US Army Corps of Engineers
BUILDING STRONG®

Inland Waterways Users Board Meeting No. 102

Hilton Springfield Hotel – Mount Vernon-Gunston Rooms
Springfield, Virginia

April 11, 2024

Minutes
Inland Waterways Users Board
Meeting No. 102

at the Hilton Springfield Hotel – Mount Vernon-Gunston Rooms
Springfield, Virginia
April 11, 2024

The following proceedings are of the 102nd Meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board held on the 11th of April 2024, commencing at 9:00 a.m. This is the first meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board held in 2024. Mr. Spencer Murphy, Chairman of the Inland Waterways Users Board presiding. Inland Waterways Users Board (Board) members present at the meeting included the following:

MR. JUSTIN DICKENS, Board Member, Crounse Corporation.

MR. MARTIN T. HETTEL, Board Member, American Commercial Barge Line LLC (ACBL).

MR. DAMON S. JUDD, Board Vice Chairman, Marquette Transportation Company LLC.

MR. RICHARD C. KREIDER, Board Member, Campbell Transportation Company (CTC).

MR. W. SPENCER MURPHY, Board Chairman, Canal Barge Company, Inc. (CBC).

MR. LANCE M. RASE, Board Member, CGB Enterprises, Inc.

MR. ROBERT D. RICH, Board Member, Shaver Transportation Company.

MS. CRYSTAL D. TAYLOR, Board Member, Ingram Barge Company.

MR. JEFF WEBB, Board Member, Cargill, Inc., Cargo Carriers, Cargill Marine & Terminal.

MR. JEFFERY WILSON, Board Member, Holcim (US).

MR. W. MATTHEW WOODRUFF, Board Member, Kirby Corporation.

All Board Members attended the meeting.

Also present at the meeting were the following individuals serving as observers of the activities of the Inland Waterways Users Board, designated by their respective Federal agencies as representatives:

MS. STACEY E. BROWN, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, for Management and Budget, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

MS. TRETHA CHROMEY, Deputy Associate Maritime Administrator for Ports and Waterways, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD).

MS. HEATHER GILBERT, Policy Advisor, Office of Coast Survey, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce, Silver Spring, MD.

MR. RICHARD HENDERSON, Transportation Services Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Official representatives of the Federal government responsible for the conduct of the meeting and providing administrative support to the Inland Waterways Users Board from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers were as follows:

MAJOR GENERAL (MG) WILLIAM H. GRAHAM, Users Board Executive Director and Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

MR. PAUL D. CLOUSE, Executive Secretary and Designated Federal Officer (DFO), Inland Waterways Users Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Alexandria, Virginia.

MR. THOMAS P. SMITH, Chief of Operations and Regulatory Division, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

MR. MARK R. POINTON, Alternate Designated Federal Officer (ADFO), Inland Waterways Users Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Alexandria, Virginia.

MR. STEVEN D. RILEY, Alternate Designated Federal Officers (ADFO), Inland Waterways Users Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Alexandria, Virginia.

MR. ALEXANDRA L. SCHAFER, Alternate Designated Federal Officers (ADFO), Inland Waterways Users Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Alexandria, Virginia.

MS. TIFFANY S. BURROUGHS, Chief, Navigation Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

Program speakers in scheduled order of appearance were as follows:

Mr. Paul D. Clouse, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Inland Waterways Users Board Designated Federal Officer (DFO) and Executive Secretary.

MG William H. Graham, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Users Board Executive Director and Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations.

Mr. W. Spencer Murphy, Chairman, Inland Waterways Users Board, Canal Barge Company, Inc.

Mr. Mark R. Pointon, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Inland Waterways Users Board Alternate Designated Federal Officer (ADFO).

Ms. Tiffany S. Burroughs, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Operations Division, Chief, Navigation Section.

Mr. W. Cody Eckhardt, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mississippi Valley Division, Deputy Chief, Operations and Regulatory Division.

Mr. Michael Tarpey, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Headquarters, Operations Division, Navigation Section, Senior Program Manager.

Mr. Ryan P. Reich, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, Navigation Business Line Manager.

Ms. Elizabeth M. Burks, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District, Chief, Integrated Project Office (IPO).

Mr. Orlando Ramos-Gines, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District, Senior Project Manager.

Mr. Jonathan A. Gillip, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District, Project Manager.

Mr. Jose R. Lopez, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, NESP Mississippi River L&D #25 Program Manager.

Mr. Andrew J. Goodall, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District, NESP Program Manager.

Mr. Stephen R. Fritz, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh District, Chief, MEGA Projects Branch.

There were no public comments made during the public comment period of the meeting, and no written public comments were submitted for the record.

PROCEEDINGS

MR. PAUL CLOUSE: Thank you for being here. I would say please be seated, but everybody is already seated. We will begin the Federal Advisory Committee meeting. For the presenters, we are going to run the presentations centrally. When it's your turn, move to the podium and our colleagues will be advancing the slides for you.

A couple of administrative items. The restrooms are down the hallway back from the lobby on the left and the folks that are online are in listen only mode.

My name is Paul Clouse. I have been appointed the Designated Federal Officer and Executive Secretary of the Inland Waterways Users Board effective January 31st. This is my maiden voyage as the Designated Federal Officer. I will do my best to make this as smooth a sail as possible.

Welcome to the 102nd Meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board. Before we begin, I'm obligated to read the record that the Users Board was created pursuant to section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. It provides that the Secretary of the Army and Congress with recommendations on funding levels and priorities for modernization of the inland waterways. The

Board and I are subject to the rules and regulations of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, as amended.

This is a Sunshine in Government Act meeting and as such is open to the public. The United States Army Corps of Engineers is the sponsor of the Board and provides the Executive Director, the Designated Federal Officer, and all normal activities related to the Board. Currently there are no requests to make public comment before the Board and no statements have been submitted for the record. If anyone wishes to make a public comment at the appropriate time or submit a statement for the record, please let me know at the break.

These proceedings are being recorded and a record of this meeting will be available afterwards. These meeting proceedings will eventually be part of the National Archive. Please ensure your microphone is on, state your name prior to making comments. A reminder that the public comment period is toward the end of the meeting.

Before I turn it over to General Graham, I wanted to acknowledge Mr. Mark Pointon, Mr. Pointon's service as the Designated Federal Officer for 18 years.

MAJOR GENERAL BUTCH GRAHAM: How many years?

MR. CLOUSE: Eighteen years. I will not be doing it for 18 years. He began his tenure as the DFO with the Board meeting No. 51 on February 22nd, 2006, in Alexandria, Virginia. That makes exactly 50 Users Board meetings that Mark has facilitated as the Designated Federal Officer.

He claims he has attended Board meetings since No. 12, but I cannot independently verify. Mark has been a mentor to me over the last six years since I moved to DC and he has done his best to educate me on the intricacies of Federal Advisory Committees, specifically the Users Board. For that Mark, I am grateful. Thank you for your service and you have set the bar pretty high.

At this point I'm going to ask General Graham as the Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations to conduct the oath of office for Users Board Members that are here today. I will also ask the Members to step up to the flag at this time.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Who's been here before to -- swearing in the Board? Raise your hand back there. Okay, some of you have heard me before, but most of us have the oath of office committed to memory now, but I'm going to read it because it's important to get it right. A few years ago, President Obama was being sworn in by probably one of the smartest people in the country and he got the words a little bit mixed up and the President had to redo the oath.

It's important that we get this right, as some of you heard before, because the Board is not going to swear an oath to a king, a queen, a homeland, a river valley, a tribe. They're going to swear an oath to a piece of paper, the Constitution, more importantly to the ideas on that piece of paper on how a free people agree to be governed. It's pretty important we get this right.

If you would, raise your right hand please, and repeat after me.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM and ALL BOARD MEMBERS: I, please state your full name, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. That I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same and I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion and that I will well, and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter. So help me God.

(All Board members sworn in.)

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Welcome. Remember Marty this is being archived in the Library of Congress. You bet.

MR. CLOUSE: Thanks everyone. I will now ask General Graham, the executive director of the Users Board for his welcoming remarks.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: First Mark, great job. Fifty of these meetings. Fifty of these meetings.

MR. MARK POINTON: I was the executive assistant for the 40 meetings before I was the DFO.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Thanks for that.

MR. POINTON: Thank you, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Paul, welcome aboard. We are delighted to have you. To the three new Board Members, welcome. We are excited to have you. For the repeat offenders, thanks for coming back. We appreciate Spencer braving the tough skies or soggy skies coming off the Gulf and having the persistence to make it here. The rest of the Federal partners, thanks for joining us here today. I think as we are seeing up in Baltimore right now, strength of the federal, state, industry partnerships can make a huge difference in how this country response to day-to-day operations which we are going to talk about here today and to the extraordinary operations.

To Mr. Smith and Ms. Brown, thanks for joining us today and to everybody who traveled far and wide, thanks for making it. I want to say welcome back to the Inland Waterways System to Colonel Jess Curry. He had an extended -- I wouldn't call it a vacation sitting out on Maui helping the -- he did an absolutely magnificent job of taking the first huge steps to get Lahaina back up on its feet with the debris removal mission. Such as, thanks for all that you did out there. Really appreciate it.

Rock Island [District] did not miss a beat. He walked out at the very end of the consolidated closure and that happened without a hitch that anybody let me know about. It's all good.

Today we've got a whole bunch of presentations and a whole bunch of transparent communication as General Spellmon has asked us to do about how we're doing as being stewards and partners with you on this amazing treasure known as the Inland Marine Transportation System (IMTS). As always, when I go out to dinner with the Board, I learn things. So last night I learned; we talked this morning about the tragedy in Baltimore with the Key Bridge.

What I didn't know was that as part of this nation's supply chain resilience, that the Inland Marine Transportation System was called in to add capacity. So, the important coal traffic that could get out, the export coal through the port of Baltimore has been rerouted down the Ohio and is now going out to the Gulf. I did not know that was taking place. So exciting to see. It's one of the priorities for Mr. Connor is the resiliency of this nation's supply chain and you all proved that here over the last couple of weeks, which is pretty amazing.

What we want to really talk about is delivering new locks and dams, Jose, in eight years or less. Not our current track record which is 25 [years]. To do that we got to talk some hard things. We've got to finish, or we've got to start the things we can officially finish. We've got to be opportunistic when additional funding opportunities come our way. Interested in having some good, transparent discussion with the Board Members on how we are doing at doing that.

We are tracking -- we had some unscheduled maintenance failures. We know the disruption that that causes your industry. Scheduled closures, you can plan around. Unscheduled closures are a huge disruption to your business and the businesses that count on your businesses. The unscheduled closures of IHNC [Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock], that probably was something that we knew would eventually happen. It's a 110-year-old lock that gets used an awful lot. I think with the help of this Board we are postured next year to take a giant step forward on building that replacement lock for it finally but delighted to see how fast in New Orleans District we got that key facility up and running.

We know Port Allen is important to you as well. That was a failure in the anchorage system that hadn't happened before. We will take a hard look at that. Mr. [Thomas] Smith [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Chief of Operations and Regulatory Division] is already looking at that to see what we need to learn to see if we can prevent that in the future was some sort of preventive maintenance. But our commitment to you is to do our utmost to eliminate unscheduled closures where we can.

Still working the Demopolis [Lock] sill failure; end of May I think is what we're still shooting for. All the soggy weather down there isn't helping, but the team down there from Mobile District is working through that. Let me stop there and welcome everybody again.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, sir. I will now ask Mr. Spencer Murphy, chairman of the Inland Waterways Users Board for his opening remarks. Chairman Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you. We good? Good morning and welcome to the Inland Waterways Users Board 102nd Meeting. Thank you, General Graham, and Stacy Brown with the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works for being here. Welcome to Paul Clouse, the new Designated Federal Officer and Executive Secretary of the Board. Members of the Board, Federal Observers, thank you for being here today.

I'm looking forward to a productive discussion on the status of our ongoing projects and the other critical issues impacting our industry. Before doing so, I would also like to add my thanks to Mark Pointon for his service to the Board and to our country. He's been an excellent partner and Paul has some very large shoes to fill. I would also like to welcome our three new Board Members and encourage you to please get engaged early and often and ask questions.

Turning to our business at hand, it is worth noting that despite 2024 appropriations occurring very late in the fiscal year, record level funding for our inland waterways' construction funds demonstrate the commitment and the investment Congress is willing to make to modernize our aging inland infrastructure. We have a rare moment here to capitalize on this opportunity to show progress and to accelerate the completion of four of the six active construction projects.

But that cannot be accomplished without maintaining a sense of urgency and a continued commitment to transparency from the Corps. We cannot waste any opportunity to advance these projects.

Over the years this program has faced many challenges, but our legacy projects may finally have the finish line in sight and not a minute too soon. Between the 9-cent fuel tax increase that went into effect in 2016 and then the 2021 Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) [also known as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act – IIJA], Congress has provided a total of $5.3 billion to the inland waterways' construction projects in the last eight years. But in that eight-year timeframe, just one lock modernization and one major rehab have been completed.

We are discouraged with the pace of projects that have received ample funding, particularly [Mississippi River] Lock and Dam 25 where funds are currently not expected to be obligated until 2027, six years after receiving more than $700 million in the BIL. Given these facts, it is imperative to seize every opportunity, whether through reallocations or other means to advance these projects wherever possible to buy back some of the time and money lost to factors beyond our control.

We certainly recognize the challenges caused by inflation and managing these very large and very complex projects. However, there is a real risk without concrete progress on our major projects, the steady support we have seen from our allies on Capitol Hill will shift to frustration and fatigue. The massive $2.5 billion investment provided in the BIL came with the expectation that benefits would be swiftly returned to the nation by removing the obstacle of uncertain funding.

To maintain our momentum on the Hill, we must be able to communicate to Members of Congress clear and consistent information about these projects. Recognizing that things can and do change, transparent communication is essential for this Board to carry out its obligation to provide thoughtful advice and make informed recommendations.

I thank you all for being here again, and I look forward to hearing today's updates and working together to achieve our common goal of achieving a modern and efficient inland waterways system. Thank you.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you Chairman Murphy. Any other Board Members at this time wish to make an opening statement? Hearing none, next we're going to move over to our Federal Observers' opening remarks. We will start with Mr. Henderson from the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Henderson.

MR. RICHARD HENDERSON: Thank you, Chairman Murphy.

MR. CLOUSE: Oh, can you turn on your mic?

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Murphy, General Graham, Board Members, and other attendees at today's meeting. For the record, my name is Richard Henderson. It's an honor to be here on behalf of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

The U.S. Department of Agriculture continues to acknowledge the importance of barge transportation to facilitate export and domestic shipment of agriculture and related products and the need for continued construction and rehabilitation projects to maintain and enhance river transportation infrastructure.

For calendar year 2023, 26.3 million tons of grain, that is corn, soybeans, and wheat, move south through the locks on barges to the gulf for export. That number is 19 percent lower than 2022 and 21 percent lower than the previous five-year average. Most of the decrease can be contributed to lower export of grain, especially corn.

According to USDA's most recent modal share analysis, 51 percent of corn exports and 55 percent of soybean exports are shipped via barge to the gulf for export. In marketing year 2022 – 2023, total grain exports were down 20 percent from marketing year 2021 – 2022, and down 17 percent from the previous five-year average. Corn exports were down 34 percent from marketing year 2021 – 2022, and down 28 percent from the previous five-year average.

Shipped export sales to China dropped 48 percent as China corn purchases were diverted from the U.S. to Brazil. Year to date, 7.5 million tons of grain have moved through the locks. This is down 5 percent from last year and 8 percent from the previous five-year average. For marketing year 2023 – 2024, year to date shipped export sales are 5 percent lower than 2022 – 2023, but corn export sales are up 3 percent. Mexico has become the largest importer of U.S. corn, most of which is shipped via rail, not barge.

Despite extreme water levels over the last two years, navigation system continues to provide agricultural producers an efficient and environmentally friendly option to move their products to market. Looking ahead, according to the Department's latest world agricultural supply and demand estimates March report, though not location specific, USDA projects that the United States will export 53.3 million metric tons of corn, up 26 percent from last year, and 46.8 million metric tons of soybeans, down 14 percent from last year from September 2023 to August 2024.

The USDA recently completed two cooperative research projects with universities covering inland waterways. The collaboration with the Ohio State University that develops operational framework to develop economic consequences of an inland waterways system failure of Mississippi [River] Lock 25, the study also looks at resilient options that can help agricultural transportation systems and related businesses in the supply chain to recover more rapidly from the instructions. The study was published in January.

Next, we completed a study with the Washington State University that looks at the economic benefits of navigation on the Columbia-Snake Rivers System. This study was published in January as well.

The USDA is initiating a project with the Department of Transportation's Volpe Transportation Center that aims to update and expand upon earlier study on the importance of the inland waterways to U.S. agriculture which was released in 2019. Volpe is in the process of completing stakeholder outreach and we use that information to inform the modeling process. The updated report should be completed by the end of 2024 or the beginning of 2025.

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate in today's meeting.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Henderson. Next up we have Ms. Gilbert from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Ms. Gilbert.

MS. HEATHER GILBERT: Thank you. Good morning, General Graham, Chairman Murphy, and Members of the Board. Welcome Paul to your first DFO meeting. I know you're going to be great. It's good to be here with you all.

For the record, my name is Heather Gilbert. I'm here as a Federal Observer to the Board representing the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Rear Admiral Ben Evans, the Director of the Office of Coast Survey and a Member of the Mississippi River Commission (MRC) sends his greetings and regrets that he is unable to attend due to being out on the Mississippi River Commission high water inspection trip this week.

I want to take the opportunity to highlight the work and more importantly the collaboration NOAA is doing in the aftermath of the collapse of the Francis Scott Key Bridge on the Patapsco River. NOAA alongside local, state, and federal agencies have been working around the clock to come to Baltimore's aid. This tragedy resulted in the loss of six lives and the immediate closure of the shipping channel leading into and out of the Port of Baltimore. Reopening the Patapsco River channel is critical to the U.S. economy with the closure having lasting impacts on the U.S. trade routes.

A few actions that NOAA took or is taking to support Baltimore salvage efforts are we helped establish auxiliary navigation channels. NOAA's Office of Coast Survey supported and worked alongside the Port of Baltimore, U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, and other partners to establish two other auxiliary channels. The team conducted lidar and sonar operations at the site of the Francis Scott Key Bridge collapse to detect any obstructions and gather precise water depth and air gap measurements. These channels opened April 1st and 2nd respectively and are now serving as alternate routes for shallow draft ships to pass around the wreckage via the undamaged bridge spans on the north and south sides of the main shipping channel.

Our NOAA aircraft captured high-definition aerial imagery to update the NOAA navigational charts. NOAA's national geodetic survey collected emergency response imagery while aboard one of NOAA's King Air aircraft to support updating the shoreline features of the impact of NOAA nautical charts. The enhanced nautical charts helped aid responding local, state, and federal agencies in the missions to approve situational awareness.

The NOAA Center for Operational and Oceanographic Products deployed a quick response buoy, QRB, on Thursday, April 4, to aid in the opening of the two auxiliary channels. This buoy provides a real-time current and meteorological measurements in the vicinity of the salvage operations and the real-time data is available on the NOAA co-op website. Additionally, behind the scenes and off the water, NOAA's Office of Coast Survey and the Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services are providing a range of decision support products for the full maritime community and agencies involved in the response.

Now I would just like to take a minute to provide a couple of other items of interest. NOAA's 2024 hydrographic survey season is ramping up and will be in full swing before too long. A few areas to be survey that may be of interest to the Board are the Chesapeake Bay Thimble Shoals, the U.S. Army

Corps is widening and deepening the Thimble Shoals Channel near Norfolk, Virginia and due to the widening of the channel, this auxiliary channel will be pushed out further.

The U.S. Coast Guard and pilots requested a new survey to verify safe waters after the establishment of this new channel.

The Columbia River, the Columbia River survey was requested by the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission and the Yakama Nation to investigate areas of sediment buildup in the Columbia River and tributary waters.

The approaches to Calcasieu, the waters offshore of the channel are identified as an area of critical need of updating the hydrographic data by both NOAA and the Lake Charles Pilots' Association. Many parts of this coverage have not been charted since the 1930s. This survey will provide contemporary data update known as nautical charting products and services improving the safety of maritime traffic and services available to the Port of Lake Charles by reducing current risk that is present due to outdated hydrography.

Finally, I just wanted to take a moment to remind you all – I think many of you are aware of this, but the NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information-hosted International Hydrographic Organization Data Center for Digital Bathymetry. This is a site established as a data pipeline to allow the public to contribute and download cloud sourced bathymetric data.

In regard to the inland waterways data, we are aware that Rose Point and Aqua Maps, and I'm sure there are others, are a big contributor of this crowd sourced data. NOAA is in the final steps of testing automated data extraction and processing pipeline for all crowd sourced bathymetry database within the U.S. coastal waters which stores and disseminates all the crowd sourced bathymetry contributed from around the world. We are excited to see what additional crowd sourced data from the inland water system will be added.

Thank you, General Graham, Chairman Murphy, and the Board for the opportunity to provide these remarks. I look forward to the rest of the meeting.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Ms. Gilbert. Next up we have Ms. Chromey from the Maritime Administration (MARAD). Ms. Chromey.

MS. THRETHA CHROMEY: Good morning. Thank you, General Graham, Chairman Murphy, Vice Chairman Judd, and Members of the Board. On behalf of Secretary Pete Buttigieg and Maritime Administrator Ann Phillips, I'm very pleased to be joining you today. I would also like to welcome the three new Members to the Board, Mr. Dickens, Mr. Kreider and Mr. Wilson, congratulations.

For introductions and for the record, I am Tretha Chromey, Deputy Associate Administrator for the Office of Ports and Waterways within the Maritime Administration. Administrator Phillips sends her regards and said she wishes she could be here with you today, however, she is on the Hill testifying before the House Service Armed Committee and with General Van Ovost, the commander of U.S. Transportation Command. She did say she wishes she was here instead. The Associative Administrator for Ports and Waterways, Bill Paape, was also unable to attend today and sends his regards.

Before I go any further, allow me to express on behalf of the Department of Transportation the condolences of families of those who were lost and the lives because of the Francis Scott Key Bridge collapse. I also want to commend the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, on their efforts to clear the wreckage out of the Fort McHenry Channel and for the restoration of safe navigation in and out of the Port of Baltimore. I also want to recognize the United States Coast Guard for the spearheading the Federal response at the Port of Baltimore and all of the other federal partners, my DOT colleagues in MARAD, the Department of Transportation's new office of multimodal infrastructure, the Federal Highway Administration, as well as Maryland state and local officials for their ongoing response to the Baltimore Bridge collapse.

Times like this highlight how important our Marine Transportation System is, the MTS, as I will refer. It is critical to our economic and national security. Our MTS, and for the matter, our entire national surface transportation is the best in the world. We have the greatest and inherent flexibility and redundancy to support the transportation segments of our supply train.

The collapse of the Key Bridge, Covid surge, the attacks in the Red Sea, hurricanes Maria, Sandy, and Irene, to name a few, are severe and notable reminders of how vital ports and inland waterways are to our nation's economy and vitality. Equally, our response to these tragedies have demonstrated our greatest result and ability to respond as a nation. At the Maritime Administration we promote the development and maintenance of a resilient Maritime Transportation System, including ports by providing grants and infrastructure projects, technical assistance, and support for port security initiatives.

Our inland waterways system is essential to the efficient transportation of goods and commodities to key regions across the United States. These waterways provide the flexible capacity during supply chain disruptions and national emergencies, a critical component of a resilient transportation system.

MARAD continues to collaborate with other U.S. DOT, other federal and state agencies – federal agencies, state and local, and regional transportation partners and the industry to develop and expand the MTS into a capable, connected freight network. One of MARAD's most critical missions is to collaborate across multiple lines of effort in promoting our nation's waterways resources. We work to ensure that Maritime stakeholders are reflected in U.S. DOT policy, planning efforts, and funding programs.

To Members of the Board, MARAD, and you, the Inland Waterways Users Board, we share a commitment to improving our nation's waterways. How do we maximize the use and efficiency of the inland waterways system? Stakeholder engagement is key as we saw during the supply chain crisis and saw with the bridge collapse. Continued engagement is needed not only with our Maritime stakeholders, but with also the users and operators along the supply chain such as inland ports, railroads, suppliers, and consumers.

Our inland waterways' imports are closely dependent on our coastal ports and our waterways system. With the recent unfortunate incident in the Port of Baltimore, we are in need, to continue working with various stakeholders to keep the supply chain moving. Our inland waterways stakeholders must be at the table. Our inland waterways users need specific infrastructure vessels and equipment to move containerized bulk liquid and palletized cargo.

Engagement with you and the users and operators of the system continues to help us better understand these needs. Our perspective is that inland waterways need to be viewed as an integrated system and is a viable, resilient freight transportation option. We will continue to engage with you, our rural and small ports along the system where some of the greatest needs are.

Several of our discretionary grant programs now offers increases in Federal share for ports in rural areas reflecting the urgency of their needs. I would like to take an opportunity to highlight some of the DOT formal funding programs many maritime projects or eligible applicants may not be aware of other than competitive programs. My team and the Office of Ports and Waterways Planning and Gateway Directors will be happy to connect with you to discuss these opportunities in the future if interested.

MARAD and the U.S. DOT are working hard to seize the opportunity to invest in the nations maritime transportation infrastructure system. Maritime research is available for funding under several grant programs. I'm going to use their acronyms because it's much easier, MEGA, RAISE, and INFRA. Alongside these funding programs for specific maritime industry maritime programs that we administer for the Department.

In addition, dedicated resources are available to benefit domestic shipping through our U.S., United States Marine Highway Program which encourages the use of the available capacity in our nation's waterways to supplement congested landside routes for freight transport.

Joining me today is Tim Pickering who leads the Marine Highway Program. Please feel free to follow up with him if you have any additional questions. The U.S. Marine Highway Program has an immense potential to benefit inland and coastal waterways and struggles to be funded. Limited program has resulted in grants award largely to fund the vessel and equipment projects. We are limited in funding infrastructure projects due to the amount of money in the program.

The U.S. Marine Highway Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 is expected to be issued very soon. Our goal is to release the notice of funding opportunity by May 3rd. In FY 24, the U.S. Marine Highway program was funded of $5 million. Additional funding, especially to help fund Marine Highway network infrastructure can result in exponential impacts on Marine Transportation System.

I would like to highlight that the Marine Highway Program is traditionally funded between $10 million and $12 million. We went down by half. Previously, port projects and marine infrastructure improvements competed with multimodal grant programs. Now under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, port projects have their own grant opportunities. As you may know, the port infrastructure development program which MARAD administers provides funding to support the safe, efficient, reliable movement of goods into and out of – or within a port to ensure our nation's freight transportation needs present and future are met.

In FY 23, Port Infrastructure Development Program had 175 applicants; 153 were eligible; 41 were selected for a total of $653 million. Demand for these funds is high. It's at a high of $2.8 billion in the last couple of years of requests. More than 40 percent of the PIDP FY 23 awards benefited ports in historically disadvantaged communities and several of these projects will help reduce emissions at the ports through electrification.

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law provided $2.25 billion for port infrastructure development for over five years, which is $450 million per year. The FY 24 appropriations act provided an additional $50 million for FY 24. Again, traditionally it is $212 to $220 million. Program staff are working really hard to amend our notice of funding opportunity and hope to have it out on the street shortly.

The PIDP NOFO [Notice of Funding Opportunity] is open and will close at the end of May. I'm sorry, will close at May 10, 2024. The goal is to make project selections and award announcements by November of this year.

I would also like to highlight EPA's [Environmental Protection Agency] clean ports program. The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 provided $3 billion to find zero emissions port equipment and infrastructure as well as climate and air quality planning at U.S. ports. Approximately $150 million for climate and air quality planning and $2.8 billion for zero emission technology deployment. This includes equipment and infrastructure.

I raise this because today MARAD and EPA are hosting a joint webinar to provide an overview of these two complementary funding programs and opportunities. We need to continue to promote our programs and to make strides in improving our maritime transportation system infrastructure.

I need to reiterate again, please look at our discretionary INFRA program funding opportunities.

In closing, I would like to discuss just how you can continue to engage with Maritime Administration. We offer webinars, online resources to help navigate than many federal programs that are available. We recommend that you visit our DOT navigator site and reach out to our field as the Administrator talks about our Gateway Directors if you are not familiar with them. I'm actually scrolling through my remarks because they are long. I apologize.

It is our understanding the challenges of funding. The needs are vast for so many critical projects. As you think about the future projects related to the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, I ask you to consider how we can collaborate and work across the program to potentially maximize the resources and minimize the impact on you. Thank you again for this opportunity to participate today in today's meeting and provide this update. Again, thank you.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Ms. Chromey. Lastly, we have Ms. Brown from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works Office. Ms. Brown.

MS. STACEY BROWN: Good morning. Secretary Connor sends his regret that he was not able to join you all today, but he was very pleased that he got to go to dinner last night. He especially appreciated the opportunity to meet the three new Board Members. Welcome on his behalf. I'm happy to be here representing him.

As General Graham said, Secretary Connor really understands and is committed to the inland waterways system. He understands the importance of it and fully supports it. And he was surprised last night also to learn about the seamless migration or shift of commodities from the ports of Baltimore to the inland waterways system.

He was marveling that that's just a testament to how strong the system is and how resilient it is and that's something that is definitely a priority of his as well as the President's. He is definitely committed to maintaining the momentum and to completing projects wherever possible to that forward momentum.

As has been said earlier, Secretary Connor had the opportunity yesterday to visit the Key Bridge recovery effort. He was very impressed by all of the interagency activity and just really happy to see the local, state, and Federal, whole of Government response. Certainly, our thoughts and prayers are with the families of the folks that perished in that tragic accident. Really looking forward to being here today and to participating in the Board deliberations and discussions. Thank you.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Ms. Brown. Now we're going to start beginning the good content of it and the meeting here.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: The other part wasn't good?

MR. CLOUSE: It was excellent, Sir. Normally the DFO gives the status of the trust fund, but I thought I would give Mark one last chance to address the Users Board here. Mr. Pointon.

MR. POINTON: Putting me to work. You all have heard this from me a few times in the past. Actually, I want to go back one. We have the status of the annual report for 2023. Can you hear me? We've got some reverb going.

Well, there we go. Thanks for coming today. Don't forget to tip your waiters.

Spencer and I were – well, Spencer was working with the colleagues on the Board to get the annual report done before the Board terms expired. We tried to accelerate that a little bit from past years. There were some things going on like Continuing Resolutions, and the potential of a Federal Government shutdown. We thought it was probably urgent to get that done and transmitted a little bit ahead of schedule.

It's usually submitted by the end of February. We did send it out to the Army. We sent it out to the Corps Senior Leaders, and we send it to all the Board Members in mid-February. I believe it was February 14th. It went to all the appropriate committees. I got the confirmation back from our committee liaison office on the 26th of February that all the various Committees and staffers on Capitol Hill also had received the annual report and acknowledged that it was provided.

All the annual reports going back to 1998 are on the Users Board website and this one is also posted there. I don't think there's any questions on that. It's the transmission of your independent advice to Congress and the Administration. If you need to go back and look and see what this Board has done in the past or previous Boards, they are all posted there for about the last 20 years.

Now we can go to the trust fund. We did provide the status of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) through March 31st. Fortunately, it was posted actually a couple of days earlier than they usually post them. We did get that included. What you're seeing here is as of March 31st. That includes all the revenues that were provided or donated. That's the wrong word. That were paid into the IWTF. Also, any transfers and what the current balances.

Total revenue was about $53.5 million through March 31st. That's halfway through the fiscal year. You can probably do some pretty simple math and figure out maybe where there might be some projection as to what the annual amount might be.

We are a little ahead of last year, but we are kind of lagging behind the last couple of fiscal years before that, which happened to be record years. The last two years before 2023 were record revenue years. I don't know if that's a good news or bad news thing. We are ahead of last year. That's good news. We are still lagging behind the record of previous years. Maybe there is some room for improvement here. There is sure $53.367 [million]. That's the total. That includes all the tax revenues as well as the earned interest on the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

That is probably a good news story as well, that the interest is still a little ahead. That as you probably know is due to the balance in the trust fund.

Again, just another way to look at this. You can see for the last few months comparison there. We are ahead of 2023 and we are behind 2022 and 2021, but we are ahead of 2020. I believe 2021 was the record year of $127.7 million. I believe that's the highest that we've ever earned.

Here we have the last few years of the allocations to the Inland Waterways Trust Fund cost shared projects. This does not include anything that was funded out of the BIL. I think Jose [Lopez] and Andrew [Goodall] will talk to this a little bit later. We are showing $75 million for the Upper Miss, NESP. That's the navigation share. It received more than that. I believe it was $120 million. But that was the total amount for both the ecosystem restoration piece as well is the navigation piece.

All told, I believe nav was about $455 million and basically the 35 percent equates to about $159.6 million coming out of the trust fund, if that's the way it stays.

This is the $71.5 million. These are the projects that have some unobligated balances as of March 31st. You can see maybe the elephant in the room is Chick Lock. I'm not going to get into that. We have a presentation coming up on Chick Lock later on this morning. They can get into that. But you can see which projects have how much that is unobligated from funds that have already been appropriated for these projects. There is your $71.4 million.

To say that another way, the commitment against that $308 million balance is a $71.5 [million] less the $159 [million] or so that's going to come out of the trust fund for FY 24. That will give you that amount, that available amount. What do I have that -- $246.7 [million] down at the bottom there.

I think that's all I've got on the trust fund. Any questions? Marty, good morning.

MR. MARTIN HETTEL: Well Mark, first off, believe it or not I don't have a question. I just wanted to thank you for your service to the Board. I believe this is my 33rd meeting. I've only been to about a third of the ones that you been part of. But as the Chairman stated, I just myself wanted to thank you for your service to the Board. I appreciate it.

MR. POINTON: I appreciate it. I know I've expressed that to the Board Members and some of the past Board Members that I had opportunities to step away and I offered to continue to do this because I think

it's very important. Frankly, I enjoy doing it. I know that probably you all think I'm demented thinking that. Thank you, Marty.

MR. HETTEL: Well, we enjoyed having you.

MR. POINTON: The General didn't fire me. I guess I wasn't screwing up that bad.

MR. HETTEL: And after –

MR. POINTON: Maybe with the audio today, but not usually.

MR. HETTEL: I have an ask of Paul. These numbers are different than the original presentation that was sent out? Would you be so kind to forward this updated presentation to the Board Members?

MR. CLOUSE: Absolutely. These will be posted online on the Users Board website.

MR. POINTON: Yeah Marty, I think we finished that on Friday. We will go ahead and get that posted and sent out. Any other questions before I leave the podium for the last time? Thanks, everybody.

MR. CLOUSE: Thanks, Mark.

Next up we have Ms. Burroughs, Chief of Navigation at Headquarters. She will be talking about the status of navigation funding for FY 24 and the FY 25 President's Budget.

MS. TIFFANY BURROUGHS: Thank you, Paul. Good morning Major General Graham, Chairman Murphy, Ms. Brown, Board Members, and Federal Observers. This morning I will be briefing the navigation business line high-level funding summary. I did make some slight changes to how we visually view the data to try to make – bring some further clarity on some of the cost data. I will expound on that as we get into the slides.

Most of you all have seen this slide before. The Corps is at any given time working within three phases of the budget, doing budget development, defense, and execution. We are currently executing our Fiscal Year 2024. We received the 2024 bills signed last month and the work plan is currently being developed. After defending the Fiscal Year 2025 budget request, the President's Budget was also released last month. Finally, we have begun development of our Fiscal Year 2026, President's Budget recommendation with Fiscal Year 2027 not too far off in the horizon.

Also, this is not a new slide for you guys. This time it will show the top line appropriations for Civil Works. It has been updated with information from the Fiscal Year 2024 appropriation and 2025 President's Budget. As you can see, since the 2013, the appropriation in the brown line has routinely been above our budget as we continue to see record-setting appropriations. In fiscal years 2024 and 2025 we had a President's Budget over the $7 billion mark.

For the most part we've been on a steady increase since 2020 with a slight dip in 2023, which may have been the result of the historic Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. The Fiscal Year 2024 request was $7.4 billion with an appropriation of $8.7 [billion] and the Fiscal Year 2025 President's Budget was $7.2 billion.

This next slide shows the 2024 President's Budget for Civil Works. It's a summary. The chart on the left shows the total program breakout by different account. The Investigations program total over $130 million to include funding for traditional studies, preconstruction engineering and design, otherwise known as PED, and study like activities as well as Remaining Items.

The Construction program total about $2.1 billion. The O&M [Operation and Maintenance] program totaled about $1.3 billion, which breaks out to about $2.7 [billion] in the O&M account and $1.7 [billion] in HMTF or Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund account. These funds were allocated to over 600 projects, for national programs, and 36 Remaining Items.

The chart to the right shows the funding broken out by business line or program with navigation accounting for approximately 46 percent of the Civil Works program, which is in line with historic amounts.

Displayed is one of the slightly tweaked graphics for communicating navigation budgets and appropriation trends. All of the total appropriations are consolidated by fiscal year. The numbers include the Investigations, Construction, Operation, and Maintenance and Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) accounts. Investigations, Construction, and O&M will be covered individually in the next few slides.

The totals displayed on this graph do not include Remaining Items. Directing your attention to the bar graph contents, the amounts from conference are in a darker blue color, the total funding allocations and light blue, 1 percent emergency funding in red, the supplemental funding in light blue, and the IIJA or Bipartisan Infrastructure Law are shown in dark green. And then lastly, the President's Budget in mint. Please note the Fiscal Year 2024 work plan is still in development and final allocations are to be determined and not included in this graphic.

Unpacking the Investigation account trends you will see a side-by-side comparison of inland and coastal by fiscal year broken out by funding source. To make this easier to read we did pull the supplemental out to a separate slide. Inland is in brown and mint, work plan and President's Budget respectively. Coastal is in blue and dark green, work plan and President's Budget respectively.

Pointing out that obviously we don't have a final work plan for FY 24, so it is only showing what is in conference at this point. We've seen a drastic increase in Congressionally directed funding and all accounts. In FY 24 we received $1.3 million in inland funding so far and $0.3 million in the FY 25 President's Budget. Although there hasn't been a large investment made in the inland Investigations program this year, we anticipate information from the Capital Investment Strategy will help us to identify opportunities for investment in this account in future years.

The Construction account funding color coding is similar to Investigations slide. These amounts do include the Mississippi River and Tributaries construction funding as well. Pointing your attention again to FY 24, although we don't have the final funding pot allocations, just with the Congressionally directed spending we have a strong funding amount in Construction. I will review the projects that were funded in conference on a future slide.

Again, same color coding here on the O&M slide. Drawing your attention first of the Fiscal Year 2024 which had a strong President's Budget amount compared to past years. The inland O&M funding amount once you add in Congressionally directed funding, is the highest funding we've received over the last few years. The FY 25 President's Budget for inland was also pretty strong in comparison.

I won't spend a ton of time here, but we did separate, like I mentioned, out the supplemental account just so you can see that visually. Obviously, the FY 22 and 23 being the strongest years when we got the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funding. We did get, as you can see, a small amount of funding in FYs 23 and 24 as well.

The next two slides highlight the specific projects that were funded in O&M through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. I won't read them off, but they will be there in the slides for your reference. This is a coastal account, and this is the inland. As you can see, several of our high use waterways did receive some O&M funding in FY 24.

As I stated earlier, we received significant funding through the Congressionally directed spending in conference this year. The coastal portfolio breakdown is on the left and the inland is on the right. Focusing mostly on inland we received funding for Bayou Sorrel and J. Bennett Johnston [Waterway] in Investigations and we received construction funding for four of our major lock projects. In O&M we received over $124 million, and I highlighted some the types of funding or types of work that was funded there on the slide.

This slide highlights the Investigations projects that were funded the FY 25 budget. Of note you will see this in a very heavy in dredge material management plans or DMMPs. You typically see these in an O&M account in conference but are in Investigations account in the President's Budget. They were really only about three studies that were funded, the Lower Missouri River Basin, Little Narragansett Bay, and Homer Harbor.

This slide gives you a breakdown of what was funded in the Construction account for the FY 25 President's Budget.

This slide gives you the breakdown of what was funded in the O&M account for the FY 25 budget. It also breaks it down, by account by activity where you can see we got funded about $31 million for major maintenance activities, about $371 [million] for O&M activities, and about $164 [million] for dredging.

This slide gives you a breakdown of the navigation specific funding pots that were included in the FY 24 appropriations bill. Obviously, the allocations are to be determined at this point. The top five shown there are in the O&M account. We received also $70 million in Construction and $10 million in the Mississippi River and Tributaries dredging. Specific to the O&M funding pots, there was the $14 million one that was specific for inland waterways.

There were no navigation specific funding pots in Investigations this year. Obviously, we are going to the process now for the work plan recommendation and we have 60 days from the day the bill went to law to post this statement to managers which would put us sometime in May.

Pending any questions, this concludes my presentation.

MR. CLOUSE: No questions. That's got to be a first for the funding side. Well done, Ms. Burroughs. Next up, and as a matter of order we would like to put – unlike the evening news, we like to put our good news stories up front. Mr. Eckhardt, can you come up and give us a recap of the 2023 low water event?

MR. CODY ECKHARDT: Good morning Major General Graham, Chairman Murphy, and the Board. My name is Cody Eckhardt. I am the Deputy Chief of Operations and Navigation Manager at the Mississippi Valley Division. Pat Chambers would normally be here, but he's out on the MRC trip.

I was just going to touch on the lock status in New Orleans IHNC [Lock] and Port Allen. This is just a map. I'm sure you all are familiar with the location of each lock. When Port Allen went down it was critical, but then IHNC [Lock] and that was really the chokepoint. That was a big deal.

MR. MURPHY: While we're waiting, this is Spencer Murphy. Just stating the obvious, but some may not be aware that with Demopolis [Lock] down and then when IHNC goes down, there is no way to go east of New Orleans on the inland system when both of those routes are closed. Again, stating the obvious, but just to Secretary Connor is concerned about redundancy and resilience, for a couple of days there we were basically dead in the water when it comes to shipping east of New Orleans or west of Mobile. This points out the importance of getting Demopolis up and running and also the importance of getting IHNC moving towards replacement.

MR. ECKHARDT: I guess we are transitioning to low water, the good news. This is kind of just an event summary for the 2023 low water and I guess what I would like to highlight on here is during the low water we had nine total dredges working. We moved 22.5 million cubic yards of material spending $63.8 million. I will note two of those dredges are over 90 years old, the (hydraulic pipeline dustpan dredges) Jadwin and the Potter.

2023 we felt like went smoother than 2022 just based on the lessons learned. One of the big ones that really helped was having an industry rep onboard our Government dustpan dredges to help manage the queue, but really was helpful and we appreciate industry support on that. Using LOMA to place the emergency [electronic] aids to navigation to get them out there before the Coast Guard could get out there and place the buoys to help mark those, that shoaling.

We also were able to get dredges to trouble spots earlier and supplemental funding was the key to that. We were able to come and do some and kind of get ahead of the shoaling whereas in 2022 we were playing more catch of trying to get the shoaling taking care of then using the Motor Vessel Grugett get out of Memphis to help supplement the Coast Guard with channel patrol.

The districts did a great job of communication and information sharing in coordination with industry, and great job by industry too. Appreciate you working with our Districts to help keep traffic moving.

Then I want to highlight the channel improvement program, the dikes, and the revetment kind of lead into the dredging because as we put more dikes and more revetment, that's helped reduce the need for dredging were some of these areas self-scour. That helps reduce that need for dredging.

Things that need improvement, we found that the different Coast Guard Sectors that are represented -- a short part of the Mississippi River is Sector Ohio Valley. Not having one Sector kind of made things challenging. The St. Louis District doesn't have that 28-day experimental forecast which we found very helpful in the lower river. Then as the river got really low there was limited access to programs for our trailer-able survey vessels. Then the river gauges require extra maintenance with low water.

Next steps, Coast Guard is updating the waterway action plan with lessons learned. Mississippi Valley Division, we are currently working on the 2024 low-water AAR [After Action Report] so we can document, so that the next will be even smoother. Industry is discussing the Coast Guard borders. I was talking about the Sectors kind of overlapped. The Potter and the Jadwin recapitalization efforts, again, those are the two 90-year-old dustpans dredges that without both of those would have made things really challenging to keep that river open.

Stressing the importance of early and complete funding for harbor dredging. Then continue the open communications and good relationship with industry and the Coast Guard.

I put this slide in here. Really the "so what" on this slide is down there at the bottom. We calculated that from '22 to '23 the channel closures, not dredging related, but just channel closures from grounding or shoaling were almost 71 percent less. So that was a good news story on that.

Any questions on the low water?

MR. MURPHY: Spencer Murphy. A question and a comment. A question on the Potter and the Jadwin, what does that recapitalization effort entail? What's happening there?

MR. ECKHARDT: I guess we're kind of looking at funding options to try to get that to start those efforts.

MR. MURPHY: Does recapitalization mean replacement? New build or --

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes, it would be replacement. I mean, these are 90 years old. The crews have done an excellent job keeping these dredges together for 90 years. For their age, it's impeccable what they've done. But at some point, something is going to have to happen.

MR. MURPHY: I understand. But as of today though, are we confident that if there is low water in '24, we have access to those capacity?

MR. THOMAS SMITH: Thanks Cody for putting it on the slide. I think we've talked about it before. Tom Smith from the Operations at the Headquarters. I just want to be a little bit clearer and more transparent on where we are with it.

First thing is, 90 years old, that is when they were put in service, they've been repowered several times, but probably using a date in the '80s is a better benchmark of their --

MR. ECKHARDT: Right.

MR. SMITH: But that's still 40 years old so they are no longer the vessel of choice. They are the vessel we have, but ideally, we would have something different. Working with the Mississippi Valley Division and our Marine Design Center (MDC) and the AE firm we have worked through the details of what we would replace the Potter and the Jadwin with. We have a pretty clear view of that including costs that are on the order of magnitude of $500 million each. Just to give you an idea.

That reflects substantial amount of contingency because of effort we are doing in the Corps to ensure that we actually built contingency into the prices we expect that we would actually need to deliver a product depending on the level of design, so now where are we with it. We do not have at this point, a detailed programming approach.

It is a Senior Leader discussion. It hasn't even been brought up and the need. Mr. Connor for example is aware of it, but we have not worked through how we will do that because of the magnitude of the requirement.

The other thing is the reality is that it is still a 5-to-7-year journey to replace because of the physics involved of just design, acquisition, and construction. We have to, in addition to continuing on in a very deliberate way this recapitalization effort, we have to continue to look at how we will keep the river open with the equipment we have, with equipment that industry can do some things with to do other things about the revetment, or excuse me, the channel improvement program, early movement of the dredges we own.

Marty was talking last night about where we actually have challenges. It's not along the thousand miles of the Mississippi, it's half a dozen places that we know. Those of the way we are attacking it now. I just wanted to be a little more transparent about how difficult this next step will be. It's one thing to know what you, me, to know what it looks like, to have a reasonable assurance of what the design elements are. It's another thing to have a programming approach that would actually be able to work back to.

MR. MURPHY: I don't want to sidetrack us on a non-trust fund issue, but that's going to be important to make sure that that capacity is available. I certainly understand as most of the operators here, a 60-year-old hull doesn't necessarily mean a 60-year-old vessel, right? We have towboats that have been recapitalized over the years and the original steel might be old, but it's practically a new vessel.

On dredging, I think we all really appreciate all of the success that went into last year's low water. I hope we don't have to repeat that this year, but if we do, just make a note that a lot of the harbor, smaller harbor dredging projects are where I think we can make sure we are communicating. If you ever get cornered by George Lovell, he will give you an earful about the different harbors that need to be dredged to make access available.

Because it's great that the mainstem is up and running, but if you can't get cargo in and out of some of those harbors it kind of defeats the purpose. Just kind of put that marker down. Hopefully not an issue that we have to worry about this summer but be prepared.

MR. ECKHARDT: Yeah, that's one of the lessons learned. We are looking at how can we do the harbors where we are not having harbor closures.

MR. CLOUSE: Marty.

MR. HETTEL: Hey Cody, Marty Hettel. This last slide on the hours, total hours closed certainly shows what proactive dredging did versus 2022, which I call reactive dredging. What would be interesting is do you have the same statistics for when the channel was closed for dredging?

MR. ECKHARDT: Not here in front of me, but I'm sure we can get that together.

MR. HETTEL: I think that would be a great comparison also between 2022 and 2023. Thank you.

MR. ECKHARDT: Any other questions on the water? Well, we will move back to the IHNC and Port Allen discussion. IHNC closed on 28 March due to the gate pin failure. New Orleans District, great job getting it back together or getting it repaired. Those numbers are when I sent the presentation in.

As of this morning we had 62 vessels on turn at IHNC, 32 on turn at Algiers. We have locked, since the reopening, 125 tows through IHNC. Not going to go into a lot more detail on this since it's already back open.

Port Allen Lock, this one certainly did not see coming. Hard to predict because it was an anchorage in embedded concrete. The thought is that it's a weld that's going to have to be repaired. They are currently removing the concrete and if everything goes as planned and the repair that they think is going to need to be made, we should have it reopened by 24 April. Again, we won't know exactly. We could find some surprises when we get that concrete out, but hopefully it's just the weld on that anchorage that needs to be repaired.

Subject to any questions, that's what I have.

MR. SMITH: I did want to point out one thing Cody, which we did have some new Board Members. One of the things that General Graham and others wanted to make sure we did last week when we were focused so heavily on the Francis Scott Key Bridge is to directly communicate about where we were. Colonel Jones and the New Orleans team did a phenomenal job enabling that with clear products, with clear timelines, when it was expected to be operational, what pieces of equipment were moving, and what challenges they were having and try to be as direct as we could in sharing that with Board leadership and also with WCI (Waterways Council, Inc.).

I think that's the best practice that we just need to continue. Obviously, we always want to do that, but it's helpful when we really get on it. But the point I think was to make clear that while we certainly had a lot of focus instilled to Baltimore, there's a lot of other critical inland system work going on in real time. Hopefully, we are keeping up with your expectations for communications in addition to what they do in the region.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Cody.

MR. ECKHARDT: Thank you.

MR. CLOUSE: Next up we have Mr. Tarpey. He is going to give us an update on the 2025 Capital Investment Strategy. Mr. Tarpey, the floor is yours.

MR. MICHAEL TARPEY: Just making sure I know how to use the technology. Good morning, Chairman Murphy, General Graham, Ms. Brown, Members of the Board, and Federal Observers. For the record, my name is Michael Tarpey, and I am the lead for the 2025 Capital Investment Strategy or CIS. The information that I will present today has been developed by an expert team from the Corps and stakeholders. It builds upon the lessons learned of previous reports.

Some of my presentation today will cover some of the background for those that are new to the CIS. I know that there are several Members of the Board that have been involved with all the CIS reports that we've developed. I've been involved with the 2016 a little bit, the 2020, and all the 2025.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act or WRRDA '14 established the requirement for the Corps to prepare the 20-year Capital Investment Strategy for the fuel taxed waterways in conjunction with the Users Board. The CIS is a planning framework and informs the normal budget processes. For the record I'm going to state it does not represent a commitment by the Administration to budget the amounts shown in the scenarios. It is a planning framework.

Since the 2020 report was sent to Congress, significant things have happened. First and foremost, we had the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law that appropriated $2.5 billion for inland waterways construction. There has been significant WRDA (Water Resources Development Act) legislation changing the cost share from 50/50 to 65/35 percent. The project at Brazos River and Colorado River have been authorized for construction. Most important perhaps is we've had four new starts at the Upper Ohio, NESP (Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway Navigation and Ecosystem Program), MKARNS (McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System), Three Rivers, and the TJ O'Brien major rehab.

A little background for those Observers and Board Members that don't know the history. The first report was the 2010 Capital Project Business Model. This was an initiative by the Corps and stakeholders in response to cost escalation and schedule delays and funding challenges. The 2016 report was the first Capital Investment Strategy that was required by the WRRDA '14. It was drafted May 2015 and it was sent by OMB (Office of Management and Budget) to Congress in March 2016.

The 2020 report was the first five-year update that was required under the law, and it was sent to Congress in January 2021 and now we are working on the 2025 report, which is the second five-year required update.

Primary outcomes of the 2020 CIS. First, I want to state I highlighted that little box. Our understanding that the 2020 report was well- received and provides a strong starting point for the 2025 report. In the 2020 report we filtered the projects into four categories based on the work status and then we grouped the projects into bands of relative priority.

The 2020 report developed three funding scenarios, the baseline and an enhanced scenario which was a program to show what we can accomplish with $400 million. Then, a really pie-in-the-sky what-if scenario, what would it take funding wise to complete all of the projects in 10 years. The impact of the 2020 report was significant. First it aligned stakeholders behind a common message. It was referenced and used in the legislation for the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the USDA and other agencies referenced the CIS in multiple documents.

This slide shows you the Corps team as well as the stakeholders that are part of the process involved. Now getting into the heart of what the 2025 report looks like. This slide, the next several will cover the scope, schedule, the key tenants, and our assumptions. If you have questions, please feel free to ask at this point because I want to make sure that I get the appropriate Board feedback. This is the intent of this presentation is to officially get Board feedback.

First, the timeline is from 2025 through 2044. The CIS will obviously incorporate the WRDA changes of the cost share and any other WRDA changes that might happen before this report is published. At the core of this, we are refining the category to better reflect the current environment and work. Category One which was previously described as ongoing construction will now be split into two categories, active construction, and active design.

Category Two is being retitled a little bit to better reflect as well. It's going to be project authorized for construction and awaiting design fundings.

Category Three is being split into ongoing studies and reevaluation, Category 3A. The 3B is ongoing major rehabilitation reports.

Category Four is the focus has shifted. We're going to focus on the future work. We want to identify the recapitalization of existing infrastructure and that recapitalization, an example of that would be the recently completed project at LaGrange where we had major rehab completed as well as major maintenance because we all know there is significant need to recapitalize infrastructure that we've seen through Demopolis or some of the recent failures.

Second part of looking to the future is that capacity expansions. Those are the new projects, the new locks, channel deepenings, et cetera.

Schedule. This schedule highlights the key dates as we are moving forward. It does not include the regular and recurring working meetings that happen inside the Corps as well as within the stakeholder group. This is an aggressive schedule and is built upon the window that we have of opportunity between appropriations, President's budgets, and WRDAs and we want to get this report done while the information is hopefully static before things change with the next round of appropriations and President's budget.

I don't have a date of completion because the goal is to start the coordination with the Administration in September and receive their feedback so that after that point things will be happening. We just don't know what that timeline looks like. We said that September is the target to get this completed. Next time we will come back to the Board is in the summer meeting in that July, August timeframe.

The report's objective is to fund projects to completion as soon as possible in order to minimize cost growth and expedite construction. The driver behind this is to deliver the benefits as soon as possible. We've seen lock projects taking, I think General Graham mentioned in his opening remarks, 25 years. Our goal as we build the scenarios when funding allows is to complete construction in eight years or less.

As we develop the scenarios, we are going to have the design work not starting 3-to-5 years before the plan and construction start. We don't want to have design work sitting on the shelf per se and then

having it be redone which increases our costs. Lastly, we are going to seek the geographic distribution of projects in compliance with WRRDA '14.

Inflation is going to be assumed in the report to be 4.2 percent per year. I'm highlighting that and it's based on the 20-year average of the Corps' cost index. This is higher than the OMB published rate and is based on what we have seen to be the reality over the last 20 years. Assuming the 2024 appropriations funded to completion, Chickamauga, Lower Mon and the MKARNS Three River projects.

Further, in all scenarios we are assuming that Kentucky [Lock] is funded to completion in FY 25. We will seek to officially utilize the trust fund balance available each year. Not in all scenarios do we spend it all because there is a healthy balance right now, but in the scenarios, we try to pull that down over several years.

Our revenue assumptions moving to the future are listed there. 'So, 2025 and 2026 are based on the recent President's budget. Beyond that we are assuming it will grow at 3 percent per year.

The design costs that you will see in here are assumed to be $25 million per year for three years based on Corps experience. If you look at the numbers in the future, they do get inflated into the future. It's assumed that locks will be operational three years after the project is funded to completion. The category 1A, that's the active construction. The priorities are listed based on the amount needed to fund it to completion.

The next project in our construction alternative scenarios is assumed to be LaGrange Lock. It's based on the prioritization framework that we developed in the 2020 report. We reviewed it and found it to be sound and worthy to continue forward.

As we seek other opportunities to efficiently fund a small project such as Brazos River or major rehabs. Generically we refer to the next project, the next megaproject after LaGrange as Next Lock A. And in one scenario you will see Next Locks B and C. The assumption was this, based upon as we look at the scenarios, the next project, the Next Lock A doesn't occur until at least 10 years. We know there are a number of studies ongoing. There is one or two more CISs. Then we didn't think it was premature to identify what the next projects are beyond LaGrange.

The 2025 report as I mentioned in my previous remarks follow a similar analytical process that we did in 2020. We categorize, we filter, and that we prioritize. The analytical framework we saw, it was reviewed in the 2020 report was sound. Just with minor tweaks that you see here is where things layout. This shows you where the projects were in the 2020 report and where they are landing in the 2025 report.

This slide and the next three are draft scenarios that have been put together for Board input. This is really the heart of my presentation today as we try to lay out the funding into the future. The first scenario is based on our historical funding and execution trends where the construction contracts are base plus options because we've not been able to get the continuing contracts, or the incremental funding clause added to these projects.

One of the key assumptions to constrain the funding is we assume that it is 90 percent of the annual trust fund revenues are used. Because of the uncertainty and constrained funding, costs are increased by 3 percent. This is based on reality and expert opinion from a Corps team and others. That uncertainty comes in so if you have base and options that you don't know what money you're going to get the next year, do you have money at the time the options are rewarded, do we have to renegotiate, reprice. Things can have unforeseen impact and drive costs up.

LaGrange Lock and this New Lock A that you see in the scenario is assumed the funding is spread over 17 years.

Scenario Two is referred to it as accelerated schedule with the eight-year construction funding. The key assumption here is that there is timely and certain funding to efficiently execute the construction. The potential tools are the continuing contracts clause, incremental funding clause, that the project is funded annually in the President's budget, which gives you that certainty. Or there is a future MILCON-like five-year program that gives some recognition of what the funding could be.

Other assumptions are that there are General Treasury funds to match the trust fund. We are assuming that after Lock 25 and Montgomery [Lock] are funded to completion that the focus is on funding LaGrange to completion while we are trying to weave in other projects like Brazos River in this scenario.

Scenario Number Three is the what-if scenario. The BIL projects were 100 percent based on what the intent of Congress was when they passed it, so the project that received BIL funding we are assuming here would be funded at 100 percent General Treasury. It assumes that the annual construction program is between $500 and $600 million with a $350 million being targeted for the BIL projects and then $250 million being targeted to the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, for a typical project plus the New Locks A and B.

The goal in this one again is to fully allocate the annual revenues, try to balance that and draw it out over time. Now I'm going to pause here because I feel like I went through a lot of information. Pause and see if there are any questions. After this I'm going to turn it over to the new Inland Program Manager, Craig Moulton, to talk about major rehabs.

MR. SMITH: When Michael Tarpey went through several places, said assumption this, assumption that, those are determinations that have been made as part of a process to produce a draft document which isn't even a document yet.

There is for those of you who are trying to think, where do I even start discussing, just about everything with slide number to go back to forward, it is intended to be professionally informed, but there is nothing you need to just say, where did that come from. It came from kind of what some pre-work that led by our Headquarters and Navigation Team and then went through an industry engagement with some of those selected industry representatives.

Those are the dialogues that are shaping this. Please don't think where do you start; everything here ought to have some logic to it. Follow it or you want to stop -- obviously we could talk a long time about this, but I just want to make sure that somebody doesn't think this is done inside the table today.

This is a lot of material in this that you can feel free to comment on to understand better. We will take it from there.

MR. TARPEY: Thank you for letting me off easy. I'm going get off the stage while I can.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: No, you're not getting off there.

Nice try.

MR. TARPEY: I will turn it over to; where is Craig here so he can talk about major rehabs?

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: You're not; hold on Michael.

MR. TARPEY: Sure.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Go back to Scenario Two.

MR. TARPEY: Yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Just trying to do some Marty math in my head. Actually, let's start with Scenario One. Constrained we hate because we don't want to go back to not staying ahead of the deteriorating locks and dams. This funding scenario has total, between the trust fund and General Treasury, $300 million per year. That's your investment; is that right?

MR. TARPEY: Correct.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Let's go to Scenario Two. I just didn't see it on here. How much per year is from the trust fund and General Treasury, what was your plan for Scenario Two? How much a year?

MR. TARPEY: Probably about $350 million that grows over time. We started with $117 million in revenue, matched that 65/35 from the trust fund. In some years and since there is a little more of a balance out there, we were trying to balance. If you take a look at FY 25, Kentucky Lock gets $332 million. I can't read the numbers. My eyes not that good to read on the screen.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: That's okay.

MR. TARPEY: I made it as big as I could. This is softly done. We are trying to execute work within the fiscal constraints that are there.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: But in general, I understand is not linear.

MR. TARPEY: We target at $350 million a year is what we were targeting.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Okay, and then --

MR. TARPEY: We had the balance. We were trying to draw that down to get ahead of the projects. An example would be -- I think it's probably $500 something million in FY 25.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: $50 more million per year than in scenario one?

MR. TARPEY: Correct.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Then we get to Scenario Three, $500 to $600 million per year?

MR. TARPEY: Correct.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Tracy Zea (of WCI), what do you think? Come on up to the mic.

MR. TRACY ZEA: Yes, sir. Working with the Corps and understanding the history and the funding scenarios over the last 8 to 10 years, these are all very realistic and achievable and attainable. Getting over $500 to $600 million is very hard for the annual appropriations and where you are, unless they continue to grow the overall pot, which they have the last eight years. But also recognizing a lot of that growth is the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. You do have a constrained growth.

Now where this might get difficult as far as the scenario is the budget. You look at the growth of the budget over the last six, seven, eight years and then constraining what the Congress is providing, trust fund, all of our projects are not eligible to be in the budget. That growth within the appropriations is going to be difficult because you're going to take up the majority of the extra funding that Congress is providing. But within $500 million is attainable. $456 [million] this year which was record level.

MR. MURPHY: General, Spencer Murphy. Just a couple of comments. Number one, going back a few slides talking about the impact of the Capital Investment Strategy 2020 and 2016, just want to reinforce the importance of keeping stakeholders aligned behind a common message because the work that is done in the Capital Investment Strategy should directly inform the work that we do here and the work that you all do on the river, especially in an era where Congressionally directed spending is making a comeback, which I think should be an additive factor to this plan and something that will help us get it done. It can also be our undoing if we aren't careful.

When he was signing the Declaration of Independence, Ben Franklin said we had all hang together or we will surely hang separately. I think that is the case if we don't keep our commitments inside the CIS because you have the Senator from Pittsburgh and the Senator from Texas who have great arguments for why their projects ought to be what we do today and we as an industry and with the Corps have worked together to put our personal preferences aside and prioritize what's best for the nation and how to best use our trust fund dollars. I think this is a really important work that everything flows from getting this right.

Certainly, on behalf of me and my company, we feel this is one of the most important things that we can do. I also want to recognize -- I know the Corps gets nervous about putting dollars projected on a page in different scenarios. We appreciate that. Appreciate you putting into a slightly uncomfortable position by doing so, but we also recognize this is a planning document. It's not a budget document. Nobody is bound by anything that's in this report other than we agreed to work our best to make it happen. I just wanted to kind of make that comment just to recommit out the importance of this for what this Board

does because we could very easily slide back into a posture where we are spending a little bit of money on a lot of projects, and nothing gets finished if we don't follow this plan.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: The next Board meeting we will have the final draft ready to –

MR. TARPEY: We will have a draft report. On the schedule we are – after this, any comments that we get from the Board we will incorporate into the scenarios and our assumptions and all that, rework the scenarios if needed. Then we will start writing the report. The goal is having a draft report available by late June.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: The next Board meeting?

MR. TARPEY: Yes.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Okay. Anybody concerned about that?

MR. JEFF WEBB: Do we want to tweak scenarios based on the WRDA?

MR. TARPEY: If there is information that the Board wants to recommend to us, we will consider that and work with that stakeholder group. This should be a joint product that we are both happy with and reflects it.

MR. WEBB: Would WRDA be out at this point?

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: What you're talking about is a potential change in the cost share to 75/25?

MR. MURPHY: No, BIL infrastructure projects.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Oh, okay. Or BIL funding 100 percent continued to completion?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Okay, so that's valid. We get a WRDA in September, October. It might not be done. Would you want us to hold on to this until after the WRDA is done? Because if WRDA is going to change the cost share, then it's kind of moot for us to finish it if WRDA is going to change the cost share for certain things. We can deal with that card as it comes out.

MR. MURPHY: WRDA might affect the CIS but will not necessarily affect the priority.

MR. TARPEY: I was going to say we will incorporate that draft language. Based on the timing we can adjust it with the coordination of the Board. The plan is to annually update this, the heart of this. What does this look like? Because we do have appropriations that are not going to match the scenario. If we do that process, we can get some of the changes along the way.

MR. SMITH: General Graham, Tom Smith. I would just – I think what you are saying essentially, is let's not get overly focused on what wording might be in a WRDA. The scenario should be broad

enough to inform different ways of thinking about which projects can be started and finished and the reason I'm saying that, even though Spencer Murphy, I think you said that already is there will always be something out there that somebody has an idea on, and we try to keep this as much as we can. Knowing what we know about so many variations about what's actually in WRDA or what might be being worked at different levels for actual funding.

That's why we have these three scenarios that ought to inform kind of the broader thinking. If we get too focused on very, very granular information we can cause a lot of friction as we try to get this to closure.

MR. MURPHY: Another scenario is we will never be 100 percent.

MR. SMITH: A little bit of saying that out loud for folks here who can't not know what they know about a specific thing going on with a budget decision or anything else.

MR. MATTHEW WOODRUFF: This is Matt Woodruff. I was just going to say the same thing that we can adjust the scenarios and inform the scenarios based on where we see things going as we get closer to a finish. But I don't think we necessarily need to wait until we have final WRDA legislation or anything else. We just need to have broad enough and flexible enough scenarios that would inform decision-making.

MR. MURPHY: To inform the decision-making.

MR. TARPEY: Thank you all. Now I will turn it over to Craig. I'll get off the stage while I still have all my body parts.

MR. CRAIG MOULTON: Good morning. As Michael said, I'm Craig Moulton. I'm your new Inland Navigation Program Manager for Headquarters after Mr. Frantz retired. I'm here to cover the current status of our ongoing major rehab reports. There's quite a few of them ongoing.

The detail has all of it on the slide, but as a summary we did have two on the Illinois Waterway, Dresden, and Starved Rock. After going through the analysis and the details, they don't qualify for an MRER (Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report), so they have transitioned those over to major maintenance and are starting to pursue O&M funds to fix the needs they have there. We do have Winfield that is currently, the director's report has been done since 2022 and it is currently trying to budget to get major rehab funding to start to work on the dam.

The future reports we have coming and the order they are coming, we have three upcoming on the MKARNS, they are in various statuses. The first one, David Terry, the screening is complete, and they are working on the report with the expectation to have that report done later this year.

And then Webbers Falls and Kerr; they are both still in the screening process, but they are on schedule to have a report completed by the end of next year. That will be three good projects there on the MKARNS. As we get into the Ohio River Valley only two out of Pittsburgh there, New Cumberland and Pike Island. They are both still finalizing their screening processes.

The decision milestone meeting they are working to finalize that and get that ready, but they are on track by the end of FY 25 to have a report done on those two. Then the three, I guess that is four out of Huntington District. The first three there, Greenup and Meldahl on the Ohio and Marmet on the Kanawha River. They are working on the evaluation and the analysis. It is ongoing, they are through the screening phase there and they are working that. That will be first quarter FY 26 is the expectation there.

Behind that is Racine. It is still in really early stages for that one. That will be after FY 26. –

If you notice on the CIS scenarios once we get through the major ongoing lock construction we start feathering and setting aside some funding to fund major rehabs to keep the system, because not everything needs a brand-new lock. We need to keep what we have, recapitalize it, keep it going forward.

These future studies are going to inform what's next, and then there are more studies that will be coming in the future. That's what I have on the major rehab pending any questions for me?

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Craig. Thank you, Michael. Next up we have Mr. Reich from the Mobile District to give us an update on Demopolis Lock and I think we've got some good news this morning.

MR. RYAN REICH: Yes sir, we do. Thank you, Major General Graham and Board Members for having me. My name is Ryan Reich. I am a business line manager in the Mobile District, but I am the acting PM for the effort going on at Demopolis Lock for the upper miter sill failure.

An overview outline of the presentation. We will give an overview of the Demopolis Lock and then we will go into the failure, the emergency response, and the impacts to navigation. After that I will cover the repair efforts and then we will go into schedule and questions.

Demopolis Lock was open to navigation in 1954 so it is hitting its 70-year anniversary this year. Major project features: It's a single chamber 110 by 600 foot and it is a 40-foot lift. Adjacent to the lock is a 1450-foot-long fixed crest spillway. It is the busiest and oldest lock on the system. As you can see on the right-hand side there it's just south of the confluence of the Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway and the Black Warrior River, so it is a crucial lock for our District. Three-year average is, we have two and a half a billion tons a year go through it, approximately 1850 commercial lockages and 450 recreational lockages. The most common commodities are coal and petroleum products.

The failure on January 16th of this year just after a shift change the operator on duty heard a loud bang, walked out to the lock, and saw what you see in the upper right picture there. The upper miter gate was closed, and a large amount of water was passing under it indicating that the concrete sill had failed. The chamber was set up for traffic passing upstream at the time meaning the chamber was at lower pool and the lower miter gate was open. We had a breach and uncontrolled release going through the project.

That was the first issue to address. How to stop the breach. Our team came up with a couple of different courses of action, but the one chosen was to close the lower miter gates underflow. A risky decision but we had plans to mitigate the risk with help from Parker Towing we put three barges in the chamber to mitigate the chop and the wave action caused.

Then we actually got three separate barges with three tugs as you can see in the lower left picture, place them up on the downstream side of the miter gates and they kind of walked the gates back into miter. That was successfully done three days after the failure on January 19th. The next day we actually were able to get in touch with TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) to send a crane barge down to the site. Unfortunately, our District fleet was not in the proximity. Some was in drydock, some was at a different project in Apalachicola Bay a good distance away. TVA answered our call, helped us out and came down to the site and helped us place stop logs successfully on January the 20th.

Because of the failure we had a large impact to navigation. For those who can see it, the red line on the graphic is the traditional route from Demopolis down to the Port of Mobile. The blue is now where industry is having to go. I think from the Port of Mobile to the Port of Birmingham was originally 600 miles, now it's getting close to 1,700 so we added 1100 miles to that route. That's a lot of time added and a lot of money cost.

Some of the things that we have looked at as a result of this failure, we had aging infrastructure. Demopolis is 70 years old, two other locks, Selden, just upstream is 67 years old and Coffeyville, just downstream, is 64 years old. We have actually put in budget requests for major rehab reports in the FY 26 a budget cycle to look at possibly replacing these locks.

One issue with all of the locks in the Mobile District is we do not have auxiliary chambers so once a lock is down, there is no way traffic can pass through it. If it happens at a lock like Demopolis at a major chokepoint it can really mess up navigation.

Our dam safety program, we do inspections every five years at all of our projects. There was no indication that any of these inspections said that there was an issue with the upper miter sill. That also leads to our operational condition assessments, better known as OCAs, so these particular components were still rated a B in our system because there was no visual indication that there was an issue.

Some other things that the District has investigated as a result, the project just upstream, Selden, is kind of similar in design. It does not have any reinforcement in the concrete sill, and we have a similar project, Jim Woodruff on the ACF (Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint) Waterway which has a similar intake structure for the culvert system, but it actually does have reinforcement in that concrete. Woodruff and Demopolis design reinforcement was taken out of the design.

We will go into the repair. The District has a pretty vast crisis response team going on right now between engineering, our project office, maintenance contractors and subcontractors. We have gotten help from sister Districts, particularly ERDC, our Engineering and Research Development Center, Pittsburgh District. We've had help from Jacksonville District. Subject matter experts get together to come up with a plan to quickly, efficiently and deliver a great product for the fix.

One of the biggest, I guess issues or actions for the repair was the debris removal. Up to this date we have removed approximately 1000 tons of concrete from the chamber with the largest piece of being a 400-ton chunk of concrete which you can see on the bottom right. Our District fleet was not capable of lifting this, so we actually had to subcontract out a salvage company in New Orleans to bring a 700-ton A-frame crane over to get that piece of concrete out.

The repair, the design is another mass concrete pour with reinforcement. These placements will be done in the wet and the dry. A lot of engineering is going into the mix designs. We've gotten, some help from other Districts that have done wet concrete placements and the subcontractor has actually done work for the Corps and done wet placements. A lot of experience from a lot of different areas helping out with this.

The schedule. Actually, this has been updated, the install anchors and formwork that is in blue, that is it now green. It has been completed and this morning the first concrete placement is occurring. I think it actually is wrapping up right now. Hopefully everything has gone successfully. I haven't gotten any texts from anything. There is a picture of what has happened right now.

The scheduled completion date is the end of May, and it looks like we are on track to hit that. Barring any severe weather which has been unkind to us so far in 2024, but the project schedule is looking very good. You can go back to the slide. Thank you.

So total costs are now up to date, I think we are hitting just the $23 million mark. We are constantly doing mods as things pop up. All of our fleet costs are getting charged to the project. All of the funding for this repair is in general O&M funding and there was some earmarked funding also that was reprogrammed. None of those costs is shared with the trust fund. It's all coming from O&M.

MR. MURPHY: I have a quick question. I think you sort of touched on this, but in terms of the lessons learned and investigation to carry forward to other locks and dams in the system, where does that stand? I kind of heard you talk about Selden has a similar profile.

MR. REICH: Right. We are actually going to do some core drilling at Selden Lock in the sill to get some strength test and whatnot, some data on it to make sure there is nothing similar happening there. Since this was -- it's not a visual thing you can see, it just happened to fail. We're also developing lessons learned, that day that it occurred was a very cold day and the chamber was at lower pools so there might have been some freeze thaw action happen so that could be a way we change our SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures), how we have the lock set up on extremely cold days.

That's kind of where we're at right now. Our engineering team is working on a good lessons-learned project. Right now, we're extremely focused on the actual repair going on, but I think within 30 days of the reopening of the lock we should have a lessons-learned document that we will be passing up.

MR. MURPHY: I appreciate that and, it's no different than our industry when you have a casualty you focus on the repair and the incident response first and then you go back, and you do an investigation and lessons learned and try to apply that elsewhere in your operation. When the time is right, would appreciate some follow-up from you all on what you did learn.

MR. REICH: Absolutely.

MR. MURPHY: Not just for the Tenn-Tom (Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway) system but really kind of elsewhere because unfortunately we have a lot of 70-year-old locks out there that may have similar problems. Thanks.

MR. REICH: Any more questions?

MR. DAMON JUDD: Damon Judd. Yes, one clarification, when you say it's the oldest and most heavily used lock, that's within the Tenn-Tom system, not the waterways system as a whole, right?

MR. REICH: Correct. Within the Tenn-Tom and what we call the BWT (Black Warrior-Tombigbee) systems.

MR. JUDD: I guess to layer on to what Spencer was saying as you think about the recap here with the pace we spent some time over the last couple of years talking about whether it's an 8 year pace or a 20 year pace or somewhere in between in terms of replacements, just I think industry is very appreciative of the response and reaction to the failure, but it's unfortunately probably something we have to be ready for locks. I mean, the odds are at the pace were moving that we are going to have more failures before we get to everything. As part of the postmortem, if there's a lessons-learned around response and reaction that would be great to capture as well.

MR. REICH: Agreed.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Ryan, thanks. Great news that first pour happened today so that is kind of a week and a little bit more ahead of schedule.

MR. REICH: Absolutely, ahead of schedule.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Well done on that. Absolutely understand what are we going to learn from this casualty and Mr. Smith and the rest of the team are looking at that.

Can you go back up three slides? Ryan talked about closing the lower miter gates while there's water flowing through the chamber and that was high adventure day.

MR. REICH: It was a very nerve-racking day.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Those are not Corps boats in the chamber, those are not Corps boats that were helping push those gates. Those are industry boats, industry barges. I think this is a great example of the Corps working with industry to take care of this inland system. Wonderful work by Mobile and the operators out there on that cooperation. Everybody rushed in together. I want to highlight as well, the TVA sent a crane down to Tenn-Tom because Mobile's was down on the ACF at the Apalachicola Bay, so it was a great teamwork, great partnership across the board.

Matthew, did you have something you wanted to add to that?

MR. WOODRUFF: I just wanted to add to what Mr. Judd said with respect to when we're looking at the postmortem of this, we have locks all across the system and we know that something is going to fail somewhere sometime and as they get older, we know that we are not going to recapitalize everything before we have problems.

But not all locks are the same on the system and some areas we have auxiliary chambers. That gives us a little bit of comfort. Some of the locks on the Gulf Coast can be run open pass if they need to be even though there is no auxiliary chamber that there is a way to get through. It probably would bear some

thought as to where the locks like this one are, where if it goes down there is no auxiliary, there is no alternative and were shutting a significant part of the system down.

Maybe those locks deserve a little bit more attention in terms of analysis, testing, and making sure that were looking for any leading indicators that we could find that there could be a problem there so that, it's always best to anticipate fixing a problem before it occurs. I don't know what tools might be in the toolbox that would allow that, but it would be something to think about.

MR. HETTEL: Ryan, Marty Hettel here. One quick question for you. Will you be in ahead of schedule by a week early starting a pour today, that is great news. I know you're having weekly calls. I have been on those calls. It's really imperative for us to know exactly when that lock is going to open. What we don't want to do is leave New Orleans, go to Cairo, and come down and spend 15 days to get there when we could have been going up the Tenn-Tom and getting through there through Mobile. As soon as you can give us an estimated time that that lock will be operational the better off we are. Thank you.

MR. REICH: Understood, yes sir.

MR. SMITH: Marty, 30 May. That is the date.

MR. HETTEL: I understand that but we're already a week ahead of schedule. Maybe we can move to the left.

MR. SMITH: Well, I've had these discussions on the side here which is that we are effectively pouring.

MR. REICH: 30 May is --

MR. SMITH: Hopefully we will continue that trend.

MR. HETTEL: But if it moves to the left, we just need to know as soon as we can. We will deal with that we just need an ultimate --

MR. SMITH: 30 May.

MR. REICH: It will be said on the weekly calls. Thank you all.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Ryan.

Okay. Next up, we have Ms. Burks. She is going to give us two updates. One on Chickamauga and another one on Kentucky Lock. It's all yours.

MS. ELIZABETH BURKS: Yes sir, thank you. Good morning, Major General Graham, Ms. Brown, Mr. Chairman, and other distinguishing Board Members, Federal Observers, and guests. It may name is Elizabeth Burks and I am the chief of the Integrated Project Office in Nashville District. I will be briefing Chickamauga Lock Replacement and Kentucky Lock Addition both on the Tennessee River. We will begin with Chickamauga Lock.

Chickamauga Lock is a new 110 foot by 600-foot lock replacement. It is being built based on the requirement due to alkali aggregate reaction growing concrete which threatens in the stability and operability of the existing lock. We are currently on schedule for an operational date of November 2026. A total project cost estimate is $954 million. That is based on a certified total project cost summary completed in March of 2023. Our next total project cost summary update is due in March 2025.

This next slide is the latest aerial of Chickamauga Lock. In yellow we've identified the two construction contracts that are ongoing, and, in the bottom, you will see the lock chamber that was awarded in 2017 for $245 million. That is on schedule to be completed January 2026. At the top, you will also notice another yellow box where we have a second ongoing construction contract. This is for the upstream approach walls which was awarded in September 2021 for roughly $61 million. That is also on schedule with contract completion in March 2025.

We have one remaining contract that will make this lock operational. The remaining components of that operational contract will be the downstream approach walls, commissioning of the lock and decommissioning of the existing lock. That open lock that you see there will be filled in and then the constructed area will be this lock replacement.

Our bottom-line up-front summary, our dashboard shows that we're green with project safety. Our project status summary we remain on schedule with an operational date of November 2026. We are green there as well. Then, our financial summary status is a yellow reflecting the earned and actual difference is there where our actual costs of $470 million is above the budget cost of roughly $435 million. As we get closer to contract completion with the lock monolith we will catch up and return to green.

To provide an executive summary of the existing contracts and the upcoming contracts, our lock chamber contract primarily concrete production, we have completed 220,000 of 250,000 yards of concrete placed. As we continue forward with this contract, we get towards the top of the monolith so the production will slow. As we transition from concrete production we will move into the miter gate placement, that will take place this fall. We will have the remaining electrical work for the buildings.

For that upstream construction contract, the upstream approach walls we have placed 10 of 14 shafts. Our next step is to place our upstream approach wall beams. Those beams have been constructed and they are actually sitting on a TVA site about two hours upstream. That is considered Government furnished equipment. Our contractor will pick up that equipment, move that downstream in the fall for placement. Our final contract, I'm happy to share with you that approach wall and decommissioning contract is out for solicitation, and we plan to award that in September of 2024.

The next slide is our schedule and funding summary. Anything reflected in green shows that funds have been appropriated for that contract. You will see that we have completed a lot of contracts but will where the red line is that shows that there's three initiatives that have been funded. The top two blocks reflect those ongoing construction contracts and then the bottom block is the contract and solicitation.

This is our funding slide. I'm happy to report that in FY 24 Chickamauga received Community Project Funding in the amount of $236.8 million. That does fund Chickamauga Lock to completion based on that total project cost summary certified in March of 2023.

The remaining issues and challenges I would like to share. The first two bullets are a repeat from our last meeting. But just as a reminder, the lock chamber contract is an ongoing claim. In October we were able to award the contractor 779 non-compensable days. That brings them up to date, so they are currently on schedule.

We have remaining portions of that claim ongoing and those will move into litigation. The judge has set our hearing date for April 2025. The last bullet is it really identified risk with the future contract. Any further delays with the ongoing construction will impact the full mobilization of that third contractor, the approach wall and decommissioning contractor.

Again, our total project cost summary was last certified in March of 2023. We will perform an interim cost update in June of this year and then certify that total project cost summary in March 2025. That will incorporate any remaining cost to include the award for September of 2024 as well as any additional impacts.

That concludes my update for Chickamauga, I'm happy to answer any questions.

MS. CRYSTAL TAYLOR: Crystal Taylor here. I know in the update it said you are no longer pursuing the alternative dispute resolution and I assume that is what you are referring to that has now moved to litigation? There is potential for additional added costs, or is it that already in contingency somewhere?

MS. BURKS: Yes ma'am. We are moving forward with litigation. If there is a judgment against the project, then we will probably need to request additional funds.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MS. BURKS: Yes ma'am, thank you.

Next, I would like to provide an update for Kentucky Lock Addition. Kentucky Lock is a 110 foot by 1200-foot lock addition being built to meet current and future traffic demands. The average queue at this moment is between 8 and 10 hours. We are also on schedule for Kentucky Lock with an operational date of July 2029. Our cost estimate is $1.56 billion. That cost estimate for total project cost summary was certified in April of 2022. Our next total project cost summary is scheduled to be certified in the fourth quarter of 2024.

Again, this is the latest aerial update for Kentucky Lock Addition. The ongoing construction is identified in yellow, the downstream monolith was awarded in 2021 for $380 million with a construction completion date of May 2027. The remaining work that will make Kentucky Lock Addition operational includes the upstream and downstream approach walls. The operations and maintenance building, two bridges, electrical and mechanical components, and site restoration. We have a tentative solicitation date of July 2024 pending funds assurance.

This is our bottom-line up front. The status and dashboard. I am happy to report our project safety is green. We are approaching 1 million man-hours with no lost time accidents. That's a credit to not only the construction contractor but of course, safety culture. We are very proud of that statistic. The project

status summary is also green reflecting an operational date of July 2029, and then our financial status summary also remains green.

I would like to provide an executive summary of the existing construction contract as well as the upcoming solicitation. Our downstream lock monolith continues to be on track with construction completion in May of 2027. Our remaining capability is $332 million. That was the remaining capacity identified in that Fiscal Year 2022 total project cost summary. Our next total project cost summary will be updated again in the fourth quarter of 2024.

The team has tentative approval to move forward with an integrated design and construction acquisition strategy pending funds assurance. The contract award is tentatively planned for the second quarter of FY 25.

This is a summary of our schedule and funding. Again, blocks identified in green have appropriated funds, those in yellow are pending funding. Where the red line in this is reflective of where we are today. We have one ongoing construction contract and one pending for solicitation in July of 2024 with an award in February of 2025.

This is our funding summary. The last funding received for Kentucky Lock Addition was in Fiscal Year 2022. No funds were received for Fiscal Year 2023 or 2024. Our full capability in that request has been expressed for FY 25 is $332 million but you will notice there is a caveat that the minimum funding required to stay on schedule to award this operational contract is $218 million.

The only issue or challenge that we would like to share today again, is based on funding. If funding is received in FY 25, we will be able to award the operational contract and stay on schedule for operational date of July 2029.

I'm happy to answer any questions.

MR. JUDD: Ms. Burks, it's Damon Judd, I just want to echo what you said on safety as the Board's representative on Kentucky Lock. The Board was out there last summer, this project went through a massive ramp-up in terms of activity and it's my recollection that the Corps team had to kind of realign safety expectations with the contractors, and so to see the zero incidents, that's a really strong performance and a great job by the team.

Second comment, I guess, as it relates to kind of the project, Ms. Brown, you mentioned the word momentum. For those who are in the local area, this is a project where there is significant momentum and seeing concrete placed at a very rapid pace, which is also awesome.

I guess a couple of questions on the industry's behalf. The first is the notes around project funding here are very specific as it relates to Q2 FY 2025 and I guess just as we think about the way funding often evolves during a year, is there a significant hit to the project timetable to the extent that were to become a Q3, or Q4 funding commitment?

MS. BURKS: Any additional shift to the right in terms of funding status could affect the operational date. Of course, the team would work as efficiently as possible to maintain that commitment to the July 2029 operational date. But again, it's a risk to the schedule.

MR. JUDD: But more of a linear risk than something that changes the schedule dramatically? Is a one month delay a one-month delay, or is a one-month delay become, a nine-month delay, is I guess, kind of the question?

MS. BURKS: Yes, sir. A one-month delay is recoverable. A one-year delay is not recoverable.

MR. JUDD: Thank you, ma'am. You noted that there is an updated cost exercise here in the fourth quarter, do you have any concerns that that will result in a potential breach of the 902 limit?

MS. BURKS: No, sir. We will not breach the 902 limit.

MR. JUDD: He called out the footnote that references the $218 [million] to award the contract required to stay on schedule versus the $332 [million]. Is there any additional clarity you can provide the Board on, between the $332 [million] and the $218 [million], how the contingency factor kind of works within that bucket and assuming you get the $218 [million] are you able to risk reduce the $332 [million] at all?

MS. BURKS: Yes sir, thank you for that question. The $218 [million] is the minimum that we need to execute the contract. That's the totality of the contract. It doesn't account for remaining out-year labor. It does not account for mods, modifications to the contract. Any changes. There's no perfect contract. The contingency accounts for the modifications, as well as in the remaining site restoration that wasn't initially accounted for. We are on TVA property, there are commitments that we have made to TVA, and we've incorporated those into our contract. But again, because this is their property there could be some additional requirements and that they would need us to fulfill.

MR. JUDD: Just to make sure we're following, so it should be our assumption then that just because you receive the $218 [million] there's not a significant reduction in the contingency as it relates to funding certainty in terms of the capital in the $218 [million] and the $332 [million]?

MS. BURKS: Correct. Yes, sir, you're right.

MR. CLOUSE: Any questions for Ms. Burks?

Hearing none, let's see how were doing on time here. We are about 10 minutes early from the break so let's go ahead and take a break and we will be back at 11:50. That will give you about a half hour.

(Whereupon a break was taken at 11:17 AM.)

MR. CLOUSE: Let's start our second half here. We are going to be talking with the Southwestern Division (SWD). First up, we've got a little audible here, were going to swap the order of Three Rivers and the Brazos Rivers.

There is a new program manager for the Brazos River Floodgates, and Colorado River Locks. His name is Ramon Navarro. He was fully planning to be here today, unfortunately, he had a death in the family, so we made a last-minute change and we're going to get Orlando on the line and have him do it. He did mention there was not a whole lot of change and that he could talk to it really briefly.

Orlando, are you on the line there?

MR. ORLANDO RAMOS-GINES: Yes, mic check?

MR. CLOUSE: Yes, yes, you sound good, Orlando. Go ahead.

MR. RAMOS-GINES: Mic check.

MR. CLOUSE: Sounds good.

MR. RAMOS-GINES: Okay. Thank you. General Graham, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Brown, Board Members, all. I apologize for not being there. We've got a situation with our PM family, Ramon Navarro, he couldn't make it. There was some delay and some face time on his side but I'm filling in for him. But my apologies again for not being there in person to deliver this briefing to you all.

Next slide, please.

This is just a quick reminder of the importance of this project, the high use waterway. There is significant impact to the economy, even the narrow opening of this sector gates at Brazos River crossing. This project has a high benefit-cost ratio of 2 for Brazos River Floodgates, is less for Colorado River Locks but combined its benefit cost ratio of 1.

The project is a Category 2, which essentially is authorized and waiting construction funds. Under the new classification I was told that this project will fall, and delivery was Category 1-A, meaning that we're in active design for the Brazos River Floodgates facility. However, we have completed the design. That's something I will brief you on briefly, next.

Next slide. Here's our work situation status. We have completed the final design. The design as you all recall includes both west- and eastside. It's the entire facility and that was done with the expectation that we were going to proceed with a full contract. But it was also required to conduct all the H&H (Hydrologic and Hydraulic) analysis, including the ship simulations to ensure that we do have the design that needs to move to construction, and that the quality of the design that needed to move to construction.

As I mentioned we continue awaiting construction funds. Once we receive the construction funds, we will have to conduct a repackaging of the design information because it's the entire facility. That's quote/unquote an easier exercise to extract the components that are included in the design and the specifications for a smaller contract.

Next slide. It's a refresher of the features that are included for the westside only, smaller contract for Brazos River Floodgates. Essentially, we need to do some improvements to the placement area because of the material that we will be placing there, there is a need to make some improvements. Then, we realign the channel and part of the crossing section. We're also working on mitigation areas and finally, we'll be demolishing the westside structures, a sector gate and a few buildings that are located on the westside.

Next slide. This is a generalized schedule that we have discussed before. As I mentioned, once funds are received, we will have to go through getting the AE contract company back through a task order. As soon as we take care of that task order and execute it, we will be able to get the AE firm to repackage the westside only features for us and then provide a cursory review of that implementation to ensure the quality is still there before we proceed with contract solicitation. Once contract solicitation is done, we will be able to construct the facility.

We are estimating still about 30 months of construction to do the westside only. This effort will be up to between $70 million to $99 million including the AE design efforts for the repackaging and then the construction cost including oversight of the construction.

Next slide. This provides the funding summary that we have for this project together with the funding capability. On the top left is the funding allocation that we have received, total about $23.6 million. We have not received any construction funding. On the top right, we have the, essentially the authorized costs. We did 902 limit calculation. That is all based on the 2022 cost certification.

At the bottom is a list made based on escalated cost estimate that we received from Brazos River Floodgates and provided the capabilities per year for Brazos River Floodgates, or Colorado River Locks. As a reminder, although the top right chart provides potentially that we will be exceeding the 902 limit in the future by constructing the Brazos River Floodgates facility we're not in exceedance of the 902 limit for this project. Now, we do know that once construction funds are needed, we need to go through a reauthorization of the increased cost for this project.

Any questions?

MR. CLOUSE: I do have one thing that I just forgot to reiterate. When you're speaking, please talk in the microphones so that we can capture the dialog. Thank you. You can go ahead, Orlando.

Mr. RAMOS-GINES: Okay. That's it. That's my presentation. Any questions?

MR. CLOUSE: I'm not seeing any questions, Orlando. Thank you and send our condolences to Ramon.

MR. RAMOS-GINES: Okay. I appreciate it and again I apologize for not being there in person. Thank you.

MR. CLOUSE: Next up from Southwestern Division we have Mr. Gillip giving us an update on the MKARNS Three Rivers project.

MR. JONATHAN GILLIP: I can say good morning for one more minute. Good morning, General Graham, Ms. Brown, Chairman Murphy and Members of the Board and our Federal Observers. My name is Jonathan Gillip, I'm the project manager for the Three Rivers Project on the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System (MKARNS).

As you can see from the picture on the lower right, construction is well underway on Phase 1 of the project, which are defined here in a minute. The project was authorized in 2018. At the time the authorized cost was $184,395,000. You will note at the bottom of the slide the 902 limit is

$279,490,000. Our current certified cost estimate which is a FY 23 estimate is for $355,681,000 so exceeding the 902 cost limit of the project. As a result, we are currently completing a Post Authorization Change Report (PACR) and that is scheduled to be completed in July. We did award Phase 1 of the project which is underway, and we have Phase 2 contract in process with an anticipated award in December of 2024. We can award this over the 902 limit because it qualifies for the 902 Holiday.

A little bit of an explanation of the project, especially for the new Board Members. The purpose of this project is simply to preserve navigation on the MKARNS in the area where the system exits onto the Mississippi. The navigation is actually in the White River and in the project area, specifically the White River is at a higher elevation than the Arkansas River. It's a common occurrence in the area that high water levels in the White River flow overland towards the Arkansas River and it has caused extensive head cutting and threatens an uncontrolled connection between the two rivers which would result in a loss of the navigation pool.

The project has four main elements. The first is being constructed in Phase 1 and it is a construction of a hydraulic weir at 145 feet elevation at the location of the historic cutoff. What we're doing here is letting the water go where it naturally wanted to go, however, letting it pass over an armored weir with a controlled elevation so that we can preserve that navigation pool.

The second phase of the project is a design bid build construction of a hydraulic containment structure across the isthmus at an elevation of 157 feet. That's shown in teal on the image. It's about 2.5 miles long. The modification of Owen's Weir, the blue feature on the picture and the modification of the La Grues culverts, the red feature on the picture here.

The system will receive some relief on the completion of Phase 1 with the water being allowed to flow from the White to the Arkansas in a controlled manner. But we won't achieve full benefits of the project until both phases are completed. Even with Phase 1 completed there is still ongoing damage on water flowing across the land there.

The BLUF status, or bottom-line-up-front status, we've had a little over 60,000 hours of work completed on a Phase 1 with no accidents. On schedule, Phase 1 is scheduled for completion in September of 2026. Our contractor is performing very well. We have experienced good weather with lower water levels probably than average, and our contractor’s demonstrated a good capability of being able to manage water on the project sites. We're ahead of schedule right now.

Phase 2, the completion is still to be determined, dependent on the award of the contract. As I mentioned, we have a contract award scheduled for December of this year. On the financial status summary, Phase 1 of this is a firm fixed price contract so not a lot to gain on finances, but as far as productivity we have a schedule performance index of 1.5 percent. It's probably a little better than that now, we are approaching 50 percent completion, well ahead of schedule.

As I mentioned earlier, Phase 1 was design bid build, we do have the complete design now. We use our early work packages to start construction prior to having a complete design and that has helped us to gain an advantage on production on the project. The Phase 1 contract was $175,850,000. As mentioned earlier, we have exceeded the 902 limit, so we are completing the PACR. We have gone through the Change Control Board process and have an approved change.

The PACR will be complete in July of this year. As a part of the PACR we are updating a certified cost to FY 24 levels. We had an FY 23 certified cost, so we were good as far as the two-year time window but as part of the PACR we were directed to update it. It appears that that there has not been a significant change in that certified cost. It should be certified, hopefully, by tomorrow, though I don't have the final number yet. Phase 2 design bid build contract schedule for award in December 2024 because we received additional funding in February of 2024 and March of 2024 which I will provide further detail on here in a minute.

This is a general schedule update, we're in about a third of the way through the period of performance for the Phase 1 construction contract approaching 50 percent of the way through the actual work so we're performing well there. The other bullets there I believe I've covered. The funding summary, as I mentioned, we received money in February and in March.

In February at the end of the month the BIL spend plan was adjusted to move $82.95 million from the MKARNS 12-foot channel, or MKARNS deepening project, to Three Rivers. That would allow the project to award the second phase of the contract. We had expressed the capability this year of $103.17 million. In mid-March there was an earmark in the minibus appropriation that provided that $103.17 million split 65/35. As a result, we have more funding on the project than we had requested than we anticipate needing. You have also updated the BCR (Benefit/Cost Ratio), the total project first cost BCR is 2.2 and the remaining cost BCR is 4.7.

Some of the issues and challenges, from early on in the project; the Phase 1 contract award was much higher than was anticipated. The market conditions in the time were, I think, a large driver as well as some of the unique conditions of the project. This led us to update cost estimate and do the Post Authorization Change Report.

We had a protest on Phase 1 that delayed the project by five months. It was awarded in July of 2022, and the protest carried on until December of 2022. This protest, unfortunately, occurred in historically the driest period that area has seen in over 20 years. It would have been ideal construction time. We were concerned that we had lost the dry season, a construction season and so that five months could have caused a significant delay to the construction schedule. However, with current contractor performance, this challenge, the impact of this challenge has been reduced significantly. We don't think that will be a problem. We don't know what the future holds as far as weather, but we've made up ground on that.

We also have challenging site conditions going back to where this project area is fully submerged usually a couple of months annually. We have not had that for the last two years but going forward the remaining work to be done on the project, we are still subject to delays caused by flooding. It's always a possibility.

That concludes the information I have so I would be glad to answer any questions on the project.

MR. LANCE RASE: Yes, Mr. Gillip, thank you for your presentation. Lance Rase for the record.

On slide 4, we discussed this a little bit already, but I think it would be good to share some of your comments with the wider audience. For the Phase 2 award, that money was received in February and

it's showing a December award. Curious, we've seen other projects get awarded quicker than 10 months. Do you have any comments on that?

MR. GILLIP: Yes. Of course, the high value of the contract, there is certain requirements for the solicitation process, reviews that we have to go through and things. That factors in overall to our solicitation schedules. There're a few unique situations in the way the funding came in and some other requirements. The funding came in at a time where we would not have time to award using the same contract mechanism we used for Phase 1.

On Phase 1 we used the Border Infrastructure MATOC, that's a multi-award task order contract. We were awarded a task order on that and that provided a fairly expedited contract award. That MATOC expires in, I believe it's June. We wouldn't be able to award on that. We've changed the acquisition strategy to a full and open competition. We had to redo some of our contracting documents to do that. Additionally, before solicitation, our projects undergo a review. It's called a BCOES review to make sure that it's biddable, constructable, operable, meets environmental and sustainability requirements. That review had expired so we had to redo that.

Both the contract documents and the BCOES, as soon as we received word, even before we actually received the funding we started that process of updating, of making those updates, but it did take time. Another component that factors into the solicitation period is a new, at least new to us, requirement, I believe the requirement begin in January of this year for projects, Federal projects over $35 million to have a project labor agreement included in the project.

Arkansas has not been a strong union state in the past. We don't have a good basis for ourselves estimating a project labor agreement and then for contractors to establish the project labor agreement. We did some industry outreach and talked to some different contractors, and they indicated that they would essentially be starting from nothing in developing the project labor agreement. As a result, they need longer to prepare the solicitation. We have had to incorporate a longer proposal preparation time into the solicitation process to allow for that project labor agreement requirement.

Those things factor together give us a timeline. We are expediting things as much as possible. We are currently a little bit ahead of our schedule getting to solicitation and will continue to push to pull that date back, but that's a conservative estimate on the timeline.

MR. RASE: Thank you for that explanation. That January law was new information. Thank you.

Last question, on slide 6 and you have already addressed this, it says that $103 million is needed in fiscal 2024 to fund the project, the current project to completion, fiscal 2024 appropriations provided that $103 million. I don't mean to repeat what you already said, but the infrastructure package dollars of $82.9 million are still there.

With that being said, do I need to wait for new business to make a motion or let it rip any time or?

MR. CLOUSE: Yeah, you can go any time you want, Lance.

MR. RASE: Let's do the first motion of the day. I welcome discussion from the other Board Members after this, please.

The Board moves that the extra $82.9 million at the Three Rivers project be reallocated over to Kentucky Lock to ensure that project is efficiently funded to completion in Fiscal Year 2025.

MR. CLOUSE: I was going to ask for a second? Okay. We have a second from Mr. Woodruff. The motion carries and it will be entered into the record.

MR. RASE: Do we need a discussion about before we do that?

MR. CLOUSE: Yeah, I think we do. I got ahead of myself there, sorry. Let me make sure I got this right. You are making a move to use the extra $82.95 million from Three Rivers to reallocate to the Kentucky Lock to expedite completion?

MR. RASE: Yeah, to ensure the project is efficiently funded to completion in Fiscal Year 2025. I think we want to stay a little more specific in the motion.

MR. CLOUSE: To ensure project completion. I will get your written words here in a second. Anyway, we have a motion to reallocate Kentucky Lock funds -- excuse me, Three Rivers funds to Kentucky Lock. Can we get a vote on that? Or discussion?

MR. MURPHY: Spencer Murphy, thank you for making a motion. I appreciate the information. I mean, I think the motion is on the floor and fits with our ongoing discussion about being flexible and being efficient with our funding and getting projects completed where we can. Money sitting on the sideline that is not doing any good should be put to its highest, best use. I think this is kind of a no-brainer when you look at it from that perspective, particularly going to a project like Kentucky that we are trying very hard to push across the finish line. So, I fully support this motion.

MR. CLOUSE: Let's for the motion here, can we get a vote? All in favor?

ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CLOUSE: Anyone against? Now the motion carries. I put a note to myself to work on that.

MR. RASE: That's all I had. Thanks for the update.

MR. MURPHY: The PACR number, can we get that once it's available for Three Rivers?

MR. GILLIP: We can provide that once it is approved.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Jonathan. Next up we have Mr. Lopez who will be talking on Lock and Dam 25, the Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP).

Mr. JOSE LOPEZ: Good morning, or no, good afternoon. I'll get started. Good morning, Major General Graham, Chairman Murphy, Ms. Brown, Members of the Board, Federal Observers, colleagues, and members of the public. For the record, my name is Jose Lopez, and I am the Lock and Dam 25 project manager under the NESP authority. I will go ahead and get started. A lot of changes since we last met in this very room. Not only authority or the purpose. For the new Board Members all

touch base real quick on the purposes of the NESP program and particularly on the Nav side. It is to construct a new 1200-foot chambers along the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois waterways to primarily increase efficiency, reliability, redundancy, and safety of the inland waterways in that segment of the Upper Mississippi River.

Talking through where we are with the project right now. We are on schedule. We have had a design schedule for a June 2026 completion since we kicked in the project off back in FY 23. We've been on schedule since then. I'll dive in deeper into where we are actually at. If you all recall, we picked the project up from a 15 percent level of design.

That's how it existed back in 2010 when the project was kind of mothballed and stopped receiving investigations funds. We have been moving along to complete that design through this FY 26 date. I would say right now where at about a 50 percent design; our 65 percent milestone is coming up here in June. That's when we will start going through our different quality reviews for the design milestone.

Scheduled for completion of construction, I've got it as TBD, but I just want to be clear on something, the team's always been driving towards a 2034 day. That's based on our design schedule, and it's based on a very detailed construction schedule. Right now, our construction schedule is probably at a 75 percent level of detail and our intent here at the 65 percent level is to get that to a 100 percent level of detail.

What that means is that this construction schedule is the same type of construction schedule that a that a contractor would be using to build the project. That’s the contractor scheduled they would be using to submit pay requests to us and to execute the project. It has concrete lifts, crews, batch plant efficiencies built-in so there's a lot of engineering and science and assumptions that go into that. That 2034 date is kind of what we have been driving.

The reason we have TBD in there as has been discussed previously, and there's that many case studies on this is that its funding dependent. 2034 is assuming that we either have full funding or some mechanism for the most efficient funding. That's why we're saying it's highly dependent on funding streams. Mr. Tarpey talked through different scenarios in Capital Investment Strategy that obviously demonstrate that when you throttle funding your construction period goes wider or longer. That inevitably also carries costs, just time cost of money is going to add to your total project cost so just kind of putting that out there.

Speaking to costs more specifically now since we had been in the procurement process and had been a little bit more guarded with the sharing of that information, we last received our certified cost in June of 2023 and that's that $2.3 billion. That is at a 15 percent level of design, so that was a relatively immature design.

That does have a 59 percent level of contingency which is a sizable amount. As we progress the project and we passed our 35 percent milestone this past fall, we redid our cost estimate, and we are looking at more like $2.2 billion. More specifically I will say we look at our costs almost on a weekly basis. As the design is progressing our cost engineers are embedded with the design team looking at how -- the engineers went from red paint to blue paint, what does that costs in different? We are constantly doing that.

We do some more specific deep dives on the cost at these design milestones, 65 percent being one of them. That's coming up this summer and fall. We will have another current working estimate at the 65 percent level. Then, we intend to get that cost certified to stay within the two-year window. I am not making commitments because we still have to coordinate with our Center of Expertise for Cost [Mandatory Center of Expertise for Cost Engineering], but we're looking at trying to get a new certified costs for Lock and Dam 25 in the spring of 2025 to keep us within that two-year certified cost window.

One of the things to add though, is that both these costs that you see there, again assuming efficient or full funding. As Mr. Tarpey demonstrated with his slides once you throttle your funding that extends your construction periods, that means more escalation. That means more cost.

Part of our process and during these next few months is going to be how do we go about assuming our delivery method and structure for moving forward? Because we can always assume the baseline, which is full and efficient funding, but as you know, it is based on the history and the information that has been provided, that is not always the case.

I'll pause there for questions. Yeah, Mr. Webb?

MR. WEBB: Yes, this is Jeff Webb. Is there a material difference between construction completion date and operational date?

MR. LOPEZ: There is. We think that our current construction completion date is probably in the 2033 timeframe. Obviously, after that there's commissioning and so we're talking about those two things separately. Yeah, there is a difference there. That doesn't mean that once construction is complete there will be boat lockages, but it might be much more, it won't be like the highway is fully open. We're starting to take some of the orange cones out of the roadway and things like that to use an analogy.

MR. WEBB: Thank you.

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, sir. Next slide.

This slide has substantially changed. Because we have pivoted our delivery method. We went from an early contractor involvement type delivery method to a traditional design, bid, build delivery method. Ninety percent of Civil Works projects do design, bid, build delivery method so it is not an unusual method. It does create some levels of complexity, especially for our project as we have discussed many times before. We are building this project, the closest we could ever get it, to the existing channel. That has some implications and that kind of drives some of the schedule on the design side. But since we've shifted, we're always looking for ways to accelerate things to the left. What things can we get after where it makes sense. To that end one of the things that we accelerated was the bulkhead procurement. That was awarded in February 2024 that was about a $17.7 million contract and that's what's listed in yellow up here as a current contract.

I will highlight that the first contract, construction contract that was ever awarded on Lock 25 was that Phase 1 contract which essentially installed, and I've got some pictures in later slides, but it installed the floating mooring bits and different features on the river side of the I-wall to facilitate barges locking through. That contract was completed about three months ahead of schedule this past February as well.

I will highlight the other items. We've got some upcoming contracts that we've also decided to pull to the left. Again, where it makes sense and where the risk tradeoffs are measured, we are taking action and accelerating design, moving it to the left, separating it and going after it as a separate procurement. To that end we've got a downstream guide cell that's going to be constructed that's going to facilitate entrances into the 600-foot chamber during construction, and also entrances into the 600-foot chamber in the future when the 1200-foot is down for maintenance.

Same thing with some of our O&M facilities. Again, we're always looking and open to ideas of where to accelerate and where does it make sense.

MR. WEBB: The red and the purple up there, this is a big project, complicated and it's tight. Is there any of that that we could move to the left in your mind?

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah, that's a great question, sir. That is something that we are actively looking at right now. I will say that the purple, that's what you're referring to sir right here, the I-wall and the river wall, correct?

MR WEBB: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: I chuckled when Mr. Smith talked about physics problems. As the son of a former college physics professor that is exactly what it is that right there.

There're two components of that complicated physics problem. On the river wall were talking about a scour repair that occurred there in 2012. That scour repair is actually what's holding up the current 600-foot chamber. It's a buttress. That's what's keeping that 600-foot chamber stabilized. The way we move about designing this so that when our contractor gets in the water and is pulling, 5000-pound boulders out of the water, out of 60 feet of water. It's done in a way that we can make sure the risk to that existing structure is mitigated, that is a lot of science and thought and measured, deliberate discussion that needs to occur between the engineers. That's one component of the physics problem. From the design and construction side both the river wall and the I-wall are sort of the items that are in the critical path.

The second component is the I-wall. That physics problem is much more related to space. We need to have very deliberate discussions with the users as to how our construction contractor is going to impact you guys as you're trying to navigate and move through the 600-foot chamber. We've always been transparent that there is going to be some temporary pain and some shared pain to construct this project because of the proximity that we have.

We've already started those discussions with some of you on what is it going to look like when our contractor is out there? Is it a full closure paradigm or is this a with restrictions paradigm? Again, those are the two physics problems that are really driving the design durations for the purple items that you see there.

Now, the red, there may be more room to operate there. I will say though that because the walls, the purples are the critical path for construction even with full funding, accelerating the red isn't going to get you a sooner in service date because the amount of concrete that we're placing in the wet for all those purple boxes is significant, to the tune of about 50 Olympic size swimming pools worth of concrete.

Sorry for the long-winded answer.

The bottom-line-up-front status, safety wise we completed the first contract and we're green there on safety. On schedule, as you can see our scheduled performance index is at 1.02. We're actually a little bit higher than that because we finished Phase 1 ahead of schedule, we're actually overall ahead of schedule, I suspect that will go back down that 1 level.

On the cost side, we are a little bit under budget now, so our Phase 1 came in a little bit under. Our bulkhead award that we awarded in February also came in a little bit under and our design is burning a little bit cheaper than what we thought it would.

I don't necessarily want to rehash this because I think it has been discussed but we did in the canceling the ECI solicitation. One good thing that came out of that, and ECI is Early Contractor Involvement, is that at a 15 percent level of design we had a cost estimate. We were able to ask industry to give us their cost estimate and they did. It validated those total project costs.

I don't know that there is a lot of case histories of the Corps putting out a 15 percent set of plans and specs and having industry say yeah, we think it is going to cost you this to the penny. Silver lining overall, it did kind of validate and sort of calibrate our compass from a cost estimating standpoint as we move forward. That was very specific to Lock 25. That wasn't a general inland nav projects, that's what is it going to cost to build Lock and Dam 25.

MR. WEBB: Just so I understand, Early Contractor Involvement, those costs were roughly $2 plus billion. We've talked in the past about a 1200-foot chamber, $1.5 billion so this is significantly over.

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah. One quick clarification, and I'm not even the most well versed on this. But that $1.5 billion that Mr. Tarpey talked about, I mean he highlighted in their as a first cost. That's cost right now in today's dollars. When we received bids that was for the project that had a six-year construction duration and that was the contractor saying we think material pricing is going to be way five years from now, et cetera, et cetera. It was more of a fully funded cost, and so just a nuance there.

I just want to kind of highlight another couple of things. Because we are still in design, we are looking through our acquisition plan right now. Because we have to get a new acquisition plan done. Because of the magnitude of this contract just like the previous presenter talked about, this is going to go through the highest levels of review at the agency level. This is what we call an HCA level review, or Head of Contracting review. We have already started that coordination through the vertical chain on the contracting side to make sure that we're not off the rails on what we're thinking.

Obviously, the sort of next default for us is a base plus options is how most of the projects have been executed from a contract structure. I will say there are a lot of risks with that particularly in our situation because if we do a base plus options, our optional items are probably going to be two thirds of the contract value. That has a lot of risk that gets baked into it, and it is something that the contracting community is not hugely in favor of, for good reason.

We are entertaining the thoughts of using an indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity, single award task order type contract. That would give us a lot of flexibility to receive varying degrees of funding,

whereas a base plus options basically constrains us that because we say the base is this much, pre-price it. The options are this much, pre-price it.

We have to exercise in those in a very tight window at a very specific amount so that other contract structure that I mentioned gives us a lot more flexibility to say here's the base pricing and we receive X number of dollars so here is another task order. We receive X plus, whatever, and here's another task order. Those are things were thinking about.

We are going to go to industry, the construction industry and talk to them about this and see what they think and where they believe there is a better methodology to be used. The third methodology would be just multiple contracts. That kind of speaks for itself. We would just carve it up and solicit it that way in chunks.

Real quick, current project status, we completed the 35 percent design. There's a typo there that says fall 2022, it was fall of 2033, or sorry, 2023. We are in the 65 percent phase. The other two things that I want to highlight is we have started the real estate acquisition process. We need significant real estate to build this project because the site is constrained.

Most of that real estate is for temporary access for the contractor. We have started doing title work, boundary surveys and all those other things that are going to be needed for the contractor to get onsite and be able to move out. All those things are going on. Same thing with our NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) work. We do have to do a supplemental environmental assessment and we want to make sure we're all copacetic on that front.

Pending questions, I'll move on.

MR. JEFFERY WILSON: One question. For the design phase, I think you mentioned 2026. Just for my clarity, is that the end of 2026 or when does that kind of --

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah. Our current milestone that we benchmarked, or locked in, to put it another way, in November 2022 is June 2026.

MR. WILSON: Thank you.

MR. LOPEZ: You're welcome. That's what's in our systems, our Primavera scheduling systems.

Again, this slide is very different than the last time because we have switched our delivery methods and because we have tried to pull to the left and continue to pull things to the left that we can. You're starting to see more stratification, more phasing, we will do a better job for next IWUB slide to break this out even further, so the level of detail is seen. But essentially, what we're looking at is in blue. Things that we'll probably be able to complete with the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funds. Then, in red are the needed funds. I'll have an image here that kind of breaks it down into parts and pieces.

Complicated image here but I just wanted to show this is what we would do if we broke out the project into base and options. In the green, the bright green, that is basically what the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funds will buy us. We will get a batch plant set up and we will get the river wall built probably substantially past the scour repair area so that we are in a stable and sort of safe environment. That is

what you see this kind of green blob at the top here is the stabilization rock that is being moved to the side.

After that, the different colors are just denoting the different optional items that would need to be exercised at the appropriate time with the appropriate amount to meet that 2034 in-service date.

This still keeps us in that $2.3 billion range. This second image where the funding gets throttled and the duration is extended, as you can see it is way more carved up. There're more colors, there's more options and this is pushing $3 billion that is just time cost of money. That doesn't account for any baked in risk that a contractor may put in because there's 12 optional items. Again, just to demonstrate what extending and compressing does to total project cost just from a time cost of money standpoint.

MR. WEBB: Your completion date would be --

MR. LOPEZ: This is 2040. Yeah, I believe it is 2040. It's kind of small. I apologize for that.

MR. WEBB: Was just unpacking that a little bit. You're talking the difference between efficient and inefficient funding --

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah.

MR. WEBB: -- is roughly $700 million and six plus years additional?

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah. I mean that is what it is. I think this isn't just ethereal or theoretical, we've experienced this in real life. There's a lot of case histories that speak to this being how it works. The funding is throttled.

This slide really is just kind of summarizing the previous one. I will highlight the two scenarios here more clearly stated. We kind of edited list of the cause this is an outright capability. That's what capability could be. But just to kind of restate what that funding battle rhythm would need to be to meet either of those scenarios.

Marty Hettel?

MR. HETTEL: Jose, Marty Hettel here. A question for you, in your previous slide showed the BIL funding of $732 million through October of 2028. Help me understand why you're asking for more funding in 2027, $120 million. Is that to issued contracts? Why do you need more funding if you've got funding through October of 2028?

MR. LOPEZ: That's a really good question, Marty. When the design is complete, we can express capability for more than what we have because the design will be complete. The world will be our oyster, so to speak, with regards to what we can advance. The soonest would be 2027, and then '28, '29, and '30. That's why we're showing that battle rhythm of funds, whether or not that aligns with the trust fund balances or whatever other scenarios, that's to be determined.

As the discussion was occurring earlier, the scenarios in the CIS are broad enough where there's some ability to adapt so to speak.

I know I have eaten up some good amount of time here and I know Andrew needs to speak to us, so the rest of the slides are somewhat self-explanatory. I do want to show some images of the Phase 1 construction complete, and then this is not our bulkheads but just to show what a bulkhead is, we did award a contract for $17.7 million to fabricate these bulkheads that will be used to facilitate lock construction. I know there's a lot of questions.

MR. MURPHY: A quick question, or a comment. If you go back to the slide 8, I just want to say thank you for the breakout of the scenario funding. That's exactly what we have been asking for and that's what we need when we go to Congress to say look, this is the impact that funding will have if we do this versus that. That's really helpful.

I appreciate that and would encourage the Corps to repeat that with other projects because that's where we can go to Congress and give them real information based on what you are seeing in real time. It's not just a guess, is based on something concrete, so anyway that's really helpful. Thank you.

MR. LOPEZ: You're welcome, sir.

MR. JUDD: One question, I guess, just with your comments about moving away from the ECI. As we have looked back at the briefs over the last year or so on this project you guys have kind of consistently highlighted that this is one that's got significant risks relative to the other projects. I guess if we go to the CIS presentation and if we were to find ourselves in a world where we do get the BIL projects funded federally to completion from an execution risk standpoint would we consider going back to ECI or has that ship kind of sailed? Just how do you think about the trade-off were making there on.

MR. LOPEZ: I thought you were going to ask a different question, sir, but that's a good one. Unfortunately, the ship has sailed on ECI. We are going to be at 65 percent design here this summer, fall. The ECI paradigm only works if the contractor has enough time to really provide us input so that we can enhance the design and so that they can share in those savings. That's what the ECI IDaC (Integrated Design and Construction) mechanism is intended to do is to control costs. Unfortunately, that has sailed. We had to cancel the solicitation just because we had to be fair to the bidders that had bid on the job, and we knew that the tea leaves were already sort is not great for incremental funding and things like that. We needed to kind of let them know.

I do want to pull on a thread that you mentioned as far as risk and not using ECI. Because we're not doing ECI, we are doing some other things to try and mitigate those risks. Primarily, what we're doing is we're starting to engage with the users at RIAC (River Industry Action Committee) levels and above a little bit more deliberately about that coordination and what closures going to look like? Is it with restrictions? Is it a little bit of both?

Because one of the benefits of that we were going to extract from IDaC is having the contractor in the room to listen to those discussions and help inform better sequencing. We are going to have to take that onus somewhat more.

The other thing that we're doing is that we're leveraging the Engineering Research and Design Center and we're actually also leveraging the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to support us on some of the concrete mix design efforts that are somewhat complex to this project because of the in the wet methodology.

That was something that our IDaC contractor was going to help us out a little bit with since we pivoted from that, we are attacking it a different way but trying to still buy that expertise.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Jose, thanks for laying that out that.
MR. LOPEZ: You're welcome, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Let's go back a slide. Back one more. Slide 6 is best case; is that right?

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah. Right, next best case.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: That's where we're at?

MR. LOPEZ: Correct, yes. I'm sorry, yes sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: This is a base plus options?

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Okay. Let's look at those funding scenarios in those years.

MR. LOPEZ: Slide 8 shows them a little bit more clearly.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Yeah, just bear with me.

MR. LOPEZ: Sorry.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: It's helpful for me to look at pictures.

MR. LOPEZ: You're the boss, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Thank you. The size of the amount of money we're going to need laid out on those years, the biggest lift there somewhere around $400 million, almost $500 [million].

Michael, with a Capital Investment Strategy because what would we have ongoing in these years? We've got Montgomery. We've got this, Kentucky will be done, Chick will be done. Right now, two projects feeding off of this. We heard from Tracy [Zea] that a $400-ish [million] is probably as high as we are going to get, generally. There's a whole bunch of permutations in here, I get it. But I'm just trying to do a little Kentucky windage here to see if this is achievable.

Can anybody in the audience see that this is not achievable? Jen [Armstrong]?

MS. JENNIFER ARMSTRONG: Yes sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: You're good, you think this is achievable? Because I don't want to sell the Board anything that we aren't going to deliver. Because as the Board Chair has said we want

efficiency and were already at, best case scenario here this is $2.2 billion, it's $2.3 [billion]. It's going to take us how many years, 11? We're going to finish this thing in 2033.

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: And we started it in 2021?

MR. LOPEZ: We received BIL funding in ‘22 and kicked the project off in October of ‘23.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: We will start the clock at 2022.

MR. LOPEZ: Sounds good.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: That is 11 years. Board Members, so $2.3 billion, 11 years. That's not eight years and a billion-five, as we kind of did when we laid out some of the scenarios.

To the Board Members, I don't know how to do this any cheaper or any faster. We had some ideas, we're still going to see if we can tap into some of the more innovative construction techniques that are out there, but right now were struggling to gain access to those. That's the efficient funding scenario and the big dark blue blob of -- I'm trying to find the right word here -- the big dark blue blob of hard because that is going to impact you all because we're back in the chamber. Anybody got any thoughts? Anything we're missing on how to do this under $2.3 billion and under 11 years?

MR. MURPHY: General, no. I mean, certainly we are relying on y'all to provide us with your best information in your best plans on how to do it efficiently. What we are asking for is what you are giving us here is tell us what that is in real time so that we can then communicate that to Congress. If we need to make change and make a change.

Bad news doesn't get better with time, it only gets worse. We would all love to see a lower price tag and a shorter timeline. I am confident that you all will continue to try to achieve that. But in the meantime, we just need to know what your best thinking is so that we can all be pushing on the – in the same direction with the same information. If that's what it is, then we’ll go do it. But we just need to know. Where we get into trouble is two or three years go by without an update and we get this Christmas morning surprise that says oh, by the way, it's actually $3 billion now and it's the 2050 before we know it. That's what we're trying to avoid.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Given Michael's [presentation], you get to come back up to the [podium].

MR. TARPEY: I thought if I left --

MR. MURPHY: Yeah, I know. I know. I thought Jose was going to tackle you for a minute.

Can we start a third lock? We've got Montgomery [Lock] going on, we've got [Lock] 25 going on. We heard kind of some of these big draws, Pittsburgh [District] is going to get up here in a minute and they are going to talk about Montgomery. Is it feasible for us to start construction of a third 1200-foot or a third lock and for us to be able to fund this efficiently?

MR. TARPEY: No.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. TARPEY: Okay, I'm sorry. My clarification, the three ongoing mega projects simultaneously, that's what I interpreted you to mean, sir?

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: You got it right. Can we do three simultaneously? When we are drawing major construction money? On that top right chart where those green bars are drawn and were trying to get efficient options which mean big dollars because it frustrates the heck out of me when I'm building the maintenance sheds which are the least important things and that's the first thing I'm building.

Or the emergency bulkheads that hopefully we won't need for 20 years, 30 years. Right? How about we build the lock? This is kind of what we are forced into doing. It is not unwise what they are doing. But I'm just trying to make this somewhat simplistic. Mr. Smith's point is, it's not too simplistic, you got to look at the Capital Investment Strategy, absolutely acknowledge.

But generally, it's problematic to get efficient funding if we've got three locks going on at the same time.

MR. TARPEY: Correct. If we take a look at that $1.5 billion is a first cost of a lock, so you don't have inflation. If we had three of those projects going on simultaneously, we're looking at $4.5 billion worth of construction and if we get the expanded funding that Tracy and others believe. Let's just say it's that $500 million.

We can't fund it, you just break the math down. It's going to take us longer than we have time and so that's where I think the two lock solution looks, as we look through all this and balancing it out one in the beginning of construction, one's in the tail it looks like that's kind of a reasonable spot we can get to.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. TARPEY: We have an expert team from the Corps, all our people there trying to look at this. It just kind of breaks down, we've got to be careful where we are and what can be funded in the current environment.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: We'll go to Tom in just a minute here. We're trying to get into that virtuous cycle where we finish stuff. Then, ideally that builds upon itself. We just have to be careful here that particularly the land of community funded projects is that there's going to be great appetite for ribbon cuttings, or in starting groundbreakings. We just need the discipline, but that needs to be colored by what we really can do. Tom?

MR. SMITH: Well, Tom Smith here. General Graham, I mean, I think I'm fully in sync with you. I just wanted to say a couple of other things. What we also don't want to do though is think that we see the future with such clarity that if there's an infrastructure bill in five years, we don't have any design

work done and we come into where we're sitting here at the time with a 2019 design that we have to use to fund something and just be sitting there because we never thought we could do two.

They're going to end up being staggered in some fashion. If you look at the number of locks we can work at, literally simultaneously, I'm not disputing it, but there's going to be some sequencing there, so I just want to make sure we don't -- because what you say influences a lot of folks in here. I just don't want to get so fixed on it that we -- General Graham said, we'll only do two. We're not prepared for –

(Crosstalk)

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: He doesn't listen to me at all. He never does.

MR. MURPHY: We're already doing several, multiple mega projects right now. We're not doing it the way we would draw it up but it's happening.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: I just wanted to add this very broad macro scale conversation with you all is that is as Michael starts putting the next iteration of the Capital Investment Strategy and I understand that it's a prioritization document. But there are some things that can help shape what we think our investment decisions, so maybe just some rules of thumb.

Two constructions ongoing at a time and we want to have two designs on the shelf so that we can be opportunistic. I just made all that up. But that might be some good rules of thumb that we start to look at. I think, Tom, your sound counsel there that we should be opportunistic when there's episodic funding arrives, when the Nation has the collective will to invest in large infrastructure projects. That is our history. It's episodic and we should be opportunistic, and we can do that if we have mature designs on the shelf and we maintain those cost estimates updated.

Our doctrine says if we have a plan on the shelf, we should update those costs every two years. That's what we're trying to get towards. As you're thinking through the Capital Investment Strategy and we start pushing it out to you this summer, I think if we look at it with those lenses, what can we construct at any one time.

Then, what designs we should have on the shelf at one time, and we'll continue to try to work some thoughts to you on can we get these costs lower by being more innovative with construction. We tried it in this case with Jose, and it didn't work out. That cost us what? A year?

Mr. LOPEZ: Yes, sir, a year. Basically, tacked on acquisition to the end of our design period as opposed to it occurring in parallel.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: There's risks associated with this. We lost a year. That's my responsibility. Anybody got any thoughts on this?

MR. JUDD: General, Damon Judd. I guess one of the things I think we've got to all be focused on though is that if we find ourselves pace of, let's say two locks every 10 years, the debaculous situation is not going to be an anomaly. I don't know if there's work that we can do in connection with the CIS to kind of look at from a resiliency standpoint for the value of the nation, if that is the pace, what happens to the tail risk based on the age of the portfolio when we actually get to the rest of the portfolio? That's

the part of this that from my seat it's just very concerning in terms of -- and I don't have the answer on where we solve that in how we solve that, but you just look at the age of the infrastructure.

I think we're kind of walking down a path that leads to failure, not success we can only handle two things at a time. Again, we've got to work within what we have the funding constraints, the program as it is designed but as we kind of stepped back and really look at the next 30 years for the country I think the Corps and this Board have kind of a duty to kind of think about what do we really need to think about trying to accomplish and is there a path? Is there creativity we can apply to what that looks like?

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Somewhere we need to add capacity and safety. Which is what we're doing here.

MR. WOODRUFF: I just want to add on to what was just said. This is Matt Woodruff. When we started the capital development plan process and getting back 15 years ago, we said 20 years and we thought well, 20 years gives us this horizon that we can be on top of everything that could possibly go wrong. If we're looking out 20 years, we can react to conditions that are going bad at a particular project, and I think what we're hearing is if you're looking at 20 years down the road and you are only looking at three or four projects.

I hate to throw this out because it's going to be daunting, but we probably need to be looking more than 20 years down the road. We really need to be looking at how do we maintain a reliable system in perpetuity? Is there a train wreck coming? Where is the train wreck and when will we get there? Because as somebody said earlier, bad news doesn't get better with time.

If there is bad news on the horizon and I intuitively think that there is, we need to figure out when we're going to get there so that we have at least an opportunity to try to prevent it. To go back to what I view as the shorter-term issue, does it make sense if were working on two projects to have two on the shelf? I think absolutely.

I think history has shown us that opportunities present themselves, that big chunks of money show up from time to time and being shovel ready makes a difference. It gives you the opportunity that you might not otherwise have, and it allows us the opportunity to compete for some of those funds.

But I think really when the Nation spends that money it's because the Nation needs results. I think that's the problem we've had is that too many groundbreakings and not enough ribbon-cuttings. I think what we need to look at when we're prioritizing is not just how much it's going to cost but when can it be finished. Some of these projects that we've invested in with the infrastructure money will not achieve the intended purpose of the infrastructure bill.

The infrastructure bill was designed to put people to work and create benefits for the nation to help our economy. Well, we're spending some of that money over an extended period of time which really wasn't, I think, the goal. But we are not going to be seeing a lot of the benefits of that for a decade or more and that certainly wasn't the way that project or that bill was sold. I think we've got to figure out how we get the benefits faster.

Two things. Yes, to your idea of being ready, being flexible, but also, we maybe need to take a sober look longer down the road. The whole system. If you're operating a system in perpetuity, I think one of

the questions we sort of know how long a barge lasts and when you're going to do major rehabilitation on a barge, and then when you're going to retire it. I think the good news is that some of the structures are lasting a whole lot longer than maybe anybody thought they would when they were built. Just because they are lasting a whole lot longer doesn't mean that will last forever. You go to Italy, and you see aqueducts that have been there a thousand years and you think that's pretty cool. How many of our locks are going to last a thousand years? I don't know. But we need to figure that out, I'm not an engineer, I can't figure that out, but you guys are the smart engineers and probably we need to try to figure that out.

MR. MURPHY: Just add to that point, the longer-term, the trust fund dollars coming in are not going to support $2.5 [billion] or $3 billion 1200-foot chambers, multiple projects. Just the math won't work. Our industry is not going to grow to the point that we are putting out additional funds in, particularly as we are putting more efficient and greener towboats on the water so there is going to be less fuel burned so you going to have a similar problem that the highways have which is EVs aren't paying their fair share because of no fuel tax. I think these projects will absolutely require massive occasional influxes of cash from the Treasury because that is just how it's going to have to be, or we don't do them, so I think being prepared for those days when they come is absolutely the right thing to do.

I think as a Board we are not the engineers. We are here to kind of help you guys look maybe a little bit above the horizon and think about that. I would definitely encourage the Board to continue thinking about not just what can we do with the current pot of money that is in front of me, but what could I do? Then, will help you figure out the money afterwards.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Thanks for that discussion, Jose.

MR. CLOUSE: A very good discussion. Thank you, Jose.

MR. LOPEZ: I can't take full credit for that, sir. Thank you.

MR. CLOUSE: Next up is Mr. Goodall. He will be talking about LaGrange Lock.

MR. GOODALL: Good afternoon General Graham, Chairman Murphy, Ms. Brown, Members of the Board and Federal Observers. Great to see you all again. Andrew Goodall for the record, the NESP program manager. Thanks Jose, great briefing. Great rundown of the current status for Lock 25.

What I will go into today is following up a little bit on the conversation we just had from a big picture standpoint. LaGrange, just a very quick overview for the new Board Members. LaGrange, a new 1200-foot lock is the second of seven NESP authorized locks on the priority list. Over the last two years the project has been funded for design completion through Congressionally directed spending in FY 22 and FY 23. That project is under contract for 100 percent design, and I will go into some details on that here shortly. The same overall goals as Lock 25 with a new 1200-foot chamber to add operational redundancy, add reliability at the site. Ultimately, provide that opportunity for future enhance transportation network at the site.

Schedule, and again I will go into this in a little more detail on future slides, but it ties into the conversation we just had. The design was fully funded. We've been executing those funds to advance not only the big design for the new 1200-foot lock but also some interim packages in advance of having

that full design completed. The first interim package is machinery fabrication, which we anticipate will take five years approximately and we do anticipate awarding that machinery fabrication contract by the end of this fiscal year, so September 2024. The funding we would utilize for that is funding we just received in Fiscal Year 2024, Congressionally directed spending for the project. That is approximately a $40 million cost for that machinery fabrication contract.

Overall cost for the LaGrange project, we started initially developing the comprehensive cost estimate in March of 2024. As the design goes it is nearing a 35 percent design level. That certified cost will be completed along with that 35 percent design level and will stay within that two-year certified cost window. Not mentioned specifically here but we do anticipate that certified cost will be completed by the end of this calendar year.

Just a very brief overview of scope. Again, since the design has progressed further in the last six months since the last Board meeting, a little more detail to show here on the project and the associated sequencing. Really the only thing in yellow which is a current contract is that machinery fabrication and that's all off-site fabrication. It does not require any land acquisition. That is all done by a third-party fabricator contractor and will be stored offsite. We have started to break the project down into potential phases for construction and that is purely based off of what is best for the project at this time and will continue to be refined when it comes to funding limitations. Ultimately, we will get in line with the Capital Investment Strategy as that is finalized and will adjust accordingly for the project.

Current bottom line up front and status and dashboard. We did here recently in February test the physical model down at ERDC, or Engineer Research and Development Center in Vicksburg and we did actually have some modifications as a result of coordination with IRCA, or Illinois River Carriers Association and we were able to make those adjustments. That's the reason we do those visits is to make those adjustments long before construction.

Design status, we are nearing the 35 percent design level and then we do have final design scheduled to be complete by September 2025. That is under contract with an architect engineer firm who is specifically doing that for us. Then, as I already mentioned, the machinery fabrication contract. But more specifically, what that includes is miter gates, miter gate operating machinery, tainter valves, culvert valves, bulkheads and then all the associated operating machinery for those culvert valves as well.

Current funding summary. The project, just briefly because this is the first time we've shown this for LaGrange and the project continues to develop further. Prior to FY 22 the project received very little funding before the NESP construction new start. That was just the feasibility level design. Since then, the project has received the $20 million as shown here in FY 22, the $49.3 million in FY 23, the $40 million here in FY 24 for a total today of $111 million. We have not developed the full scenarios with the funding outlay at this point because we don't have that certified cost. When we have that certified cost, we will further develop that part. However, we did show $100 million in FY 25. That is the second contract at LaGrange. That would be cofferdam construction and potentially additional site development. There's a caveat there again is there's a capability expressed for LaGrange and some additional items that that I will go into in detail here shortly.

I will pause there, and I will go back and kind of sit on this slide. If there any questions on LaGrange specifically as it fits into that conversation, we just previously had or anything else on the project.

MR. WEBB: How are you coming on the land acquisition? Can you explain that a little bit?

MR. GOODALL: Yes, Jeff, sure. Land acquisition, we have continued to advance with the funds we have on hand. I anticipate all land acquisition will be complete by next summer, the summer of 2025. The primary reason for that is there is one parcel in particular that we have had issues getting onto because of some property owner concerns.

Moving down the next steps, the necessary process to work through the historic property identification on the site and other associated NEPA specific criteria there. We don't anticipate it being a problem moving forward. It's just challenging to get on the site because it's a multiple family and ownership specifically.

But we are on track for land acquisition in calendar year 2025.

Yes, sir?

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Andrew, reading back what you just told me, in September of this year we are going to start construction of LaGrange?

MR. GOODALL: Sir, we're going to start machinery fabrication.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Oh, yeah.

MR. GOODALL: Yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Going to start construction of LaGrange.

MR. GOODALL: Yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Right?

MR. GOODALL: Yes, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Okay, now we've got three locks we're building at once which we just said we didn't want to do that because we don't think there is enough money to efficiently do it. Why are we doing this?

MR. GOODALL: Sir, we are advancing it as Congressionally directed spending for the project. I know I've heard the conversation here today, and that's the reason we've been continuing to advance it, sir.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: We're going to turn it over to the Board, right? In September we are going to start building three locks at once. We're not going to be able to do that efficiently is what the analysis we just heard before.

MR. WOODRUFF: It's Matt Woodruff. In my view it doesn't make sense. It's just going down the same pathway that we've been saying for 15 years we need to stop going down.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Matt, do we have to add capacity to LaGrange, absolutely. Right?

MR. WOODRUFF: Lots of places.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Lots of places. The conversation you had; this is where we get ourselves into a trick box is if we can build more that's a good thing. As if you just said there are lots of places here we need to add capacity or build, replace something that's worn out. The fiscal realities as we just heard from Tracy is that you probably can only afford to do two of these at once. We either need to throttle back LaGrange, or we need to get more funds to change Tracy's calculus to be able to do three of these at once.

But to start three and not get more funding that can keep up with it we're going to go back to it's going to take us 25 years to inefficiently deliver this, and we would have solved nothing. We're on the same trajectory we're on right now. I don't have any solutions to this. I would be really interested in what the Board has to say.

MR. WOODRUFF: I've said what I think.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Thanks.

MR. GOODALL: Yes sir, you're welcome.

A couple of other smaller items that I was asked to include on the presentation this time around as well is also funding received here in Fiscal Year 2024 as part of the Congressionally directed spending. There were mooring facilities authorized in the program, eight total. We continue to advance design of those cells. It was previously funded in design in Fiscal Year 2022. Those are very short-term projects, and they are fully funded with the FY 24 appropriations. We anticipate each one of those cells taking one year in construction and will be completed and immediately available for use. The list here, you see at locks 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 20 and 22 on the Mississippi were determined to be the industry priorities. That's the reason they were advanced. We had a meeting as mentioned here back in 2021 to establish those priorities and have advanced them since. We do anticipate the design being complete here in the summer, June timeframe, and then we will award those construction contracts in Fiscal Year 2024 and continue to advance them accordingly anticipating that they will be done within a year of when they start.

The next slide just shows those more graphically, specific locations to tie into the legend and a specific outline of the slides of where they are located, with the one at Lock 14 nearly complete here, again within that one-year construction window. That was funded two years ago and went through design and into construction. It will be available for industry use here later this summer.

Last, but not least, the NESP program is very vast and very large. There are some additional capabilities the program has. I understand that the capabilities might be determined for us in a lot of ways, but we do have some capabilities starting in Fiscal Year 2025, again purely from a program standpoint to continue to advance other things as determined by its priorities. That could include -- we are required to do systemic mitigation for the program which is future work to ensure that we offset any impacts for the new 1200-foot locks. In addition, we could advance switchboats depending on

additional discussions. Kind of a moot point maybe with the discussion we've had today, but we could also advance site investigation work at additional locks to get a little better information on the cost.

As Michael Tarpey said during his presentation, the next new lock A, B, or C could potentially be informed some of that information.

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: I don't think I've been paying attention before, but when I read through the prebrief, the switchboats caught my attention because I'm not really familiar with that. Can you explain what switchboats are?

MR. GOODALL: Yes, sir. Absolutely, sir. They were developed during feasibility and the general idea of a switchboat is instead of -- so during construction at the Mississippi River locks, and Lock 25 is an example, if you do have a width restriction or some type of impediment for industry we would contract towboats to help industry extract their cuts more efficiently during construction either upstream or downstream, don't have to wait for the kevel rail system or gravity, if you will, to provide that efficiency is specifically during construction of those projects. Yes, sir?

MR. CLOUSE: Anybody have thoughts or questions for Andrew? Hearing none, thank you, Andrew.

MR. GOODALL: Thanks.

MR. CLOUSE: We are a little bit behind right now.

COLONEL JESS CURRY: Thank you. Colonel Jess Curry. General Graham, and Chairman Murphy, I would like to come over top with one additional point. As part of all the briefings today, I always want to provide an additional point on the Inland Navigation Design Center (INDC). We talked here, I think the complexity of these programs, these projects are significant as we just discovered.

We're reminded of as we talked through the Capital Investment Strategy and these particular projects which are between Jose and Andrew the additional complexity of having them bound into a program like NESP that creates another responsibility as we look at those seven locks it makes this more and more complex.

But I did want to just mention the Inland Navigation Design Center as we look to address or mitigate where we can a lot of what has been discussed with respect to risks for cost and schedule. The Inland Navigation Design Center for the new Board Members, is really the Corps of Engineers' Center of Expertise for exactly -- the hint is in the title, inland navigation design. It brings together the best that the Corps has in that discipline which is the best in the world.

I mean ultimately as they look to, not only embed tech leads and engineers within those design teams, we have one in here in Bryan (Dirks) for Lock 25, but also work to identify innovation in other areas of commonality that in the long run can deliver cost savings, can deliver greater resiliency.

The comment that was made earlier, Lenna Hawkins, the Director of the INDC, the next time I talk to her and say hey, a challenge to the INDC, how can we design a lock that we can show how it's going to last 1,000 years, to that earlier comment. Her response will be, at least, maybe aggressive and go back towards me and at least entertaining for those that are watching when she puts me in my place.

Again, I think that is part of the responsibility that the INDC has for the Corps of Engineers and ultimately for everything we're discussing today. I didn't want to move beyond the NESP topics without -- and really for our opportunity from Rock Island District and the Mississippi Valley Division to highlight the INDC in this forum once again.

Sir, that was all. Thank you.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Colonel Curry. That was very relevant to our discussion. Thank you. Next up is Mr. Fritz. To give us an update on the Upper Ohio and Lower Mon.

MR. STEPHEN FRITZ: Thank you. General Graham, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Brown, Board Members, Observers, and everybody else, thanks again for letting me talk at the Board here. Let me see if I can get this thing set. I'll try to hit just the high points so that we can get back on track here. I know there's some new Board Members. Essentially Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4 are the Lower Mon project, recapitalizing at three facilities. One of those recapitalizations is removing Lock and Dam 3, two new locks are authorized at Charleroi, a gated dam at Braddock to replace the fixed crest dam. There's some other work as well like extending the stilling basin and some relocations work, and some dredging.

Project safety. We had struggled there a little bit. We're back on track again. We had some injuries back in 2022 and 2023. The contractor now is winding down, but we are still focused on safety, so the safety has gotten much better, so we are improving. When you do the metrics, it still comes out in the yellow category. But we haven't had any injuries this year, so we are moving well at the Lower Mon site.

Project schedule. The project operational date will still remain the same, December of 2024. We did have some significant flooding just last week, so we are assessing that damage to determine whether or not there is any chance of impacting that date. But right now, it looks like things are still moving towards December of 2024.

FY 24 appropriations, we got $41 million, a big-ticket item for that is to make sure we get that land chamber at Charleroi closed so that's going to be closed to navigation, but it is still going to be operable to help us remove drift from the upstream approach, and I will show you what that is like in a couple of minutes.

Cost update is a big thing were working on right now. We expect that is going to Walla Walla (the Mandatory Center of Expertise for Cost Engineering) this week. We've been trying to capture all those ankle biter things like at the end it's almost like a project punch list to make sure we got all of those things captured so that we don't miss anything. I'll talk a bit more about that in a minute. The big risks I want to talk about are dredging and some scour that we have noticed at Braddock.

Out at Charleroi right now we're doing what they call the functional integrated system testing. That's taking a little bit longer than we did anticipate. We thought that was going to take about a month to get that done, we are now about three-and-a-half months into that, and we are still working on the systems to make sure that when you push a button in that control tower it doesn't flush the toilet in the operations room. Making sure those things are working. I know that's a little facetious, but we're making sure it works right before we get moving on it.

We're capturing the lessons learned with that and the INDC is capturing the lessons learned with that, so we are sure that other projects that are coming online are using all of this newfangled technology and that they incorporate that into their schedule, so it doesn't hit them in the backside when they start pushing those buttons.

The substantial completion date for this contract, it's highlighted there, in June 2024. We're actually going to extend the substantial completion date for the project into 2025. There is some work in the filling gallery, we're going to rewind some motors up there to ensure long term efficiency and long term longevity of those motors so that if those racks that lift where the valves go up and down, if those start getting corroded a little bit, we were a little concerned that those motors might be undersized so we are beefing the size of those up so that we get that 100 years or 1000 years out of the project.

At Lock and Dam 3 the removal there, the breach is still scheduled for the week of July 8th. That could be influenced a little bit by this of flooding that we had but we think we got it -- we think we are okay. We have to still hold that. When we do that, as soon breach that dam that week of July 8th there is going to be a three to 12 day navigation closure until those pools stabilize a little bit. Once they stabilize then all traffic is going to be using the land chamber out there to navigate until the dam is completely removed and the navigation channel is certified that it is open. At that point, all traffic will just go through that navigable pass with the dam used to be.

We are planning another navigation stakeholder meeting. That will be on May 16th. There will be an announcement going out about that shortly. We had one in October of 2022, one in December of 2023, and we're going to engage again in May of this year. That same day, later in the day we'll be engaging the local communities again, like we did back in December to make sure they are prepared for those pool changes.

The fish reefs. Our environmental mitigation for the fish reefs. We were notified back in February, the Coast Guard notified us that these fish reefs are a hazard to navigation. They are not anywhere near the navigation channel but because they do stick up above the bottom of the riverbed there was some people that voiced concerns about those, mostly recreational boaters. These are adjacent to the banks. They are in a low wake zone or a no wake zone, but the Coast Guard notified us about this, so we are in the process right now of modifying that fish reef contract to put buoys out there temporarily. Long-term solution we don't know what that's going to be yet. We don't know if it's going to be signage or if it's going to be buoys. But we are evaluating that.

That's about all on this particular slide unless there's questions.

MR. HETTEL: Steve, Marty here. You left that door open.

MR. FRITZ: I should have kept talking. Go ahead, Marty.

MR. HETTEL: You have funding for removal of Lock and Dam 3, right? The dam and the lock?

MR. FRITZ: Say the question again, please?

MR. HETTEL: You already have contracted removal of Lock and Dam 3?

MR. FRITZ: That's correct.

MR. HETTEL: Okay. You have $41 million appropriated for the land chamber decommissioning?

MR. FRITZ: That's not all for the land chamber, that's a big chunk of it, yes sir.

MR. HETTEL: Okay. What are the cost estimates are you doing?

MR. FRITZ: We have all the relocations have to finish up yet. We have to --

MR. HETTEL: Relocations of what?

MR. FRITZ: Relocation of municipal facilities.

MR. HETTEL: Okay.

MR. FRITZ: That cost is included in there. We have a bunch of real estate that we have to work out the disposition about what we're going to do with it in the future. We have the Victory Hollow railroad bridge that we have to get off of our books from a standpoint of we don't want to maintain that bridge throughout history. Those are the type of things.

MR. HETTEL: Does the $41 million cover that?

MR. FRITZ: I don't know that yet. I will know that after we get the certified cost back from Walla Walla.

MR. HETTEL: The reason why I'm asking is when are we going to stop funding this project? I mean how long has it been going on? We've heard how we need to fund these other projects; it just seems that the Lower Mon keeps taking, taking, and taking. When can we close the books on it?

MR. FRITZ: Well, I'm going to go back to our 2014 cost estimate. We said it was going to be $1.2 billion to get the project to this 90 percent benefits. We are still with that -- with the $41 million this fiscal year that was appropriated we are still $68 million below that baseline estimate. There were a lot of risks when that project was funded to completion that were not addressed by that. It was written in the President's Budget that it was funded to completion and that with all the risks that were still going on, especially with the construction of the river chamber out there at Charleroi, it was premature for them to fund that to completion.

MR. HETTEL: Okay. Total projected cost doesn't mean you have to spend it.

MR. FRITZ: That's correct. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. HETTEL: Let's quit spending, that's the point I'm getting at. Sorry, that's it --

MR. FRITZ: No, I understand. It's --

MR. HETTEL: We would really like to close this thing off the books of the trust fund because we've got all these other projects going on that are going to need this funding.

MR. FRITZ: I completely agree with you and that is our goal to get it off the books.

I do want to talk real quick again about Charleroi. I'm expecting by the end of this month we will be passing traffic through that new chamber. We plan on having a ribbon-cutting and a renaming for that facility in August so you can kind of mark your calendar for now for either the 28th or 29th of August. There will be something coming out about that in the next month or so.

MG GRAHAM: Mr. Fritz.

MR. FRITZ: Yes, sir.

MG GRAHAM: This Lock and Dam, what it is going to be known as?

MR. FRITZ: No sir, it's going to be renamed in the John P. Murtha Lock and Dam and then in parentheses, Marty Hettel.

(Crosstalk)

MR. FRITZ: Are you saying he's good at passing drift?

MS. TAYLOR: Paul, did you get that on the record?

MR. CLOUSE: Yes, it was. We got that one.

MR. FRITZ: As Marty did point out; we've got $41 million coming. This table doesn't show that it's been allocated yet but when it shows its allocated it will show there's $68 million remaining in the balance.

With the money that has been appropriated we are going to be able to get the project operational but there's still those closeout items that we talked about. On the dashboard slide I said we're still looking at December of 2024 that Lock and Dam 3, the dam is going to be out of there and that is when project benefits really start hitting at that point. The risks, there are some large risks. I'm going to talk about those now, and those are going to be in the cost estimate, but it doesn't mean that we're going to ask for the money. Dredging is one of the big ones in there. For years I have been telling you that the Mon River flows pretty clean. We don't do a lot of maintenance dredging except at our locks and at tributaries. We finished the dredging in 2022. We had, I think, somewhere in the neighborhood of 34,000 cubic yards of material that had deposited that first year. After the second year that number had gone down. After the third year, or after the third monitoring which was December of 2023, or down to about one percent siltation in there. That's about a third of what we were originally anticipating. What I've been telling you is that that that river flows clean, and it is starting to clean itself again. When we lower that pool level at Lock and Dam 3 that cross-section of the river changes so that means that the velocity increases of the water. That's even going to be more evidence to show that that river is self-cleaning. But we're going to continue to monitor that, but we are going to have an estimate in there to

do dredging in case we have to. But we're not going to know that for certain until after those pools change and they have a chance to stabilize.

The second risk I want to talk about is the Braddock scour. We have noticed down below Braddock, just above Braddock and along the lower guardwall at Braddock there's some scour that is occurring there. It's a been occurring for years and we've been monitoring that. It hasn't gotten any substantially worse, or any better. The modeling that we did before we built that, the model that we built at the -- back then it was WES or the Waterways Experiment Station. That didn't show that we were going to have any issues there. But as we're going through time here and were getting ready to change these pools, we don't know exactly what that new pool elevation is going to do, that higher pool elevation upstream of the dam so we're going to monitor that. We have a number in there for that. Again, it's just a placeholder. Marty, just like you said, we're not going to ask for the money if we don't need it. But we don't want to have to go back and say we missed something in our cost estimate. We're trying to identify all these risks.

MR. HETTEL: Marty here. One last question on the cost estimates. You are not doing an updated cost estimate on the second chamber at Charleroi are you?

MR. FRITZ: That has to be included because that's part of the authorized project but they're not --

MR. HETTEL: Even though it will never be built? You're going to spend the money to do a cost estimate?

MR. FRITZ: Yeah, the cost estimate itself is already done and I don't know what Walla Walla will do with that. They'll put an appropriate amount of risk on that because it hasn't changed since the last time that we did any work there.

These are just some photographs at Charleroi. It shows you the lower approach going into the lock there in the top left-hand corner. It shows you the chamber, the top right-hand corner full of water and they're removing the downstream cofferdam. And then on the left-hand side bottom corner they're picking up one of the last panels that they put in the upstream guardwall, that closure there.

Today, if you go look at some of the equipment that they used to operate that facility that's kind of what it looks like. It looks that way on a screen, that's what the lock operators are going to see in the future something similar to that.

A couple of other pictures so I mentioned the high water we had last week. It was a year and a half ago or so, we were at Charleroi as part of an Inland Waterways Users Board meeting and on the left-hand side there where that yellow stripe is we all still out there and had a picture taken. If you would have stood out there last week, your thighs would have been getting wet. It overtopped the existing chamber; it overtopped the new chamber and that's what we are assessing now what the damages associated with that.

This is a view looking downstream after the water started receding, and you can see that there is no water on the wall there on the left, but the chamber to the right, the walls are still underwater. This is the upstream approach. I mentioned that were using that land chamber to help us shed that debris and drift. The picture on the right-hand side and see how thick that stuff gets. I mean it's feet thick. That's

looking down in our filling galleries so there was about 40 feet of water in that. We are assessing now what we do to make sure eliminate that risk here in the future.

That's all I have on Lower Mon, but I do want to -- I like this picture because I remember the days when you went out and you threw a lever and that's what operated the gates and the valves. This is what we have now. This is the type of system that we have now. It's a lot more complicated, but it allows more functionality as well. Things like the remote lock operations at some point in the future.

That's all I have unless there's other questions on the Lower Mon.

I'm just going to try to hit the high points for the Upper Ohio. Similar to Lower Mon it's a condition driven project. We are replacing the auxiliary lock at each of Emsworth, Dashields, and Montgomery which is a 56-foot-wide chamber, 360 feet long with a 600 foot 110-foot-wide chamber. Montgomery is the first in the chute there.

As far as project safety is concerned, we've had a pretty good safety record until just about two weeks ago, a contractor severely injured his hand while they were moving a beam. I don't know all the specifics of that yet. They are developing a report for that.

As far as the Montgomery Lock, the goal is still award -- the goal is still to award that contract by the end of this fiscal year, but we have had a couple of amendments. One of those amendments required us by executive order to put into this contract a project labor agreement. We did that a month after the thing was already on the street. So that, putting that project labor agreement in as well as contractors asking for an extension, a four-week extension to do more coordination with their subcontractors, we did grant a four-week extension to the proposal due dates.

That proposal due date went from the 29th of April to the 23rd of May. We are still shooting for that end-of-fiscal-year award. It takes roughly a month out of our schedule but were going to streamline what we can to try to get to that award. Just to let you know that that award date may be at risk. There's a lot of things that could still affect that, contractors could ask questions on solicitations out there that could maybe add time to the proposal due date. Instead of getting say three proposals for the construction of the lock we get five and it takes more evaluation time. Just bottom-line up front there is that still shooting for the end of the fiscal year there's things that happen on the way to church if you remember Mike White used to say that.

Financial status. We updated the total project cost in December. We got a certified cost estimate and I'll show you that slide in the second. With that increase cost, that kind of tanked our benefit-to-cost ratio. Our benefit-to-cost ratio at the OMB 7 percent rate went down to 0.5 to 1 and at the current discount rate of the 2.75 were sitting right at 1.0 to 1.

We are looking at an economic update in Fiscal Year 2025 so will be able to assess whether or not the benefits have also increased. But unless we have another way to capture all of the benefits, the financial side of all the benefits, this could be underwater on the BC ratio.

The certified project cost was done in 2023 and shows about a $404 million decrease from what was the last time we updated the cost. The biggest driver in that was new cost guidance from a higher headquarters. We were directed for all things that were actually in construction, you can use the

inflation rates, the OMB rates plus inflation rates. For things that were not in construction we were told to use only the OMB escalation rates. No inflation for that. That $404 million is all inflation. Primarily inflation, I won't say it's all inflation.

Emsworth design is going to wrap up in January 2026 so we will have that on the shelf if you guys want to get us some money to build that one right away that would be good. That would be one of those that are on the shelf.

MR. HETTEL: Steve, Marty here. Emsworth design. Let's talk about that for a minute. You spent almost $24 million on the design. We heard today in the Capital Investment Strategy that preconstruction engineering and design shouldn't start until three to five years before the project is going to start construction. This project is behind Lock 25, Montgomery, and LaGrange. As we have heard today, we've got too many projects going on. Why not take the remaining funding that you received in the BIL for Emsworth and transfer it over to Montgomery? Let's halt the preconstruction engineering and design because it's not going to be built for 20 years.

MR. FRITZ: Your point is well taken. It's not my call to move that amount of funding. That money was designated under the BIL for Emsworth. If we need it for Montgomery, it's available for Montgomery, we could take that if we needed.

MR. HETTEL: How about if I propose a motion that the $59 million in front of the Board, the $59 million transferred off Emsworth and on to Montgomery to help expedite the completion of Montgomery?

MR. FRITZ: Before you talk about the exact numbers, I don't think we have invested $24 million in Emsworth yet.

MR. HETTEL: I'm just going to your slide. But I would still put that motion, any funding at Emsworth in front of the Board here, that we transfer that from Emsworth over to Montgomery in order to help expedite and fund upfront the completion of Montgomery.

MR. WOODRUFF: I'll second that with the question is that the right place to put it or does it need to go to [Lock] 25 or someplace else? Kentucky?

MR. HETTEL: Well, my thought was Matt --

MR. WOODRUFF: I guess my point is we don't need to be spending money as you're saying to do a design on a project that is way down the road that I'm just not sure where the best place is to send it.

MR. HETTEL: Well, my thought process was keeping it within the Upper Ohio nav study between the three locks rather than going from another District to another Division and all the above. That was my thought.

MR. WOODRUFF: Yeah, and I guess my thought is I don't really care where it goes it just needs to go to the best place.

MR. MURPHY: This is Spencer. I guess my question may be for the General, Steve, how easy is it to switch the money from Emsworth to Montgomery versus Emsworth to Kentucky?

MR. FRITZ: That would be a pretty hard reach to get from one project to another. Within project it would be easier to do. Before you make the motion, I do want to make one other pitch. Is that the Upper Ohio is a system. That system showed potential for 50 percent unreliability as early as 2028, 2032 for Emsworth, and I think 2034 or 2035 for Dashields. I can't remember if those are the exact dates, 50 percent unreliability at that point. If we could at least finish the design for Emsworth and additional funds do become available by some means, then we have the opportunity to be shovel ready at that point.

Now, I'm going to let you guys talk about your motion.

MR. MURPHY: This is Spencer. I appreciate that context but even if you just use the CIS as your guideline Emsworth would be lower down the list of projects that we get funds as they became available. Unless there was an emergency or catastrophic failure. I'm open to either, I agree with your sentiment this is but the money to where it can best be used right now. My only thought is if it's going to be an internal Corps process it says we can transfer the funds tomorrow from Emsworth to Montgomery that's maybe preferable than, I don't know, if we need to go to Congress to reprogram over to Kentucky. That's my only question for the Board is think about where you want to put it. I think we all agree it makes sense to be allocated away from Emsworth at the moment, it's just a question for you put it.

MR. WOODRUFF: This is Matt Woodruff. I think that's where I am on it. Recognizing that sometimes the perfect is the enemy of the good. I seconded Marty's motion so that we could discuss it, and I think the gist of this motion is we shouldn't be spending it there we should be spending some place where we're buying concrete today, and not drawing up plans for 20 years from now. If it's easier to just move it to the other sister project and that's doable, then do it. If we can put it to our next highest priority project, then that's where it should go.

MR. CLOUSE: If you could make the formal motion, Marty we will go with that.

MR. HETTEL: I guess the motion is let's take the remaining $59 million, if that is the number at Emsworth.

MR. WOODRUFF: Whatever is remaining.

MR. HETTEL: Yes, whatever the number is and let's move that funding to where it will advance another project. Is that fair?

MR. WOODRUFF: Second that motion.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on this? The motion's been seconded, all in favor say aye.

ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CLOUSE: Any no votes on this one? No. Motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

MR. FRITZ: Thanks for that. The Montgomery Lock key activities, you will see on this funding slide here that Montgomery went down just about $10 million from the last estimate we had. As far as ongoing construction the batch plan site development contract is 72 percent complete, and the esplanade site development contract is about 45 percent complete. They are moving along pretty well right there. We have had at least two joint ventures that have showed considerable amount of interest in the project. On February 2nd we had a pre-proposal site visit out there. It was very well attended by potential prime contractors as well as subcontractors.

We talked about adding the project labor agreement, but we also just recently added the economic price adjustment clause. That's to reduce the risk associated with whatever is happening in the market today so that they can kind of project to their cost out the full performance period and have a little bit of relief. After, you will notice that there is not a funding glidepath shown on here that is because it is in solicitation right now. We don't want to jeopardize that solicitation. As soon as we get to the point where we can award this contract, then will have a pretty good outlay of where we need the funds in the future years.

Issues and challenges. If we have a failure out there before we recapitalize, we've talked about this before, we've done a lot of advanced maintenance out there, kind of the same thing were going to do at Emsworth. A lot of advanced maintenance there so that existing primary chamber out there it gets us through the construction period.

There is some dam pier work that's happening starting in May and that goes through, I think, July of 2025. We don't anticipate that there are any conflicts between those two contracts once our lock contractor gets started.

Inflation is still another challenge and that is why we added that economic price adjustment clause. The proof will be in the pudding when we open the bids and we know what the bids are, then we will know how uncertain the market was when we go to make that award.

I'm going to move on to Emsworth real quick. As I talked about because of that cost update our cost there at Emsworth went down $49 million. The design, like I indicated is going to continue through 2026 into January of 2026. Physical models are, I think 70 and 60 percent complete. The navigation model is about 70 percent complete, and the filling and emptying model is about 60 percent complete. I know that down at ERDC, the Engineering Research and Development Center, we had the navigation industry down there in January, so they got a chance to participate in looking at those models.

Real estate, we're still going on with some real estate actions there. The biggest threat with real estate is that we're in an industrial corridor and we have to go through a lot of hoops to make sure that the property that we're acquiring meets our requirements. The particular property that's the primary site for Emsworth is right beside the abutment side of the dam but it has been contaminated in the past. There are certain covenants on that property. We're making sure that we can put a batch plant out there without gaining any additional liability.

I think that is it for Emsworth. I won’t talk about anything else with Emsworth.

With Dashields with that certified project cost estimate this is where you see the biggest delta that drops about $345 million and I think that's the combination of not using the inflation, just using the OMB CWCICS (Civil Works Construction Cost Index System) numbers for escalation as well as it's far out in the future that that was a pretty significant cost drop.

MR. HETTEL: Steve, Marty here. I've got another question here for you. You're stating design start on Dashields in late 2026?

MR. FRITZ: That's when we could start it, yes, sir.

MR. HETTEL: Okay. And have you spent the $6.4 million --

MR. FRITZ: No.

MR. HETTEL: -- that's allocated?

MR. FRITZ: We have not.

MR. HETTEL: Why don't we do a motion to have that $6.4 million on Dashields be transferred to another project to advance that project? The same scenario we did at Emsworth; does that make sense to the Board? I mean, we're talking small numbers here but $6 million here, $6 million there adds up. I guess my motion on this one would be to transfer the unused monies of $6.4 million on Emsworth to another ongoing project that would advance completion.

MR. MURPHY: Dashields?

MR. HETTEL: Dashields, Kentucky, whatever the case may be.

MR. MURPHY: Move it from Dashields to another project?

MR HETTEL: This is Dashields, you're right, I'm sorry. From Dashields. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLOUSE: Do we want to have some discussion on this? Seeing none, can I get a second?

MR. MURPHY: Second.

MR. CLOUSE: All in favor?

ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CLOUSE: Any no's? Not seeing none. Unanimous. Back to you Steve.

MR. FRITZ: Dashields has the same risk as the others. I won't get into that too much. This is a picture of Dashields last week when it was underwater. When we are talking about overall risks, we're going to be removing Lock and Dam 3 as part of the Lower Mon project and we're looking at that December 2024 date, but the river gets a vote. We don't know when this stuff is going to happen so there are those risks that we have to contend with that may impact schedule and cost.

These are some good pictures here so on the left-hand side that was the pre-proposal conference that we had out there. You can see the attendance from the contractors. And then, on the right-hand side that's all the modeling down there at ERDC, the Engineering Research and Development Center. And the nav partners are there. Some of you might be in those pictures. I can't tell from here. I think that's all I have today, sir. Unless there any other questions.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Steve. Next up we're moving to the public comment period. There have been no requests to make a public comment before the Board and no written statements were submitted for the record. Before we move to closing comments, I'd like to express my sincere thanks to Mark Pointon, Stephen Riley and Allie Schafer, which by the way are your Alternate Designated Federal Officers for getting things setup for this meeting. It truly does take a village to make this meeting successful.

With that, Ms. Brown, do you have any --

MR. SMITH: She had to step out.

MR. CLOUSE: Okay. I'm going to assume she has no closing comments. Do any of the Federal Observers wish to make a closing comment? Seeing none, General Graham, closing comments?

MAJOR GENERAL GRAHAM: Thanks for everybody's time today. Thanks for the project teams coming up. Some things we've got to think through as we're continuing to shape this. I really appreciate the level of discussion here. That's all I've got.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you. Chairman Murphy, any closing comments?

MR. MURPHY: I just want to say thank you. I think this was one of the better report meetings we've had in terms of high-level discussion about where we're going to move this program. I think you heard pretty clearly from the Board our desire; our strong desire is to attend a lot more ribbon cuttings and a lot fewer groundbreakings. I think we are all pretty aligned around that. We will continue to look for opportunities to make that happen and to look for opportunities to fully and efficiently fund the projects that need to get built. I look forward to continuing that work, and again, welcome to the new Members. I look forward to continuing this work.

MR. CLOUSE: Thank you, Spencer. Vice-Chairman Judd, any closing comments? None. Any other Board Members wishing to make any closing comments?

Seeing none, can I get a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MR. HETTEL: So moved.

MR. CLOUSE: So moved. Can I get a second?

MR. RASE: I'll second it.

MR. CLOUSE: All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CLOUSE: Aye. It is unanimous. This concludes the 102nd Inland Waterways Users Board Meeting. Fair winds and following seas, safe travels and thanks to everyone.

(Whereupon the meeting was concluded.)

Inland Waterways Users Board Meeting No. 102
Springfield, Virginia
April 11, 2024
List of Participants

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
Armstrong	Ms. Jennifer "Jen"	Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI)
Beams	Stephen Scott	USACE, Mobile District
Bronson	Ms. Candida K.	USACE, South Atlantic Division
Brown	Ms. Stacey E.	HQDA, Office of Assistant Secretary of Army for Civil Works
Bucci	Ms. Mary Ann	Port of Pittsburgh Commission
Burks	Ms. Elizabeth M.	USACE, Nashville District
Burroughs	Ms. Tiffany S.	USACE, HQ Operations & Regulatory Div, Navigation Ops
Carns	Michelle	U.S. Committee on the Marine Transportation Systems (CMTS)
Carter	Nicole T.	Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service
Chromey	Ms. Tretha	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Clouse	Paul D.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Coleman, Jr.	Wesley E.	USACE, Southwestern Division
Cotton	CPT Joseph R.	USACE, Nashville District
Curry	COL Jesse T.	USACE, Rock Island District
Davenport	Stacie	Infinity Engineering Consultants
Dellorco	Louis A. "Lou"	USACE, St. Louis District
Dickens	Justin	Crounse Corporation
Dirks	Bryan J.	USACE, Inland Navigation Design Center
Eckhardt	W. Cody	USACE, Mississippi Valley Division
Flewallen	Jessica	Van Scoyoc Associates
Frantz	David A.	Private Citizen
Fritz	Stephen R.	USACE, Pittsburgh District
Gilbert	Ms. Heather	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Office of Coast Survey
Gillip	Jonathan A.	USACE, Little Rock District
Goodall	Andrew J.	USACE, Rock Island District
Graham	MG William "Butch"	USACE, Headquarters, Civil Works Executive Office
Harker	Andrew	The Russell Group (on behalf of CGB)
Harshman	Scott	Port of Pittsburgh Commission
Henderson	Richard	U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Hettel	Martin T.	American Commercial Barge Line LLC (ACBL)
Hoey	Ms. Jeanine	Private Citizen
Johantges	Donald E.	USACE, Great Lakes & Ohio River Division

Jones, Jr.	Oliver Cline	Tennessee River Valley Association; Tennessee-Cumberland Waterway Council
Judd	Damon S.	Marquette Transportation Company
Komlos	Shawn B.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Kreider	Richard C.	Campbell Transportation Company
Leese	Catherine "Kate"	USACE, St. Louis District
Lehman	Andrew	U.S. Committee on the Marine Transportation Systems (CMTS)
Lichtman	Kenneth E.	Private Citizen
Lopez	Jose R.	USACE, St. Louis District
Lowe	Marilyn	USACE, St. Louis District
Magary	Ms. Brooke E.	USACE, St. Louis District
Manous, Jr	Joe D.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Marcey	CAPT Daniel L.	USACE, Headquarters, Civil Works Executive Office
McCormack	Frank	The Waterways Journal Weekly
McDonald	Joyce M.	USACE, Southwestern Division
Morcroft	Liam	American Waterways Operators
Moulton	Craig M.	USACE, HQ Operations & Regulatory Div, Navigation Ops
Murphy	W. Spencer	Canal Barge Company
Norrenberns	Elizabeth A.	USACE, St. Louis District
Norton	Jarod K.	USACE, Northwestern Division
Olson	Patty	Shimmick Corporation
Pavlosky	Matt	Port of Pittsburgh Commission
Phillips	Christopher W.	USACE, Great Lakes & Ohio River Division
Pickering	Timothy	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Pointon	Mark R.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Ramos-Gines	Orlando	USACE, Galveston District
Rase	Lance M.	CGB Enterprises, Inc.
Reich	Ryan P.	USACE, Mobile District
Rich	Robert D. "Rob"	Shaver Transportation Company
Riley	Steven D.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Rohde	Paul	Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI)
Sanchez	Nelson R.	USACE, Mobile District
Schafer	Ms. Alexandra L.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Schimpf	Andrew C.	USACE, St. Louis District
Smith	Thomas P.	USACE, HQ Operations & Regulatory Division
Stephenson	Andrew	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association (UMRBA)
Tarpey	Michael J.	USACE, Rock Island District
Taylor	Ms. Crystal D.	Ingram Barge Company
Trzaska	Brian M.	USACE, Pittsburgh District

Turner	Richard C.	USACE, Southwestern Division
Ufner	Ms. Julie	National Waterways Conference (NWC)
Wallace	Ms. Kirsten	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association (UMRBA)
Webb	Jeff	Cargill, Inc.
White	Ben T.	American Commercial Barge Line LLC (ACBL)
Wiggins	Charles E.	USACE, Engineer Research and Development Center
Wilson	Jeffery	Holcim (US)
Winters	Robert L.	USACE, Nashville District
Woodruff	W. Matthew "Matt"	Kirby Corporation
Zea	Tracy	Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI)