

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

OMAHA, NEBRASKA
JULY 18, 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.

July 2000

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

**OMAHA, NEBRASKA
JULY 18, 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

July 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regional Listening Sessions Meeting Notes – Omaha, Nebraska	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	1
Session Objectives	2
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1 st Group Discussion)	4
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2 nd Group Discussion)	8
Challenge Q. – Marine Transportation	9
Challenge KK. – Flood Control.....	9
Challenge R. – Environmental Restoration	10
Challenge H. – Holistic Watershed Approach.....	10
Challenges C. & F. – Aging Infrastructure and Streamlined Permitting Process (combined)	11
Challenge A. – Better Coordination Among Federal Agencies.....	12
Challenge I. – Master Manual for the Missouri River	12
Closing Remarks and Adjournment	13
 Appendix A	
Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges	A-1
 Appendix B	
Submitted Public Statement and Materials	B-1

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – OMAHA, NEBRASKA

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Omaha, Nebraska on July 18, 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 steward 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, Vancouver, WA.

This report summarizes the Omaha, Nebraska, listening session. This session, hosted by the Northwestern Division, was conducted on July 18, 2000 at the Double Tree Hotel in Omaha. Approximately 89 people attended this meeting to share their views with the Corps.

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

Welcoming Remarks

Brigadier General Carl A. Strock, USACE Northwestern Division Commander, welcomed the audience to the listening session. General Strock began by informing the audience that the Corps' Northwestern Division was formed by combining the Pacific Northwest Division with the Midwest Division. This new Division comprises 14 states and includes two major river basins, the Missouri River basin and the Columbia River basin. The General extended his thanks

to the audience for attending the listening session, and noted the presence of representatives from several Congressional offices, other Federal and state agencies, and a Tribal coalition.

General Strock explained that this meeting was one of 14 listening sessions held throughout the country as part of the Government Performance Review Act. The purpose of this meeting would be to listen to the audience's thoughts on pressing water resources issues in the region and across the country. He noted that the listening sessions were not a marketing attempt by the Corps but rather were intended to encourage the public to look to the future and consider the country's water resource needs.

The General explained that the Corps has identified six national water resources needs, which are intended as a starting point for discussion. General Strock then walked the audience through the water resource challenges displayed on banners in front of the audience. The General began with the nation's waterway system and flood control, which he said is a significant concern in the Missouri River basin. The General then covered environmental restoration and the lack of adequate water resources in many areas, due in part to the age of the infrastructure and continued population growth. The General noted that the typical design life for many water infrastructure projects is 50 years, and that many such projects have reached or exceeded this limit. Lastly, the General described the Corps' role in natural disaster relief.

The General concluded his welcoming remarks by saying that each registered attendee would receive a copy of the proceedings from the meeting by mail. He noted that the proceedings from this and the other listening sessions would be posted on a Corps website (<http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/challenges>), and that the concerns raised at each listening session would be aggregated into a single report on national water resources needs. This information would be shared with decision makers in the Administration and in Congress. Finally, the General explained that the listening session was intended not only for the Corps to listen to the public, but for those in the public to listen to each other as well. With that, General Strock 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 then outlined the issues he wanted the audience to consider during the day's discussions:

1. What are the key water resource challenges facing the nation today?
2. How are you personally affected by these challenges or needs?
3. What actions should be taken to meet these challenges?
4. Who should take these actions, i.e., the Federal government, state and local governments, and/or the private sector?

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:

1:00-1:10 (P.M.)	Welcome
1:10-1:20	Overview of Workshop
1:20-2:20	Table Talk Session
2:20-3:25	Large Group Discussion (Plenary)
3:25-3:30	Dot Voting
3:30-3:45	Break
3:45-4:45	Small Group Discussions
4:45-5:20	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
5:20-5:30	Closing Remarks

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 report out 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. Paul Johnson, the Corps' Public Affairs Officer present at the meeting. 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 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 12 tables of approximately 8 to 10 people per table. The participants at each table introduced 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 participants would then be directed to discuss the challenges of importance to them, as well as the six challenges identified by the Corps. After the groups had sufficient time to develop their ideas, the spokesperson for each table would report out to the entire audience a succinct statement of each of the challenges that were identified at their table. These challenges would be recorded by a Corps staff member and projected onto a screen for everyone in the room to see. At the same time, other Corps members would write each challenge on a sheet of butcher paper, which would then be taped to a wall in the room.

¹ The written statements submitted at the July 18, 2000 listening session are included as Appendix B.

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 which 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, 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 twelve tables to take turns reporting each of the challenges that were identified at their 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 40 unique challenges, which are listed below:

- A. Better coordination between Federal agencies.
- B. Consideration of environmental concerns beyond benefit/cost ratio.
- C. Aging infrastructure as it relates to everything (agencies need to work with each other and Congress needs to resolve long-standing disputes).
- D. Get the message to Congress about these national needs.
- E. Governance body for resolving issues and setting priorities on the Missouri River (i.e., a Tennessee Valley Authority-type organization).
- F. Streamline planning and permitting of repairs to aging water resources infrastructure.
- G. Decisions must be based on good science.
- H. Holistic watershed approach (the Corps needs to take a broader approach when issuing permits, analyzing impacts of projects).
- I. Corps “Master Manual” for the Missouri River should take into account diverse needs; manual must be flexible.

- J. Promote intergovernmental cooperation in stormwater management. Recognize that improvements in one community have effects on other communities.
- K. Stakeholder involvement in projects from the outset.
- L. More floodplain coordination by the Corps. Private contractors need better guidance.
- M. Ensure clean water for this generation and future generations.
- N. Environmental issues- don't let the tail wag the dog.
- O. Mechanisms for monitoring and managing depletion of water in the Missouri River Basin, including groundwater depletion.
- P. Cost impacts on infrastructure due to compliance with water quality standards, particularly for rural areas.
- Q. Marine transportation system is becoming less competitive. Study split navigation season and its impacts on agriculture and local economies.
- R. Environmental restoration and a knowledge base to make it work. Include monitoring and active management. Sustainability is the goal.
- S. Allow community access to Corps technical assistance for programs that don't fit authorized Corps programs.
- T. Floodplain management is not well funded. The Corps and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) could fund projects jointly.
- U. Concern by Agriculture sector about the impacts of water quality regulations (i.e., livestock waste management rules, TMDL (total maximum daily load) requirements, other nonpoint-source pollution regulations).
- V. Establish a national sediment policy that can be reasonably implemented. It must include additional research on sediment and its potential uses.
- W. Examine how to fund all of the above additional needs.
- X. Accurate and balanced accounting of all beneficial uses of water resources.
- Y. Protect water recharge areas, such as wetlands and floodplains.
- Z. Operation and maintenance of existing levees. Small communities can't meet Corps minimum requirements for maintaining local levees.

- AA. Corps should be able to look at non-structural flood control approaches, such as buyouts and CSO (combined sewer overflow) regulations.
- BB. More Corps technical support for brownfields program.
- CC. Native American tribes have the same water resources issues as other citizens across the country, but the tribes often have fewer resources to draw on. Expand available resources.
- DD. Continuing increases in cost-sharing requirements present a challenge for many communities, particularly those in rural areas. Corps projects are often unaffordable for these communities.
- EE. Need ways to deal with increased recreation demands and the resulting environmental impacts.
- FF. Examine ways to estimate impacts of and manage exotic/non-native species, such as the zebra mussel.
- GG. Greater Corps role in watershed management and education.
- HH. Government should make better use of technology, such as geographic information systems (GIS), and make it available to the public.
- II. Streambed erosion, particularly along the Missouri River.
- JJ. Congressional review of the Endangered Species Act and the species currently listed.
- KK. More flood control.
- LL. Need to create better models of groundwater/surface water interface. This interface should be a required part of all Corps studies.
- MM. Provide adequate funding for Corps projects and programs.
- NN. Better education about waterways, particularly for younger people.

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 which challenges were of most concern to the group in general. Each non-Corps workshop participants 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 facilitator then tallied the results of the dot voting, and the dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

A	16	AA	6
B	1	BB	0
C	18	CC	1
D	5	DD	0
E	4	EE	0
F	18	FF	0
G	11	GG	1
H	25	HH	5
I	16	II	0
J	7	JJ	12
K	1	KK	38
L	5	LL	8
M	14	MM	9
N	1	NN	11
O	11		
P	11		
Q	53		
R	25		
S	0		
T	13		
U	14		
V	4		
W	2		
X	9		
Y	1		
Z	4		

The eight challenges receiving the most votes were:

Q	(53 votes)	Marine transportation
KK	(38)	Flood control
R	(25)	Environmental restoration
H	(25)	Holistic watershed approach
C	(18)	Aging infrastructure
F	(18)	Streamline planning and permitting process
I	(16)	Master Manual for the Missouri River
A	(16)	Better coordination among Federal agencies

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

After a short break, Mr. Creighton explained the 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 minutes each would be held; after the first half-hour, the participants were asked to get up, choose a different challenge, and begin a discussion at that table. In this way, each participant 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 half-hour discussion period, Mr. Creighton instructed the audience to assume that they actually had the power to actually implement their ideas. Mr. Creighton then asked the audience to consider two questions:

1. What action or actions should be taken with respect to each challenge?
2. Who should take such action(s), i.e., what should be the role of the Federal government, state and local governments, and private individuals and organizations?

The audience was also invited to use the yellow self-adhesive sheets placed on each table to write down their concerns, ideas or comments regarding the water resource challenges identified by the audience. The yellow “stickies” would be affixed later in the day to the challenges listed on butcher paper around the room. These comments have been transcribed in a table and are included as Appendix A.²

Following these instructions, the participants gravitated into groups around the butcher pads and began deliberating with others in their group. After half an hour, Mr. Creighton asked the participants to move to a different table to discuss another challenge of importance to them. Following the second half-hour of discussions, 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

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.

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.

Challenge Q. – Marine Transportation

What Action Should be Taken?

- Build consensus among adversaries in order to achieve goals.
- Create a forum for resolving issues among stakeholders.
- Various organizations with specific interests should attend one another's meetings.

Who Should Take Action?

- Stakeholder groups must each take responsibility for cooperating, sharing information, eliminate the perception of “agendas,” and reaching consensus on issues.
- Key user groups along the river as well as government agencies can provide funding for forums.

One significant development reported out by this group's spokesperson was that individuals at the table representing navigation interests and conservation interests agreed to attend one another's upcoming meetings in order to exchange perspectives and begin a dialogue with one another.

Challenge KK. – Flood Control

What Action Should be Taken?

- Develop a more comprehensive approach to floodplain management, including stream/corridor improvements and property buyouts where appropriate.
- Recognize that floods cannot be completely eliminated or controlled. The focus instead should be on reducing damages.
- Agencies should combine efforts as partners on flood control projects, particularly the Corps, FEMA, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Create stronger ties with local sponsors as well.
- Re-evaluate benefit/cost computations to include tangible and intangible benefits.
- Use both structural and non-structural solutions.

Who Should Take Action?

- Corps should take a more comprehensive approach to floodplain management:
 1. Develop consistent floodplain management standards;
 2. Educate the public on floodplain risks;
 3. Implement stormwater management prior to development;
 4. Prioritize areas to be protected;
 5. Provide better information and technical assistance to local communities.
- All Federal agencies must coordinate with one another more effectively.
- Local governments must take more responsibility for flood control.
- State and local governments must enforce floodplain development rules better.

Challenge R. – Environmental Restoration

What Action Should be Taken?

- Monitor and re-evaluate projects, base decisions on good science. The goal should be environmental sustainability.
- Determine whether ecological assessment tools actually work.
- Collaboration between all levels of government and the public.
- Develop new technologies and techniques. Invest in good science.
- Better education and increased public awareness, including a forum for ideas and demonstrations. Make the public aware of sources of funding.
- Cost-sharing should involve positive incentives (i.e., carrot rather than stick).
- Provide more funding for environmental restoration.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal, state and local governments must review their policies and ensure that they collaborating and that decisions are based on good science.
- Government and private sector can develop new technologies.
- All levels of government can provide public education on the issues.
- Additional funding should be provided by all levels of government, not just the Federal government. For example, Missouri has enacted a conservation sales tax. Private interest groups should also contribute some of the necessary funding.

Challenge H. – Holistic Watershed Approach

What Action Should be Taken?

- All Corps projects should incorporate a watershed-based approach. This should be done as a normal business practice; currently, the catalyst for developing a watershed plan is often a key project or an endangered species. This process must include all stakeholders in the basin.
- Use models to facilitate the watershed approach
 1. NRD model can be used on the Missouri River to identify issues and solutions;
 2. Clean Water Act (Section 208) approach addresses cumulative impacts on a watershed.
 3. Incorporate new technology and research, such as beneficial uses of sediment and residual materials.
- Better coordination/sharing of actions and knowledge is needed among all Federal agencies in order to preserve watersheds and understand the cumulative impacts of actions. The Corps and EPA in particular have the expertise but must coordinate it better.
- Watershed analysis should always come at the early stages of project planning.

Who Should Take Action?

- Corps should revise and expand the scope of its planning processes.

- EPA is the lead agency in water quality, needs to lead with the Corps. Federal technical skill is critical for watershed planning success.
- State governments and agencies have a role in projects.
- Local leadership is critical for success, but funding is often a limitation.
- Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can educate the public and play a role in Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) planning.
- Multi-disciplinary, multi-agency teams should be encouraged through legislation.
- Congress and the Administration must provide adequate funding. Provide more support and resources in smaller watersheds.

Challenges C. & F. – Aging Infrastructure and Streamlined Permitting Process (combined)

What Action Should be Taken?

- Better consistency between the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, possibly by combining the two agencies. Identify and resolve conflicting authorities and purposes.
- Speed up Corps permitting processes, such as calculation of benefit/cost analyses. Also clarify and speed up feedback process for Corps permits.
- 404 Permit process must be streamlined. Provide more funding and make more of the process accessible through the internet.
- Balance streamlining the regulatory process with environmental concerns (don't compromise the environment for the sake of efficiency).
- Review National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) in light of changing technologies and cost-sharing requirements.
- Make infrastructure for drinking water a priority (at least on the same level as other types of national infrastructure, such as roads, railways, airports, etc.).
- Consider sediment as a resource to be put to beneficial use, such as erosion control.
- Educate young people (grades K-12) about importance of drinking water infrastructure.

Who Should Take Action?

- Corps must streamline its regulatory process, coordinate with other agencies.
- Corps and Bureau of Reclamation should consider merging.
- Congress should review NEPA requirements.
- Congress should make drinking water infrastructure funding a priority.
- Federal agency contracts should require the use of recycled sediment.
- Private companies and NGOs can develop new beneficial uses for sediment.
- Local communities can educate children about the issues.

Challenge A. – Better Coordination Among Federal Agencies

What Action Should be Taken?

- Establish an inter-agency coordinator (particularly for permitting process) responsible for coordination among the Corps, EPA, FEMA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the White House.
- Corps could serve as a Federal clearing house and provide assistance to local sponsors who are navigating the Federal requirements for project authorization. Train Corps' project managers to serve as coordinators.
- All Federal agencies should fully participate on Federal Clean Water Action Teams.
- Eliminate duplication among agencies responsible for permitting process.

Who Should Take Action?

- All Federal agencies mentioned above must coordinate and cooperate.
- Corps can be the lead agency in this effort.

Challenge I. – Master Manual for the Missouri River

What Action Should be Taken?

- Ensure that all sides are taken into consideration when addressing spring rise, split-season navigation, environmental protection, and human needs.
- All recommendations must be based on good science, not on emotion.
- All parties must be brought to the table to reach consensus.
- The Endangered Species Act is being used by some as a “trump card” to veto consensus plans. This needs to be addressed.
- Adaptive management of river:
 1. Incremental adoption of master plan for river;
 2. Balanced representation in feedback loop;
 3. Experiments that would allow consensus building over time;
 4. Performance measures and goals with target dates in order to monitor performance;
 5. Look at impacts on other uses, such as navigation.
- Predetermine the volume of water to be released each year to protect species and achieve recovery.
- Ensure that fish and wildlife are treated on an equal basis as all other purposes when operating a river.
- Independent study on navigation economics and water compelled rates.
- Ensure that all flooding impacts are documented and understood.
- Meaningful habitat restoration program.

Who Should Take Action?

- Corps should serve as the lead agency and continue to act as an apolitical, honest broker.

- Other Federal agencies must have input, along with the states and the Native American tribes. No need to create a new agency.
- All stakeholders must be able to participate in process.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Mr. Creighton asked the participants to complete and hand in a comment 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 then turned to General Strock to give the closing remarks.

The General began by stating that the Corps' dialogue with the public is ongoing, and the listening session website provides another opportunity to continue the dialogue begun at this session. General Strock then provided a brief summary of the themes that he heard from the audience. The General acknowledged the audience's desire for the Corps to take a more comprehensive approach toward managing the nation's water resources and watersheds, rather than the traditional project-specific approach. He also said that the Corps recognizes the need for better coordination among the agencies in the "Federal family," including improvement in the regulatory process.

General Strock noted the importance of developing comprehensive solutions at the grass roots level with the involvement of all stakeholders, rather than having the Federal government develop and impose its solutions from above. The General also observed that, while specific projects were not the focus of the listening session, the Missouri River Master Manual is an issue that affects everyone in the Missouri River basin. He commented that the Master Manual provides a way for the Corps to apply what it has learned and create consensus for managing the Missouri River. At the conclusion of his comments, the General thanked the audience again for their participation and the Omaha, Nebraska 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. These were collected by the Corps personnel as the participants left the meeting.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT OMAHA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge A		
Better coordination between Federal agencies.		
1	To collaborate – collaborate – collaborate to resolve issues.	
Challenge B		
Consideration of environmental concerns beyond benefit/cost ratio.		
Challenge C		
Aging infrastructure as it relates to everything (agencies need to work with each other and Congress needs to resolve long-standing disputes).		
Challenge D		
Get the message to Congress about these national needs.		
Challenge E		
Governance body for resolving issues and setting priorities on the Missouri River (i.e., a Tennessee Valley Authority-type organization).		
Challenge F		
Streamline planning and permitting of repairs to aging water resources infrastructure.		
Challenge G		
Decisions must be based on good science.		
Challenge H		
Holistic watershed approach (the Corps needs to take a broader approach when issuing permits, analyzing impacts of projects).		
2	Better communications between Corps districts regarding common waterways.	Too many districts are having "turf fights" over their territory.
Challenge I		
Corps "Master Manual" for the Missouri River should take into account diverse needs; manual must be flexible.		
3		Spring rise should be considered.
Challenge J		
Promote intergovernmental cooperation in stormwater management. Recognize that improvements in one community have effects on other communities.		
4	What role can the Corp play in considering the <u>cumulative impacts of rivers and major creeks</u> and <u>promoting intergovernmental cooperation in stormwater management</u> .	This is important because of the negative impacts to downstream communities as a result of improvements or changes upstream.
Challenge K		
Stakeholder involvement in projects from the outset.		
5	Flooding Channel Degradation Water quality Sedimentation Wetland	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT OMAHA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	Floodplain creep (1) -- "lack of resources" <u>NPDCS</u>	
6	Integrate the science, engineering, economics and people, issues about what to do with sediments and how to use these in holistic ways (e.g., blend w/manures and food/plant waste for soils, w/ash for erosion control blocks).	Technologies are here, but the <u>organizing</u> is necessary to "glue" the effort into a meaningful whole.
Challenge L		
More floodplain coordination by the Corps. Private contractors need better guidance.		
Challenge M		
Ensure clean water for this generation and future generations.		
Challenge N		
Environmental issues – don't let the tail wag the dog.		
Challenge O		
Mechanisms for monitoring and managing depletion of water in the Missouri River Basin, including groundwater depletion.		
7	Depletion of water in the Missouri River Basin. As more water is consumed, competition among uses will grow. There are currently no agreements on how to handle this.	Water shortages could affect all uses of water. If not addressed, will become a crisis (at least for some uses & users).
Challenge P		
Cost impacts on infrastructure due to compliance with water quality standards, particularly for rural areas.		
Challenge Q		
Marine transportation system is becoming less competitive. Study split navigation season and its impacts on agriculture and local economies.		
8		We are tremendously under-crediting the River's (Missouri) impact on the Midwest economy in terms of freight. We can't just look at lost navigation dollars. We must look at competition as well. Without a navigable Missouri River, the Midwest will be at the mercy of the railroads – a monopoly of sorts.
9	Spring Rise = No Interior Drainage	
10		I favor split navigation season.
Challenge R		
Environmental restoration and a knowledge base to make it work. Include monitoring and active management. Sustainability is the goal.		

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT OMAHA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge S		
Allow community access to Corps technical assistance for programs that don't fit authorized Corps programs.		
Challenge T		
Floodplain management is not well funded. Corps and FEMA could fund projects jointly.		
Challenge U		
Concern by Agriculture about the impacts of water quality regulations (i.e., livestock waste management rules, TMDL (total maximum daily load) requirements, other nonpoint-source pollution regulation).		
Challenge V		
Establish a national sediment policy that can be reasonably implemented. It must include additional research on sediment and its potential uses.		
11	What to do with sediment. Work with non-profits that have the mission of bridging the gap between the government (others education & private sector) to advance the research, economics of healthy and useful waterways.	The government can't do it all. Education, research, new applications must be integrated.
Challenge W		
Examine how to fund all of the above additional needs.		
Challenge X		
Accurate and balanced accounting of all beneficial uses of water resources.		
12	Accurate and balance accounting & valuation of beneficial uses of water resources as affected by Corps projects.	Not all beneficial uses will be supported by Corps projects without fully evaluating all uses.
Challenge Y		
Protect water recharge areas, such as wetlands and floodplains.		
13	Protect water recharge areas and replace them where possible (wetlands, floodplains, etc.).	We need potable drinking water and protecting these areas would also protect wildlife.
Challenge Z		
Operation and maintenance of existing levees. Small communities can't meet Corps minimum requirements for maintaining local levees.		
14	Non-federal levee systems have great financial difficulties in maintaining levee systems and meeting their cost share of repair after damages in flood events.	These levees protect agriculture, industry, infrastructure, federal, state, and county roads and benefit many parties and their interests other than local landowners.
Challenge AA		
Corps should be able to look at non-structural flood control approaches, such as buyouts and CSO (combined sewer overflow) regulations		
Challenge BB		
More Corps technical support for brownfields program.		

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT OMAHA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge CC		
Native American tribes have the same water resources issues as other citizens across the country, and the tribes often have fewer resources to draw on. Expand available resources.		
Challenge DD		
Continuing increases in cost-sharing requirements present a challenge for many communities, particularly those in rural areas. Corps projects are often unaffordable for these communities.		
15	Cost-share requirements on Corps projects. Originally sold in mid-80's on 75-25% basis. Now, may be 65-35 or 50-50 with current Wash. D.C. admin. Proposing 50-50 in WRDA-2000.	Simple – No structural solicitation; only open Green Space methodology only?! *Balancing policy(ies) for the majority not minority!
Challenge EE		
Examine ways to estimate impacts of and manage exotic/non-native species, such as the zebra mussel.		
16	Recreation opportunities and impacts.	People's use of river is important and necessary. Increased use of Personal Water Craft and boats can have localized impacts on sensitive habitat or stream banks.
Challenge FF		
Introduction of exotic/non-native species, such as the zebra mussel.		
17	Exotic species and description of wildlife habitat and communities.	Exotic species (aquatic plants, e.g. loosestrife, or invertebrates, e.g., zebra mussels) can change the character of the river.
Challenge GG		
Greater Corps role in watershed management and education.		
18	Education of watershed users.	Many residents don't make the association of their practices having an impact on watershed condition. Urban runoff can exceed rural impacts.
Challenge HH		
Government should make better use of technology, such as GIS, and make it available to the public.		
Challenge II		
Streambed erosion, particularly on the Missouri River.		
19	Stream bank stabilization efforts and the cumulative effect of numerous small projects.	The individual planning and stream bank stabilization projects – do not consider the larger impact of efforts in total. Permits for 24 individual projects (at various locations) are not evaluated for overall impact.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT OMAHA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge JJ		
Congressional review of the Endangered Special Act and the species currently listed.		
Challenge KK		
More flood control.		
20	Ponca Creek flooding control Damage to town dike and channel creek	To cut down expense of repair to equipment and homes.
21	Missouri River navigation and the effects of spring rise on same.	The absence of a navigable Missouri River would have a detrimental effect on the business economy of the region.
22	Continuing maintenance on pilings abutments, etc. (riprap).	
23	The biases need to be removed from program guidelines and benefit/cost analyses in order to allow non-structural alternatives to move forward on their own merit.	Non-structural alternatives are essential in all future activities.
24	Spring rise effect on agriculture and flood control.	Flooding during an already wet season. Lack of barge competition in the marketplace.
Challenge LL		
Need to create better models of groundwater/surface water interface. This interface should be a required part of all Corps studies.		
Challenge MM		
Provide adequate funding for Corps projects and programs.		
25	Obtaining the funding, support and sense of urgency to improve all conditions related to the Missouri River (water quality, contamination, depletion, bank stabilization, wildlife/cultural issues).	Large scale projects continue to be put off – funding cut – or only pieces being addressed – the cumulative impacts could be devastating if not handled.
Challenge NN		
Better education about waterways, particularly for younger people.		
Challenges – Other		
26	Habitat preservation for threatened and endangered species.	Native species are impacted through habitat loss (spawning ground, nest habitat) related to water level during critical period of animal life history.
27	Control zebra mussels from being dispersed by barges	The cost industry millions of dollars to protect water intake pipes.
28	No overboard dumping of dredge spoils in any U.S. waterway.	The cheapest alternative is not environmentally the best and violates CWA.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT OMAHA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
29	More public meetings regarding Corps projects. They should be better advertised, more frequent and have easier access.	To improve Corps image, PR of outreach.
30	Flood control needs to be #1 – infrastructure, industry, agriculture have been led to believe the Missouri River will be controlled to the best of our abilities – 50 years. Of work needs to be continued and maintained plus improved.	Spring rise, split navigation or any master manual changes that jeopardize flood control should not happen.
31	Need Corps accountability for projects.	Only negligent work is currently accountable. Ex – when salt water intrusion of ground water and wells occur. Homeowners have to replace their own contaminated wells.
32	Agriculture will be damaged by spring rise. Interior drainage is a major problem. Missouri River farmers will be damaged	
33	Waterways should not be used as stormwater basins.	Violates CWA.
34	EIS and mitigation costs should be determined <u>before</u> BCR is determined so mitigation costs can be included.	ACE is supposed to do this, but too often does not.
35	No surface mining within waterways.	Violates CWA.
36	Appropriate money to Corps as 1 large amount and then allow Corps to pick and choose how to best spend it.	Decrease influence of special interest groups on politicians and Corps.

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS

