, we'll avoid critiquing particular projects or answering project-related questions, because today's focus is regional and national issues.

The activities of the day will be compiled into a report. That report will be posted on the COE national challenges web site. The back of the "Join the Dialogue" brochure shows the URL of the web site. Results from all of the listening sessions across the country will be used to form a summary report to be shared with the public, Congress, and other decision-makers. As the findings from the compilation of all of the individual sessions are summarized as a collective, we expect to find some constant or common themes. The intent is that the information and priorities provided by the participants will help decision-makers understand what's most important regarding the nation's water resources.

BG Rhoades concluded by saying that he was excited and honored to have the participants attend the session, and that he and his staff looked forward to hearing the participants' thoughts. He indicated that the Corps has an objective to be a "responsive Federal agency, the best-serving Federal agency around." Today, the Corps is going to "listen" not "advocate." To help that process, a professional facilitator, Jim Creighton, will be used to guide the meeting. He'll be running the session and will explain the ground rules and how it's all going to work.

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

Session Objectives

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

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

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

1. 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?

¹ The written statements submitted at the August 13, 2000 listening session are included as Appendix B.

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

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

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

Mr. Creighton then explained the format of the listening session in more detail. To begin with, the audience was asked to fill in a few of the tables, which grouped the audience into 8 tables of approximately 6 to 9 people per table. The participants at each table were asked to introduce themselves to one another and were instructed to elect a spokesperson for the table. In keeping with the theme of "listening" to the public, the Corps members who joined each table were instructed by the facilitator not to serve as spokespersons, although they would be allowed to take notes for the group if so asked by the other participants at the table.

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

1. Select a spokesperson.
2. Identify water challenges that are of interest to you and write each one on the top part of a yellow sticky. Challenges are water resource needs, issues, problems, or opportunities.
3. Discuss why they are important to you. Write down the results of your discussion or your own opinion(s) on the bottom part of the yellow stickies.
4. Give a report to the large group.

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

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

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

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

After approximately one hour of group discussions at the tables, Mr. Creighton asked the spokespersons from the eight tables to take turns reporting each of the challenges that were identified at their table. Mr. Creighton asked that only one issue per table be reported during the first round, then he would go around to all the tables again as time permitted to capture additional challenges identified by each table. Mr. Creighton also emphasized that, in order to avoid duplication and save time, once a challenge was reported out by one group, the other groups should not repeat that particular challenge. The participants identified 45 unique challenges, which are listed below:

- A. Clear authority for identifying and handling of abandoned vessels
- B. Cost of dredging (cost-sharing)
 - Corps to consider 100% funding for dredging projects as opposed to cost sharing
- C. Establish a common GIS database and system that is easily accessible

- Common GIS database to be operating between Corps and Coast Guard (that is easily accessible to both agencies).
- D. Need for consistency in 404 permitting actions
- Need accountability for decisions made at local level
- E. No one agency leading (and coordinating) water resources development
- F. Legislative requirements get in the way of holistic watershed planning approach
- E.g., EPA rulemaking on sanitary sewer flows
- G. Total watershed management from headwaters to ocean
- Current lack of total watershed management (from headwaters to ocean)
 - No systematic approach to handling exists
 - Impacts on land use, water quality, environmental health, dredging requirements
- H. Impact of dredging on bottomfish and other natural resources
- Impact of dredging on living marine resources
 - Maintenance and improvement of dredging and the impact on ecosystem (clams)
 - Need sanctuaries so that stocks can be replenished
- I. Preservation of wetlands - as it affects water quality
- J. Concern over deepening of main channels
- Be careful of infrastructure (need for new infrastructure) (must ensure defense needs)
- K. Improving coordination between stakeholders
- Give more credence to local and state projects
 - Take local and state projects into account
- L. Urban water infrastructure
- What is Corps mission, with respect to maintenance, placement, and funding?
- M. Education of the public on water resources issues
- Ease of access to information that is available
 - How to streamline the access of information; inform decision-makers and staffers regarding local issues
- N. Different Federal agencies have different regional boundaries and different views on issues
- Public may have to go to two or more regional offices
 - Different standards of definitions (e.g., wetlands)
 - Overlap of Federal agencies
- O. Utilize watershed approach to planning and management

- Since Corps is defined by watershed, then Corps should help facilitate between various jurisdictions
 - Utilize Corps expertise on watershed planning; work and do jobs on watershed basis; watersheds do not stop at state lines
- P. Combined sewer overflows (funding issues)
- Q. Focus on inland waterways
- To include Corps to work with FEMA to update floodplain maps
- R. Safety of, and protection of, source water for drinking water
- S. Beach replenishment of coastline
- Use dredge materials to replenish beaches
 - Use holistic planning approach
- T. Cost and availability of dredge material disposal
- U. Scaling the scope of the project to the scope of the problem
- E.g., environmental restoration projects
- V. Acid runoff from mines
- W. Funding that has been set aside for cleanup purposes has not been used
- E.g., Superfund sites
- X. Need for adequate supply of raw water
- To provide an adequate supply for future (competition for water)
 - Need for unified actions between Federal/state/local agencies
- Y. Incorporate new monitoring techniques and tools into existing monitoring systems
- Operations
 - Water quality and other infrastructure
- Z. Continue Corps cost participation in stream gauging
- Corps contributions to USGS for stream gauge surveys have been decreasing over the years
- AA. Permitting process should be streamlined and more user friendly
- E.g., out-sourcing, experience level of staffing
- BB. Corps to provide additional resources for habitat restoration
- Ecosystem protection and restoration
- CC. Prioritize ecosystem restoration projects

- DD. Upgrade current facilities to match existing standards
- EE. Reduce all non-point source pollution run-off
- FF. Establish a vessel management traffic system
 - Third crossing
- GG. Increase communications between Corps and Coast Guard HQ offices
 - At the COE and Coast Guard HQ levels with respect to a number of issues (e.g., scheduling of projects; coordination of appropriation processes)
- HH. Coming up with funds to replace aging infrastructure
- II. Planning ahead to ensure that infrastructure is in place to support commerce, including navigation and dredging
 - Support projections of commerce with infrastructure
- JJ. Failing individual septic systems
 - Need programs for people with limited means
- KK. Linking infrastructure improvements and environmental restoration
 - Look for opportunities to do both on same project
- LL. Coordinating and funding economically-linked land-side projects
 - Need to fund all components of projects before all projects can work
- MM. Support smaller port growth
 - Priority for Hampton Roads port (e.g., overall economic impact of the Port of Hampton Roads)
- NN. Keeping up with advancing technology through public/private partnerships in order to maintain agency viability
 - Federal government seeking partnerships and coordination with respect to advancing technology (e.g., GIS, design, modeling)
- OO. Work holistically in partnerships for Corps projects
- PP. Corps of Engineers costs
 - Need to continually assess Corps costs
 - Corps too expensive
 - Corps costs may eliminate some potential partners
- QQ. Find mechanisms to minimize frivolous lawsuits
 - Cost to project proponent during litigation
- RR. Do port planning on regional basis vs. project by project

- SS. Cost-sharing formula should consider ability-to-pay
 - Look at a community’s ability to cost-share

After the group spokespersons had finished reporting out the challenges identified at their tables, Mr. Creighton asked the audience members to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots, in order to identify those challenges that were of most concern to the group. Each non-Corps workshop participant then took five dots and affixed them on the butcher pad beside the challenge or challenges of most interest to him or her. The five dots could be distributed in any way the individual saw fit, such as one dot per challenge or all five dots on a single challenge.

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

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

A	6	P	5	EE	4
B	8	Q	1	FF	2
C	10	R	17	GG	3
D	7	S	0	HH	12
E	7	T	10	II	12
F	1	U	1	JJ	1
G	19	V	3	KK	4
H	0	W	0	LL	2
I	14	X	20	MM	4
J	5	Y	6	NN	5
K	16	Z	4	OO	5
L	8	AA	4	PP	1
M	10	BB	2	QQ	1
N	8	CC	2	RR	3
O	4	DD	2	SS	1

The seven challenges receiving the most votes were:

- X (20) Need for adequate supply of raw water and unified action between Federal, state, and local agencies
- G (19) Lack of total watershed management

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

R	(17)	Safety of, and protection of, source water for drinking water
K	(16)	Improving coordination between stakeholders
I	(14)	Preservation of wetlands - as it affects water quality
HH	(12)	Coming up with funds to replace aging infrastructure
II	(12)	Planning ahead to ensure that infrastructure is in place to support commerce

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

After the lunch break, Mr. Creighton described the results of the voting. He mentioned that the breakoff point for the top vote getters was 12 or more votes. There was some discussion about the differences between issue X and issue R (see above). One person thought they were very similar, but others thought they were very different issues. It was noted that some votes seemed very “environmental.” However, when the group was specifically asked, the participants agreed that the vote seemed representative of the group as a whole.

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

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

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

1. Select someone from your small group to be a spokesperson. A Corps person will record the main points on the easels.
2. Assume you have the authority to implement the changes you’d like to see. Discuss within your group:
 - a. What actions would you take?
 - b. Who should do it?
 - i. Role of Federal government.
 - ii. Role of state or local governments.

iii. Role of private individuals or organizations.

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

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

Following these instructions, the participants gravitated into groups around the butcher pads and began deliberating with others in their group. There were 7 tables; one table for each of the identified key issues/challenges. The table for Challenge G had 8 persons, Challenge II had 13 persons, Challenge K had 5 persons, Challenge I had 7 persons, Challenge X had 7 persons, Challenge HH had 6 persons, Challenge R had 3 persons (these counts include some Corps staffers). After about 40 minutes, Mr. Creighton asked the participants to move to a different table to discuss another challenge of importance to them. However, very few participants decided to move to another challenge and, therefore, continued to focus on discussion in their originally selected challenge. Following the second discussion period, Mr. Creighton asked the spokesperson for each challenge to report the results of the discussions for their respective challenges. The results of the discussions are provided below:³

Challenge X - Need for Adequate Supply of Raw Water and Unified Action between Federal, State, and Local Agencies

It was noted that the water quantity aspect is closely related to water quality issues. The King William project was a common experience among the participants that helped to shape the discussion. The participants had a broad range of water supply planning experience. Water supply development is typically done at the local level (therefore, there is no unified approach). There may be competition at the regional level.

Problem Definition

1. Conflicting Federal requirements
2. Often lack of regional watershed approach
3. Process held hostage by special interest groups
4. Lack of clearly defined lines of authority

Action Plan—Define Roles

1. Federal government (Lead agency: a. Planning: Corps. b. Water quality/environmental: EPA)

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

- a. Resolve multi-state issues
 - b. Facilitate creation of level playing field (there should be uniform criteria among states)
 - c. Provide technical expertise, basic scientific and engineering information
 - d. Funding unfunded mandates
 - e. Unified process or organization to guide the water supply development process (Corps could be primary candidate for this; in the West, the Bureau of Reclamation might be primary candidate)
2. State
- a. Advocates for locality with Federal government
 - b. Leadership in water supply development planning within region
 - c. Conflict management/resolution between regions
 - d. Facilitate interregional issues
 - e. Provide technical assistance to locality
 - f. Funding
3. Local/Regional
- a. Define water needs (assess own water supply needs in concert with regional water supply planning)
 - b. Primary funding responsibility
 - c. Project implementation/accountability

Challenge G - Lack of Total Watershed Management (from Headwaters to Ocean)

What Action Should be Taken?

1. Establish system of information exchange
2. Manage oversight by sub-basins
3. Establish vision
4. Establish roles/responsibilities for all participants including residents
5. Define threats to hydrologic units
6. Identify work already done and who's responsible
7. Evaluate existing regulatory programs
8. Look for opportunities to combine regulatory programs
9. Set standards for watershed
10. Prioritize different reaches
11. Develop common definitions of watershed
12. Identify problems
13. List of functions
14. Identify stakeholders
15. Web-based GIS information
16. Educate stakeholders
17. Establish roles/responsibilities for agencies
18. Connect agencies at all levels

19. Protect life and property through planning, design, and implementation of structural/nonstructural and forecasting measures
20. Conduct basin assessment to determine demands on the resource and related resources
21. Establish task force to establish vision and provide oversight
22. Find funding
23. Identify wildlife impacted
24. Establish consequences for noncompliance with regulatory program
25. Establish lead for initiative; take proactive role
26. Establish an organization for the basin
27. Establish a data dictionary
28. Timeline (schedule) for implementation
29. Voluntary participation
30. Maximum local participation with steering committees
31. Determine alternatives/costs
32. Identify voluntary works
33. Implement CWA plan
34. Establish uniform process guidelines
35. Process to periodically evaluate plan
36. Develop realistic action plan
37. Start real local projects

Who Should Take Action?

1. Private/public partnership
2. Congress needs to sign up private/public partnerships using hydrologic boundaries
3. Need to better define roles and responsibilities for all participants including residents, public/private partnerships, Congress

Challenge R - Safety of, and Protection of, Source Water for Drinking Water

What Action Should be Taken? (Who Should Take Action?)

1. Source water assessment
 - a. Water quality
 - b. Inventory of sources of contamination
 - c. Conduct susceptibility analysis
 - d. Delineate source area
 - Surface water
 - Groundwater
 - Watershed
2. Source water monitoring
3. Source water protection (public/government educational/training program)
 - a. Institutional management (Federal/state oversight)
 - Regional agencies/authorities
 - Citizen's advisory group

- b. Land use controls (establish model plan; deed restrictions)
- c. Mitigation of existing contamination sources
- d. Funding source (development fee)
 - Federal/state/local grants
 - Superfund/brownfields

Challenge K - Improving Coordination Between Stakeholders

State and local players need more voice. The playing field needs to be leveled. There needs to be more interaction through coordinating meetings.

What Action Should be Taken? (Who Should Take Action?)

1. Intergovernmental meetings (Federal government should be lead agency)
2. All Corps projects should be linked with at least one local government agency or stakeholder (Corps)
3. Allow local input into projects (Corps)
4. Data sharing (partnering)
5. Corps should “own” local projects (Corps)
6. Justification of Corps’ projects linked to other initiatives/projections maximize resources (Corps – asks state/local – provides information)
7. Need “vehicle” for Corps to notify others about Corps project funding sources (Corps to lead; vehicle may be political, electronic, face-to-face)
8. Local, state, and Federal exchange of project data (state to lead)
9. Policy and guidance on best sources of information and experts: review and evaluation; roles and responsibilities (Corps and MATF; maybe state agency has more intimate knowledge of area or species of interest)
10. Local governments need to be engaged in Federally-driven actions (Corps)
11. Stakeholders are anyone with an interest; who takes lead to ensure public involvement process?
12. Corps should acknowledge local land actions
13. Corps should provide information about other projects and effects (Corps)

Challenge I - Preservation of Wetlands - as it Affects Water Quality

This issue focused on wetlands (which will ultimately affect water quality).

What Action Should be Taken? (Who Should Take Action?)

1. Education, communication, and assessment of impacts (Corps, state, watershed councils should take lead)
2. Coordination between the levels of government and non-profits (locals should take the lead)

3. Address backlog of mitigation projects (Corps)
4. Address competing land use interests (public, private entities, state)
 - a. Communicating failures and successes
 - b. Compensation alternatives
 - c. Future liabilities and responsibilities
5. Work towards consistent treatment of wetlands (Corps, US Fish and Wildlife, EPA, NRCS)
 - a. Definition
 - b. Complete national and state wetlands inventory
6. Expand funding and awareness of North American Wetlands Conservation Act and Wetlands Preserve Program (state and Federal agencies)
7. Expand local purchase of development rights "PDR" program (state/local governments with private partnerships)

People don't know these things work and why they don't; they need more education.

Challenge HH - Coming Up with Funds to Replace Aging Infrastructure

Need to first define the notion: "What constitutes infrastructure?" Is it Federal? Is it local? It was built 40 years ago; it used to be rural and may now be in middle of urban areas.

What Action Should be Taken? (Who Should Take Action?)

1. Federal legislation (action should be taken by Congress)
 - a. Confirm project need
 - b. Confirm standards
 - c. Assign to NRCS
 - d. Appropriations
 - e. Determine risk (life and safety and public health) (e.g., Congress to take action on State Dam Safety initiative)
2. Determine beneficiaries
3. Develop implementation strategy
4. Federal/non-Federal local partnership

Examples

1. Federally assisted infrastructure (e.g., dams 25' to 75' high)
 - a. Need to meet current standards
 - b. Costs will be same as previous shared
2. Wastewater treatment plants and collections systems
3. Bridges

Challenge II - Planning Ahead to Ensure that Infrastructure is in Place to Support Commerce

The present guidelines are a little fluid. We need to educate public. For example, 95 percent of commerce comes through ports of this country. We need Federal/state/local agencies to educate public about commerce infrastructure (e.g., ports). We need to integrate/coordinate ocean-side (Corps) and land-side (DOT) transportation and the Federal government needs to come up with standards and guidelines for integrating these activities. The Federal government needs to stress the multimodal planning process (comprehensive planning for all of our transportation planning needs). States and local agencies should be more active participants. We need to look at regional/coastline planning in a holistic planning process (e.g., NY to Miami).

What Action Should be Taken? Who Should Take Action?

1. Identify placement areas for dredge materials
 - a. Role of Federal government
 - Adjust funding formula
 - Consistent guidelines and criteria
 - Educate
 - b. Role of state or local governments
 - Be a strong participant
 - Educate
 - c. Private role or organization
 - Understand
 - Educate
2. Integrate landside and oceanside transportation planning
 - a. Role of Federal government
 - Develop standards
 - Need strong multi-modal transportation Czar
 - b. Role of state or local governments
 - Be a more active participant with the Federal government
 - c. Private role or organization
 - Inform your Congressman
3. Regional and coast-wide planning for navigation-related commerce
 - a. Role of Federal government
 - Analyze local/regional needs
 - Identify environmental costs
 - b. Role of state or local governments
 - Identify local/regional needs
 - Provide input to Federal government for economic analysis and design requirements
 - c. Private role or organization
 - Provide technical needs to government

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

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

Mr. Creighton then turned to BG Rhoades to give the closing remarks. BG Rhoades indicated that the Corps wants to be the champion of issues that relate to the Corps. The Corps in turn will work with the Department of Defense (DOD) and Congress with the data from the stakeholders. Other issues will be brought to the attention of other agencies. When the Corps reports its findings to Congress and the DOD, the national summary report will be posted on the web site.

BG Rhoades thanked the participants for coming and sharing thoughts about what the Corps should be doing and what the nation should be doing. He mentioned that he learned a lot from today's session and expected that many of the identified challenges and issues will vary from region to region. BG Rhoades specified that he appreciated everyone's time and that he felt that it was time well spent. He believed that something would come of this session, with respect to our long-term view of water resource needs. BG Rhoades reiterated his desire to bring to the public the best government possible, with respect to what the public wants and what they feel that they need regarding water resources. At the conclusion of his comments, BG Rhoades thanked the participants again for their participation and the Williamsburg, Virginia Listening Session was adjourned.

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

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge A		
Clear authority for identifying and handling of abandoned vessels.		
1	Exercise of ACOE jurisdiction with respect to wrecks and obstructions. Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 defines application to "U.S. Navigable Waters" but ACOE application is concerned with impact on ACOE navigation projects.	Review all wrecks and obstructer and exercise ACOE authority in all "Navigable Waters of the U.S.".
2	Identification and handling of abandoned vessels.	I believe that the Coast Guard definition of an abandoned vessel differs from that of the ACOE. We should be able to better coordinate our efforts in addressing the problem of removing/handling these vessels.
Challenge B		
Cost of dredging (cost sharing).		
3	Forecasted major increase in deep-draft (50'-55') container vessel traffic throughout the world = insufficient channel depth and vessels constrained by draft = increased risk of marine casualties. (dredging ---> dredge spoil disposal)	Increased risk of hazards to navigation. Limited number of ports in U.S. with deep enough channels; competitive disadvantage with other port states.
4	How to pay for the extensive cost of construction and maintenance dredging of America's harbors, channels, and waterways.	As global trade increases, led by U.S. efforts to expand WTO membership, size of vessels; need for larger and more container terminals, ports cannot do it alone; 100% federal funding of dredging.
Challenge C		
Establish a common GIS database and system that is easily accessible.		
5	(1) Development and/or expansion of water supply systems and protection of environment (coordination of local, state, federal groups); (2) Development of up-to-date water supply plans for future needs; (3) Better planning on watershed specific areas; (4) Incorporate GIS detailed information into plans and development with info from all areas (Pt &/Non-Pt) and agencies.	(1) Need to protect our environment and natural resources while providing the needs of the people. (2) Supply plans from DEQ and community are old, done in the mid 80's. (3) It is important to look at areas on a smaller scale. (4) Will provide a lot of information that previously was not available and coordinate all areas of concerns (environment, number of people, needs, dredging, maintenance).
6	Accurate up to date floodplains maps; FEMA/U.S.A.	(1) Accurate information for building decisions. (2) Accurate information for financial risk management. (3) Support

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
		National Flood Ins. Program.
7	Establish/identify a common GIS system, useable by ACOE/NOAA/CG for waterway hydrographic surveys.	Diminished staff necessitate using "labor saving" techniques; using offline is good but time can be saved with inter-agency operability.
Challenge D		
Need for consistency in 404 permitting actions.		
8	There appears to be little accountability of district actions and decisions. Also, districts vary widely between each other in interpretation of project facts, as well as regulations.	While one could say this provides flexibility (and this can be important) it also suggests inconsistency and subjectivity who provides objective evaluation of decisions?
9	Permit streamlining.	Specific criteria often change; backlogs prolong processing.
10	The changing definitions of wetlands from "tidal" to "upland" wetlands.	The new "upland" wetland definitions places an unfair burden on municipalities in the Tidewater/Hampton Roads Region, (examples states at the upstream portions of the watershed are dumping pollutants); we're being asked to "clean the bay," when much bigger issues upstream exist.
11	Time required to get through 404 permitting process; suits vs. staff.	Difficulty in planning and implementing projects; who makes the decisions.
12	Corps at HQ level needs to insure that permitting actions (Corps policy and procedure) are being implemented similar around the nation.	Districts seem to permit pro bat on resident philosophy of career staff.
13	Local governments are not given the standing on issues that they deserve as governments; local government responsibilities should be given a heightened importance in public interest balancing.	Appears that Corps treats local government as just another problem.
14	There needs to be more consistency when problems transcend change in command at the district.	Official word is that changes in Colonels is seamless, when reality it is not. Result is that personality/philosophy of new commander can change direction of an applicant's permit.
15	Early on determination that projects are/are not permissible before major expenditures.	Public funds can/are spent in large numbers just getting to a permit decision.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge E		
No one agency leading (and coordinating) water resources development.		
16	Each ACOE district is organized differently.	Difference causes confusion. Commonality between districts, where it can be identified, would lend/lead towards better communication.
17	Each ACOE district is organizationally different-perhaps due to local demands, but leads to confusion when having to work with multiple districts.	Confusion, inability to reach the proper person.
18	No federal water policy exists. We need such and these sessions may be the start of developing one. With a national election coming up –now may be a good time.	Water availability, probably our most serious problem-is affected by policy or lack of same.
19	Intermodal accommodations.	Once cargo reaches port, are there adequate means to transport it to the Interior? Rails? Trucking?
20	The absence of a federal coordinating/funding agency on water supply planning. The EPA coordinates/fund water quality planning but there is no similar program on water supply planning.	States and local governments can benefit from experiences and lessons learned from other parts of the country and this is possible if there is one central federal agency where this information is available. Federal funding would help states establish similar program.
Challenge F		
Legislative requirements get in the way of holistic watershed planning approach.		
21	Legislative/regulatory requirements are often at odds with holistic approach to water quality problems-sometimes mandates are actually impossible.	Imposed regulations often mandate ineffective spending.
Challenge G		
Total watershed management from headwaters to ocean.		
22	Flooding: Increasing damage from flooding combined with a diminished federal investment/role.	Losses due to flooding continue to escalate; greater numbers of population at risk; lack of local land use regulations to control development in flood prone areas.
23	Holistic watershed planning could be a tool to address a majority of the issues mentioned today.	It takes a great deal of commitment to do this but it would eliminate a lot of the overlap that might otherwise occur of each entity worked independently. It would give the opportunity to make precious financial and personnel resources to go farther.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
24	Equity in development of regional pollutant reduction goals.	Without an equitable method of sharing the burdens of development/urbanization, cooperation between jurisdictions will be ineffective; jurisdictions won't want to cooperate if there is a perception of "unfairness."
25	Urban area flooding.	Nuisance to people who live in area with poor watershed planning (quality of life); safety hazards; property damage.
26	Increase regionalization of funding.	Minimizes disparity nationally for competing projects.
Challenge H		
Impact of dredging on bottomfish and other natural resources.		
27	Maintenance and improvement dredging has a severe adverse impact on bottom shell fish (i.e. clams) and destroys their habitat thus reducing their numbers.	Many watermen find their livelihood adversely impacted by dredging projects.
28	Waterway cleanup such as removal of abandoned vessels and cleanup of toxic sediment.	Quality of life; reclaim degraded waters.
Challenge I		
Preservation of wetlands -as is it affects water quality.		
29	Damming of creeks and rivers; drawing of water from other sources for water supplies.	It destroys historical areas, changes the ecosystem; allows for siltation of waterways; can change the water quality in our streams and the flow.
30	Become involved in tributary strategies.	Address water quality problems at source; partner with local jurisdictions; set/establish national/standards regional.
31	Preserve wetlands of all types.	Importance of wetlands, especially non-tidal, is grossly underestimated. Development should occur only where the natural environment can support it. Seems elementary! Should work with Virginia to help them develop a comprehensive protection plan.
32	Maintain existing wetlands/shoreline-no net loss? Provide continued cost share/grant monies (regionally)? Balance development/loss/creation.	To improve wetland habitat; allow more projects to be funded-local levels.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge J		
Concern over deepening of main channels.		
33	Increase age of bridges/locks on nations waterways + potential increase in coast-wise trade = increased vessel traffic.	Increased vessel traffic + inc. failure rate of waterway infrastructure = major problems with movement of goods = increase cost of goods. + increase in hazard to mariners.
34	Port accessibility/navigation access.	May not be able to accommodate the estimated increase in international shipping.
35	Dredging main channels to accommodate the larger vessels of the future is important to future commerce.	Ships are getting larger. Drafts are getting deeper.
36	Limits of current MTS infrastructure-namely current crossing limitations. Coordination with other federal/state/ local authorities.	If we are to dredge to accommodate increasingly larger vessels, will current and future crossings (tunnel, etc) meet proposed dredging depth clearances? If not, we need to address these restrictions.
Challenge K		
Improving coordination between stakeholders.		
37	More effectiveness interaction between Corps and permit applicant to ensure (1) honest dialogue; (2) objective review; (3) fact-based permit decision.	Failure to achieve this results, and has resulted in "doubling back" on previously "resolved" issues; delays, additional expensive reports and failure to obtain permit at 11 th hour.
38	Lack of unified Federal role on water resource policy: philosophy, goals/objectives, approaches, are the feds working on the most critical needs-or running in 10 different directions?	Federal agencies working at cross – purposes; no common objectives; competing programs-confusing to shared customers; wasted federal resources; no common priority ranking systems.
39	Greater coordination between COE, state and local agencies such as funding, planning issues, permitting.	Increase benefit of resources.
40	To better integrate water quality initiatives on a watershed basis point and non-point sources.	To hopefully get all potentially affected parties involved in assessing/developing/implementing water quality policies/actions to target their watershed/area. Coordinating with all agencies, regulators; data sharing.
41	Increase coordination of federal projects, grants and permits with local and state initiative.	Maximize limited resources; increase effectiveness of state and local goals; increase affirmation of locally driven watershed solutions.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge L		
Urban water infrastructure.		
42	Better coordination of state and federal agencies during emergency/disaster events; effective coordination will reduce disaster stress and maintain public confidence.	In order to efficiently, effectively and rapidly respond to the infrastructure needs of local governments and return these utilities to full service.
43	The problem of providing drinking water to a large population spread over a large area in a disaster situation during the response phase and a possible evacuation program at the same time.	To sustain life, health and begin the restoration process of the areas affected.
44	Retrofitting urban areas with stormwater detention/BMP facilities.	Urban development has degraded stream quality; often can't be fixed without regional facilities.
45	Ensure that all citizens have access to adequate supplies of safe water for consumption and other purposes.	(1) Communities need sufficient quantities of water to support economic expansion/growth (2) More rural areas need to replace inadequate/poor quality water.
46	Replace aging infrastructure (water transmission/distribution systems, treatment facilities, raw water supplies).	Many localities are financially strapped, have significant competing interests (highway system, school replacement, industrial/commercial re-development) and limited abilities to develop funds.
Challenge M		
Education of the public on water resources issues.		
47	Public not educated. Outreach needs to be incorporated into the plans.	When public becomes more educated, given the facts from a neutral view, can aid in making decisions based on the facts and pros/cons of the issue. This could increase buy-in for funding, plan implementation, project development, etc.
48	Educate capital hill staff on local, regional and national needs.	Many capital hill staffers need to be educated on water resource needs. These include staff working for non-water resource committees. These are the people who make fiscal decisions which impact future services.
49	Public education.	People need to know the importance of federal activities. Federal agencies are responsible for providing the best service to the public. Example: Over 50 % of flood related deaths occur in vehicles.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
50	Notification/education.	Comment availability by all interested jurisdiction; dissemination of written information.
51	Streamline/consolidate federally-produced information to and for the public.	There are multiple federal, state, and local agencies involved with water resource services. The public does not know where to go to acquire the information they pay for.
Challenge N		
Different federal agencies have different regional boundaries and different views on issues.		
52	Identify process/system/time frames for project, permits, studies, construction.	Different federal agencies have different geographic boundaries; makes it difficult to develop local/state/federal support and coordination (ACOE, EPA,. FEMA, etc.).
53	To improve the efficiency of the environmental process. It often appears to involve too many agencies, have little or no cost/benefit constraints, lack leadership to reach decisions, be driven by costly whims, and often lacks "common sense."	The efficient use of the environmental costs to the nation will result in more effective use of the public dollar where it counts the most. Millions are lost in long delays and questionable reasons for lengthy investigations into minutia.
54	Balance of conflicting resources- watershed and development – allowing development to continue through appropriate regulations.	To ensure that new regulations do not disproportionately hinder undeveloped areas from prospering.
Challenge O		
Utilize watershed approach to planning and management.		
55	To ensure there is interjurisdictional cooperation for the stormwater management. Example: the Chesapeake Bay Act- major pollutants come from PA, but areas in VA are being asked to clean the bay without their cooperation.	To really ensure our watersheds area protected by all regions draining into the watershed, write equitable regulations-not just listen to the few vocal minorities.
56	Water quality improvement from rural to urban stormwater discharges.	Loss of habitat, waterbody uses limited in the future; need to reclaim impaired waters or prevent future impairment.
57	Watershed approach.	Municipal/state boundaries.
Challenge P		
Combined sewer overflows (funding issues).		
58	Luzerne County, Pennsylvania has many antiquated sewer systems that drain stormwater and sewage in single pipes instead of separate ones. On heavy rain storms, sewer pipes fill up and the sewer	Combined sewage and stormwater overflow that is diverted into the river is undesirable from a public health standpoint. Sewage discharges found in the Susquehanna River after contain fecal coliform and other

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	and stormwater mix is diverted into the Susquehanna River.	microorganisms that pose a public health risk.
Challenge Q		
Focus on inland waterways.		
59	Inland waterway/river flood prevention and control.	(1) Preservation of quality of life and future viability of effected areas. (2) Reduce need for emergency response operations and rebuild.
Challenge R		
Safety of, and protection of, source water for drinking water.		
60	As a region develops, potable water and its supply become a more pressing issue. A balance must be struck between water needs, sources, costs and the environment.	Ground water contamination is becoming more prevalent with population density growth and development. Federal regulations have also inadvertently contributed to this contamination in some areas of the country.
61	Regional water resource management in terms of groundwater, source water usage and protection.	Streamline efforts-at least within a region. Localities all the way to state and federal agencies need to work towards the development of water management plans that will allow for sharing of information. Information about successful implementations of plans that look at the holistic view (economic/ environmental/ ethical/political).
62	Ensuring on adequate supply of fresh water.	Increasing population, decreasing water supplies, and contamination will force us to look for alternative fresh water supplies. What type of R & D is going into this effort? Should the funding for R & D be increased?
63	Water quality- declining water quality due to non-point source pollution.	Adverse impacts on fisheries and biological systems; increased water treatment costs; reduced federal investment to provide conservation assistance of private lands.
64	Protecting the source of our drinking water.	Increasing regulations and public expectations for purity of drinking water leads to preventing source contamination along with increased treatment capabilities.
65	Source water protection-ground and surface water.	Long term protection; incorporated into planning process/use.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge S		
Beach replenishment of coastline.		
66	Beach replenishment projects.	Extremely costly- esp. for maintenance. Fight a losing battle against natural forces (esp. Delaware) encourages building and investment on flood-prone lands.
Challenge T		
Cost and availability of dredge material disposal.		
67	Disposal of dredged material is becoming a space and financial problem.	If spoil areas are not provided and if sea disposal becomes the only alternative, the cost of dredging will become so expensive that local communities will be hard pressed to keep the waterways at required depth.
68	Establish a stronger federal role (policy and support) for marine transportation as there is for highways, rail and aviation.	There is not a level playing field between support of different modes of transportation yet maritime transportation accounts for a major part of our countries economy (particularly imports/exports).
69	Provide for placement of dredge material.	Increased maintenance dredging from sediments coming from upstream; increasing cost; decreasing availability of upland disposal sites.
Challenge U		
Scaling the scope of the project to the scope of the problem.		
70	Scaling scope of project to the size of the restoration.	Restoration projects are often local in nature and do not necessarily need multi-million dollar projects. Restoration projects development should recognize this and create a small solution to a small issue.
71	Corps needs to assign staff to projects based on the problems complexity and Corps staff members experiencing and abilities.	Inexperienced staff managing major projects all too often results in on-the-job training; effects are more time and expenditures by applicants.
Challenge V		
Acid runoff from mines.		
72	Luzerne County Pennsylvania has many acid mine drainage discharges that flow into the Susquehanna River. Correcting acid mine drainage is the responsibility of the Department of the Interior Office of Surface Mine. OSM has failed to provide adequate resources to clean up.	Funding to correct acid mine drainage is not adequate to correct acid mine drainage (ADM) problems in Luzerne County. At current funding levels it may take 100 or more years to clean up acid mine drainage problems in Luzerne County. Recommend the Corps of Engineers take over this

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
		mission of clean up of ADM from OSM.
Challenge W		
Funding that has been set aside for cleanup purposes has not been used.		
73	The Susquehanna River that flows through Luzerne County, PA, contains PCB contaminants that should be cleaned up. PCB contaminants in the Susquehanna River came from an EPA superfund site, the Butler Mine Tunnel. No funds were made available to clean up the PCB contaminants in the river.	PCB contaminants should be cleaned up to protect the public health of people living along the Susquehanna River.
74	Need more and earlier public input of Corps project development process (i.e., how do we take the "politics" out of the project development process so we don't end up with projects that benefit special interests at the expense of taxpayers and the environment).	Corps "credibility" crisis – news reports, etc. about economically questionable projects. Projects should truly be in the national interest.
Challenge X		
Need for adequate supply of raw water.		
75	Adequate raw water sources for our drinking water.	Water is life. The physical, health needs are obvious. The challenge lies in the competing demand for the resource.
76	Cost-effective and adequate supplies of raw water to provide quality drinking water for the future. Coordination and consistency of agency decisions.	Economics. Safety.
77	Providing adequate water supply for the City of Chesapeake – getting through the permitting process – conflicting agencies (Fed, State, Chesapeake Bay).	To ensure the City of Chesapeake remains economically viable (as well as all municipalities abilities to provide adequate drinking supplies to their communities).
78	Corps needs to consider water supply as a heightened permitting issue – not as just another "development process."	Experience is that no special consideration is given to water supply projects. Since by their nature – environmental effects will occur, water supply is not given fair consideration at the outset.
79	Water supply – increasing population pressures on diminishing and already taxed water supplies.	Loss of reliable water supplies.
80	Inadequate balancing of competing interests when evaluating proposed water supply projects (new or modified existing).	Provision of water to meet human needs often moved to "back of the line," to satisfy other interests.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
81	Inter jurisdiction coordination.	Competing interests. Best use of water.
82	Reliable drinking water source development/management and protection.	Protection of our children's children's health and welfare.
83	Water supply growth/water conservation and reuse.	Growth in supply not keeping up with demand.
Challenge Y		
Incorporate new monitoring techniques and tools into existing monitoring systems.		
84	Bringing advanced technology/sensors to water monitoring activities.	Provide better understanding of waterways and coastal waters.
Challenge Z		
Continue Corps cost participation in stream gauging.		
85	Water supply planning - regional scale - interstate issues - engineering and planning Support of stream gages declining - 25% cut over the past five years	Growth management / public health / economic development issues. Water resource info needed to manage water resource . Corps cut in funding not being filled by other sources – lowers our preparation for floods, droughts, and project plans.
Challenge AA		
Permitting process should be streamlined and more user friendly.		
86	Outsourcing: - Designs - Reviews/certifications	Use latest design/tech info. Regionalizing applications. Prioritizing service.
Challenge BB		
Corps provide additional resources for habitat restoration.		
87	Corps should substantially increase its emphasis in helping communities address environmental restoration/particularly with regard to aquatic ecosystems and resources. A critical challenge of the 21 st century. (Unposted).	With increasing population growth and the impacts of that growth; the impacts, including the delayed impacts, of past water resources development; and the need for farsighted action to protect and restore the health of water-related ecosystems, the Corps must become the leader in water resources planning and restoration and set the example for other agencies and the nation and the world.
Challenge CC		
Prioritize ecosystem restoration projects.		
	NO COMMENTS	

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge DD		
Upgrade current facilities to match existing standards.		
88	Providing adequate monitoring systems for expanding use of ports/harbors.	Need to balance harbor growth and water quality.
Challenge EE		
Reduce all non-point source pollution run-off.		
89	TMDLs	- Effect on development in watershed. - Implementing non-point source controls.
90	Comprehensive stormwater management.	- Ineffectiveness of small site BMPs. - Incorporate into planning. - Funding.
91	Reduce non point pollution sources to provide better quality waterways and groundwater.	This severely and adversely impacts fresh and potable water supplies.
92	Watershed management, NPS pollution.	Live in a rapidly growing county concerned about NPS pollution from growth and existing agricultural land use.
Challenge FF		
Establish a vessel management traffic system.		
93	1. Maintaining and depending the channels in an around Naval Station Norfolk. 2. Impact on same. 3. The possibility of a vessel management system.	Deepending the channel changes the dynamics; we would like to know if these can be addressed.
94	Increasing tonnage's in and around our port brings new and larger vessels. These vessels will be as large as carriers.	How will we be sure they move about safely?
Challenge GG		
Increase communications between Corps and Coast Guard HQ offices.		
	NO COMMENTS	
Challenge HH		
Coming up with funds to replace aging infrastructure.		
95	Rural water and wastewater infrastructure.	Contact person for some small rural water and wastewater systems concerned about their management and future operation and maintenance.
96	Existing infrastructure maintenance and rehab., (i.e., water and wastewater systems).	Protection of resource and environment; fiscal responsibility.
97	Aging watershed infrastructure:	Lack of local resource (\$) for O&M and

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	inadequate federal resources committed. Federally assisted/locally owned.	rehab of flood control structures.
98	Fund infrastructure improvements: existing and growth related.	Well established deteriorated condition of infrastructure.
Challenge II		
Planning ahead to so infrastructure is in place to support commerce, including navigation and dredging.		
99	Develop infrastructures to support safer 24-hour navigation along the James River.	Safety – commerce vessels, barges and deep water vessels; public safety of pleasure boaters, etc.
100	Support and sustain commerce along the upper/middle and lower James River.	Shipping industry is changing and future vessel size and availability will be challenges to the existing river system.
101	James River navigation: (1) channel depth, (2) channel width, (3) designated anchorage on the middle James, (4) turning basin on middle James, (5) coordination with D.O.T. on bridges, (6) navigation aids – buoys, lights, etc. These same issues should be addressed to the So. Elizabeth River also.	Support the commerce on the James such as Honeywell, Port of Richmond, Dupont, oil terminals, gravel and sand businesses.
102	Need to focus on wise port and harbor navigation in a regional planning contract.	Potential for developing overcapacity, environmental damage that should be avoided.
103	To prepare the Port of Hampton Roads for future growth to accommodate future vessel size. Need for 50ft. inbound channel and 55 ft. outbound. Also improvements to rivers with rating: (1) James River, (2) Southern Branch Elizabeth River, (3) York River.	Hampton Roads being a natural deepwater port close to the sea is best positioned to take advantage of state and federal funds with all systems in place. We must prepare for future years for port development.
104	To keep the channels and waterways connecting the access to the many ports, plants and facilities located on Virginia water maintained and dredged to accommodate the needs of those facilities, particularly those generating high levels of commerce thereby keeping those facilities competitive in ever changing markets. This includes all other waterway improvements such as widening of channels, deepening projects, etc.	The waterways serve as the highways of Virginia and with increased truck traffic, road congestion there will be increased pressure to use the waterway system. The key will be to keep the costs in line with commerce gains being used as the yardstick.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
105	Navigation of James River. Increasing the water depth and maintenance. We can only bring vessels up to 22' of draft to Port of Richmond.	Effecting the economy and jobs of Richmond and surrounding areas. Richmond can not attract steamship lines with current draft. Vessels are getting to be larger to stay competitive. Lack of increased draft on James River will result in job losses and effect economy.
CHALLENGE JJ		
Failing individual septic systems.		
106	Water/wastewater for the poor.	
CHALLENGE KK		
Linking infrastructure improvements and environmental restoration.		
107	Flexibility, in terms of responding to new ideas and innovations in environmental restoration (but applies to other areas).	Environmental restoration partners aren't looking for traditional solutions, but creative and efficient projects that address an issue quickly at minimum cost.
108	Linking infrastructure renovation/construction with environmental restoration.	Infrastructure renovation/construction can be integrated into environmental restoration and will help foster better projects. For example, creative use of clean dredge spoil can lead to abundant and healthy tidal wetlands. Changing traditional ways of business will increase the ineffectiveness of both programs.
CHALLENGE LL		
Coordinating and funding economically- linked land-side projects.		
	NO COMMENTS	
CHALLENGE MM		
Support smaller port growth.		
	NO COMMENTS	
CHALLENGE NN		
Keeping up with advancing technology through public/private partnerships in order to maintain agency viability.		
109	Training of new technologies to agency (fed, state, local) employees.	Many (state) agencies provide little to no opportunity for training (i.e., no professional development) in advance technologies (GIS, GPS, etc.) to improve efficiency in designated responsibilities.
110	Keeping up with advancing technology.	The private sector has been making great leaps in advancing science and technology. For example, the internet with its

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
		information and ability to enable the user to perform analyses. Federal agencies need to partner with each other and the public in order to keep up with the rapid changes in available technologies.
111	New technologies (world-wide) acceptance in our region.	Are there ways others have already discovered that we could replicate? Saving time/energy/\$.
CHALLENGE OO		
Work holistically in partnerships for Corps projects.		
112	Working holistically both in watershed and in partnership. Bring in appropriate partners (i.e., pro & con) and listen.	Watersheds encompass large areas and diverse partnerships. Little will be accomplished if only some of the partners or an area of the watershed are involved is studied. Partial efforts will lead to partial success.
113	Broad issue of need for a system approach. Watershed management from flood prone/navigation channel/coastal erosion perspective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land use; water quality (health, fisheries); health of environmental wetland issues; dredging requirement; and increased cost of placement of materials. - Problem with no n-standard definition and priorities between agencies and clear definition of watershed boundaries. - Why? Smaller issues need to connect to a systematic approval to our challenges.
CHALLENGE PP		
Corps of Engineers costs.		
114	Problem - \$/funding cost for projects is higher due to overhead than consultants – not possible for some agencies to participate.	Corps expertise is desired, but not always accessible due to costs and cost sharing (national interests?).
CHALLENGEQQ		
Find mechanisms to minimize frivolous lawsuits.		
	NO COMMENTS	

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
CHALLENGE RR		
Do port planning on regional basis vs. project by project.		
115	Regional project planning among Corps districts and ports.	Corps district-by-district approach to projects can lead to over-investment, facility duplication. Competition between Corps districts rather than cooperation.
CHALLENGE SS		
Cost-sharing formula should consider ability –to- pay.		
116	Funding authorization/cost sharing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problem source not related to jurisdiction - Affordability - Overlapping costs
CHALLENGE OTHER		
117	Corps needs to make a major effort at priority setting and think through appropriate roles and responsibilities for water resource development and conservation planning and implementation activities. (Unposted).	Limited resources; broad and increasing range of constituency with requests for assistance; threatens to diffuse the Corps efforts into a hodgepodge and disjointed program.
118	I am concerned about effects of mega landfills on groundwater.	Can we even "cure" groundwater once its contaminated? Could responsibility for permitting such landfills fall to the Corps?
119	Uphold Norfolk office denial of Newport News' KW reservoir permit request.	Damaging to <u>everything</u> <u>but</u> Newport News. <u>Power grab</u> on their part. They could easily purchase excess water from Norfolk, but they want <u>control</u> . N.N. <u>does</u> have a reputation for "cooking numbers" – to their advantage. I used to be Legislative Asst. to Wmsbg area delegate in VA General Assembly and NN would misrepresent facts to boost a position of theirs.
120	I am concerned about the future of the Chickahominy River. There should be accountability (not just <u>reporting</u>) of amount of water that Newport News withdraws.	If N.N. is allowed to pull more than what they're allowed under War Powers Act (<u>so</u> outdated, but now they're "grandfathered") it could severely damage this waterway. (They have doubled their withdrawal recently).
121	Improve water quality of James River and maintain water quality of Chickahominy River.	Two beautiful waterways of historical, commercial, recreational, and environmental important.

**COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
LISTENING SESSION**

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

ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
122	Don't go to national permitting.	Regional permitting requires greater scrutiny.
123	Assure adequate surveys of approaches to ports.	With more dredging providing deeper channels, we must assure that vessels will have adequate clearance between deep ocean and entrance channels.
124	Floodplain revisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Floodplains do not reflect current conditions - Growing and shrinking - Forecast buildout floodplains
125	Federally-assisted v. Federal water resource projects.	With the apparent "reduced Federal role," is the day of Federally-assisted projects over.
126	Expanding ports.	If we are to compete on the global market, ports will have to be expanded.
127	Rehabilitation of older projects.	Small watershed project sponsors don't have ability to do what's needed without help.
128	Flood damage reduction.	Is this still a Federal priority? If not – why not? Who decided?
129	Providing safe drinking water to rural areas. (Unposted)	Safe drinking water is obvious. However, water service to rural areas is hindered by available sources, responsible providers, cost per connection, etc.

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS

