

APPENDIX E

SUMMARIES OF COMMENT SHEET RESPONSES AND ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- St. Louis, Missouri (CS1-SL)
- Quincy, Illinois (CS2-QU)
- East Peoria, Illinois (CS3-PE)
- Bettendorf, Iowa (CS4-BE)
- Des Moines, Iowa (CS5-DM)
- La Crosse, Wisconsin (CS6-LC)
- St. Paul, Minnesota (CS7-SP)

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER-ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS
JULY/AUGUST 1999

(1) Please indicate which public workshop you are attending:

100.0%; 30 St. Louis, MO	0.0%; 0 Bettendorf, IA	0.0%; 0 St. Paul, MN
0.0%; 0 Quincy, IL	0.0%; 0 Des Moines, IA	0.0%; 0 No Answer
0.0%; 0 Peoria, IL	0.0%; 0 La Crosse, WI	

(2) This workshop provided an opportunity to gain information and a better understanding of the study's initial alternatives

6.7%; 2 Strongly Agree	6.7%; 2 Neutral	3.3%; 1 Strongly Disagree
83.3%; 25 Agree	0.0%; 0 Disagree	0.0%; 0 No Answer

(3) This workshop provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the initial alternatives.

16.7%; 5 Strongly Agree	0.0%; 0 Neutral	3.3%; 1 Strongly Disagree
76.7%; 23 Agree	3.3%; 1 Disagree	0.0%; 0 No Answer

(4) Please provide any additional comments you wish to make about the study's initial alternatives.

- I would like to have proceedings from the meetings.
- Good presentation of material.
- Not enough data available.
More questions than comments were generated.
Speed up schedule on report.
- It lacked information specifics. There were a lot of holes and not enough sandy data given. The information doesn't include enough of the system impacts. Site specific isn't only mitigation!
- The small group discussions were a bit tedious.
- A statement was made that "equity" is not an economic consideration. I think this is not true. It may be that current business interests in our economy don't have much interest in equity, but this is not to say that it is not a question for economists. The O+M costs of the locks should be covered by fuel tax for barges.
- Support 1200' locks especially 20-25.
Do not support ILL waterway improvements.
Need to increase habitat restoration of channel on Mississippi, Illinois and Missouri River.
- The meeting format and process were surprises, even though I had known the date and subject for meetings. (I might have prepared a statement in advance, but was unaware of the opportunity available).
- I believe the COE is on track with alternative F.
- Should see the option of all locks 1200 feet.
Should clarify if the improvement of the lock chamber includes updating and bringing into the 21st century the original chamber.
Should discuss the quantification of rail and truck impacts versus barge.
- Having spent 6 to 7 years on this study, with delay after delay for public input, the presentation was a quick (and fair) summary of the various alternatives, but the follow up (with public's participation) left a lot to be desired as to depth of study (details and total lack of them). as it applies to benefits, cost factors, environmental issues and potential need for extra funds due to inflation. Who will pay the difference in costs? Or will the conclusion of the project be in jeopardy?
- While the alternatives are an improvement over previous options, the net gains are woefully understated. More attention needs to be paid to the volumes of grain exports and elasticity is extremely over stated. In many markets, there is No elasticity, when the river closes and grain markets dry up grain stops moving.

- I am very impressed with the manner of which the workshop was conducted. Many "macro" assumptions had to be made. What if these are not valid? i.e. Will South America erode the economic benefits of our grain production if we do nothing, if we adapt plan A,B, ...H?
- They are not adequate. Alternatives to remove and reduce navigation need to be studied.
- The transportation of goods for export must be continuously upgraded.
- Need to reassess: Rail rates; Elasticity#; IA elasticity for IL; World Markets; Cost of modal shift (environment, impacts, fatalities, infrastructure).
The Corps needs to be more visionary and forward-looking in their assessments.
- Consideration of Illinois River locks must be assessed based on the actual production and movement of product. Improvements must move forward or access to future growth.
Environmental concerns can be addressed.
A united effort must be used. Economic, Environmental, and Historical.
Agriculture does not have an anti-environmental stand; I'm not sure environmental groups don't have an anti-agricultural stand.
- I am in full support of 1200-foot locks at all proposed locations.
- Big business is coming out with big guns to make this happen.
- The COE has refused to look, or even worse, seek "real world" information from the very users of the inland river system. How can the COE build the Alaskan highway in WW2 in less than one year while this study has gone on for over 6 years, at a cost of over \$50,000,000?

Please return this comment sheet to the registration desk as you depart.

Thank you for attending this workshop and contributing to the discussion.

Figure 1:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER-ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS
JULY/AUGUST 1999

(1) Please indicate which public workshop you are attending:

0.0%; 0 St. Louis, MO	0.0%; 0 Bettendorf, IA	0.0%; 0 St. Paul, MN
100.0%; 38 Quincy, IL	0.0%; 0 Des Moines, IA	0.0%; 0 No Answer
0.0%; 0 Peoria, IL	0.0%; 0 La Crosse, WI	

(2) This workshop provided an opportunity to gain information and a better understanding of the study's initial alternatives

44.7%; 17 Strongly Agree	5.3%; 2 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
50.0%; 19 Agree	0.0%; 0 Disagree	0.0%; 0 No Answer

(3) This workshop provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the initial alternatives.

57.9%; 22 Strongly Agree	2.6%; 1 Neutral	2.6%; 1 Strongly Disagree
34.2%; 13 Agree	2.6%; 1 Disagree	0.0%; 0 No Answer

(4) Please provide any additional comments you wish to make about the study's initial alternatives.

-
- I believe that alternative H is the best option given. This proposal provides the best balance in the region, the greatest increase in future capacity and still offers a justified investment.
 - Plan G and H are the plans that should be considered.
 - Moorings needed in pool 20 just south of lock and dam 19 (Keokuk).
Shoreline along the Gast bank is severely eroding in the 355-357 river mile. We would strongly suggest a mooring facility for north bound traffic. I am sure environmental impacts would be enhanced by not having to use the trees on the shore. Jon Hofmeister Secretary Hunt Drainage District. Rock Island officials Terry Steiger, Jim Aidala, and Jody Bausman, have been notified and are working on a solution. Please coordinate with them or call me directly to look at the site and determine the feasibility of a mooring facility along our reach of levy. Botanical use of tax dollars; Dredge material placed behind existing levee improves channel, adds to flood control measures, creates environment habitat in river and helps to protect existing habitat within protected areas (drainage districts).
 - A and H is best-must proceed ASAP with concurrent improvements to maximize benefits.
 - Silting of the river is part of the environmental impact of dams on the river. Pumping sand to one side of the river doesn't correct the problem created by the dams
 - Future grain production is too conservative. Within the next 50 years, new technology will increase production beyond historical levels. With the higher levels of production will come increased exports to feed and ever-increasing world population, which in turn will generate more revenue from usage's. This will increase the average annual net benefit and in turn defray annual costs.
 - The public needs to be more aware of the project as a whole. There is a lot that isn't being stated good and bad.
 - A very fine meeting thank you
 - Any improvements which serve to expedite and improve efficiency of grain transportation is definitely a plus for the farmers.
Is agriculture considered on equal footing with recreational and environmental issues? If so, a better levee system should be considered.
 - You needed to provide more detail in the initial presentation. Some of the questions in the breakout session could have been answered earlier.
 - Get your word out to more people about these meetings, especially in the smaller venues.
 - Plan H is preferred plan.
 - Doing nothing is a great disservice to our country.

- I believe the "no action" would be a very big mistake: the plan will put the U.S. further behind in our foreign market.
I believe Plan H is the plan we should use.
 - Good meeting!
 - I think your format was excellent for many input that leads to the best study results possible.
 - We need more of these!
 - I would recommend plan G. I think it's the best option even though most expensive.
 - I am very much in favor of the 1200' locks; as many as we can get!
 - I hope the study will result in 1,200' locks and other improvements to the navigation system.
 - The need for efficient locks is very critical to handle the projected volume of traffic over the coming years. Upper Mississippi River system handles 66% of all grain exports, so efficient lock system will contribute to faster movement of barges to the export market. No action will be destructive.
 - We need 1200' locks on all dams, if this is not possible then 1200' guidewalls to speed movement of barges. This great river must be used, as they do in Europe!
 - How do you propose to put 10 to 15 gallons of water in the 5 gallon bucket you've built-The Mississippi river
Will this study meet the criteria of honesty, accuracy, truthfulness, and financial accuracy that the average citizen uses in filling his 1040 tax form?
-

Please return this comment sheet to the registration desk as you depart.

Thank you for attending this workshop and contributing to the discussion.

Figure 1:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER-ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS
JULY/AUGUST 1999

(1) Please indicate which public workshop you are attending:

0.0%; 0 St. Louis, MO	0.0%; 0 Bettendorf, IA	0.0%; 0 St. Paul, MN
0.0%; 0 Quincy, IL	0.0%; 0 Des Moines, IA	0.0%; 0 No Answer
100.0%; 25 Peoria, IL	0.0%; 0 La Crosse, WI	

(2) This workshop provided an opportunity to gain information and a better understanding of the study's initial alternatives

16.0%; 4 Strongly Agree	8.0%; 2 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
72.0%; 18 Agree	0.0%; 0 Disagree	4.0%; 1 No Answer

(3) This workshop provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the initial alternatives.

28.0%; 7 Strongly Agree	4.0%; 1 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
64.0%; 16 Agree	0.0%; 0 Disagree	4.0%; 1 No Answer

(4) Please provide any additional comments you wish to make about the study's initial alternatives.

- There had been a tremendous amount of work done by the Corps of Engineers which should end up with some satisfactory solutions.
With 40% of the highways cluttered with semis we need the environmentally friendly waterway system and the Illinois River.
Lets increase the locks with H, and do it soon!
- I find it interesting that the C.O.E. finds it necessary to hire a firm to run a public workshop.
- It is time to quit studying and get on with the project.
- Due to so much note taking, I hope somehow the questions and answers will be made available. Especially the comments that went on "the record".
- I support alternative H.
- Learned a lot by listening to many different peoples' opinions-always good to know where people are coming from.
- I thought lack of environmental/biological information was lacking in specifics for system-wide impacts. If major impacts occur there is lack of public comment.
- I believe the technical people need to go to each small group and answer any questions.
- As a tax payer, your matrix of alternatives shows that for a smaller cost \$190 million nearly all the annual net benefits of all the alternatives \$12 million could be achieved. Of course, the direct beneficiaries want the government to spend the most to benefit them-alternative H, but I think my support would be for alternative B which makes more sense economically from the point of view of the public and tax payers.
- Economic benefits seem way too conservative.
- Can US Army C.O.E. funding for navigation include sediment removal (dredging) of backwater lakes that are filling in due to sedimentation being caused by the existence of the lock and dams?
Is it possible to upgrade the wicket dams at Peoria and LaGrange at the same time the locks are being upgraded to enhance the management of the water and pool stages? This is needed!!!
With increased projected use of Illinois river by tow boat, pleasure boats, jet skis, etc., water safety issues need to be examined and upgraded!
- Corps should consider reducing/eliminating navigation during the summer months and manage river at low flows for ecological purposes. (on the IL river)
Corps should consider replacing wicket dams to Peoria and LaGrange with more efficient systems that minimize rapid and drastic fluctuates in the river flow.
Corps should realize that while barge traffic may have minimal direct effect on sedimentation, it has

- indirect effect by maintaining high water for navigation rather than allowing backwater and lake sediments too solidify by periodically drying out.
- Alternatives are far too restrictive.
A need-basis vs benefit
- If lock time is decreased, will it not increase the tow size-thereby increasing turbidity and later the need to increase channel depth and size?
The recreational value of clean rivers with wildlife far out weighs the barge industry's value.
- Doesn't seem to focus as much on increased barge traffic and impact to ancient fishes that need deep water (main channel) habitat.
- I appreciate the comprehensive study.
Hopefully special interest groups will not be too influential.
River improvements definitely need to be made.
- We cannot afford to have this project scuttled or made excessively costly by environmental concerns.
1200' locks just maybe better perches for the eagles!!
- I attended tonight to represent the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, in Peoria, IL. We are currently involved in studying and documenting watershed, planning and best management practice in the Illinois River Watershed and Peoria Lakes. As valuable as public input is to your study, we believe your study to add valuable information to ours.
We would appreciate permission to include some of your materials in a, c library of presentation slides we are contracting with a local university to prepare. You may contact me below:

Please return this comment sheet to the registration desk as you depart.

Thank you for attending this workshop and contributing to the discussion.

Figure 1:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER-ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS
JULY/AUGUST 1999

(1) Please indicate which public workshop you are attending:

0.0%; 0 St. Louis, MO	100.0%; 64 Bettendorf, IA	0.0%; 0 St. Paul, MN
0.0%; 0 Quincy, IL	0.0%; 0 Des Moines, IA	0.0%; 0 No Answer
0.0%; 0 Peoria, IL	0.0%; 0 La Crosse, WI	

(2) This workshop provided an opportunity to gain information and a better understanding of the study's initial alternatives

37.5%; 24 Strongly Agree	6.2%; 4 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
51.6%; 33 Agree	0.0%; 0 Disagree	4.7%; 3 No Answer

(3) This workshop provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the initial alternatives.

40.6%; 26 Strongly Agree	9.4%; 6 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
43.8%; 28 Agree	3.1%; 2 Disagree	3.1%; 2 No Answer

(4) Please provide any additional comments you wish to make about the study's initial alternatives.

-
- Strongly endorse (5) 1,200 foot locks on the Upper Mississippi, five (5) guidewall extension on the Upper Mississippi, and two (2) 1,200 foot locks, on the Illinois River (LaGrange and Peoria) Alternative H!
 - I would like to see the most work done for the most benefit spending the least amount of money.
 - Start now, make upgrades and improvements as soon as possible and as fast as possible. Thank you!
 - I'm in favor of option H.
 - Facilitor of group discussion was extremely fair and competent.
Careful study by Corps and other government agencies at Federal and State levels provided needed expert assessment. That, followed by thorough public discussion, is necessary. Tonight's meeting is an important part of that process.
 - Improvements and upgrades need to be made. Barge freight costs need to be improved to keep the U.S. competitive for exporting grain, and bringing other commodities back up the river. Larger locks system safer and are more efficient to move products, and more environmentally friendly.
 - Need the 1200' locks "less time" "safety".
 - Plan B is the most cost effective.
No action plan is most. environmentally friendly.
 - I support alternative H.
I do have concerns about the annual net benefits. I would like to see the U.S. Corps re-evaluate the data used for the IL river locks. I believe that by using IL data the annual benefits will be higher than currently reflected. I also have concerns about the belief that rail rates will not increase and that rail will be able to cover grain shipments if they are being grossly under estimated.
Lastly, as a producer I must continue to have an opportunity to compete in a world market. Right now my competition is reducing their transportation costs as they make improvements to their navigation system, while our system has lost valuable efficiencies.
Please allow me the opportunity to compete and thus survive as a family farmer.
 - We need plan H!
 - The company I work for (River Valley Cooperative) utilizes the river system to ship grain to export markets and ship in fertilizer. We need to move ahead and invest in improving the lock and dam system in a timely manner.
 - I am a grain farmer from Illinois and I support alternative plan H.
 - I support plan H! As a farmer,

- as a sportsman, and from an environmental standpoint
Full tows will be more environmentally sound than locking two tows through the dams, and would be safer.
- I support no action.
- Alternative H is preferred path.
- Need to look into the effect zebra mussels have on the natural muscle beds versus what barge traffic does.
Also if anyone has been up in the hills on mountains they know you also have natural erosion in the streams there.
Towing companies have for a long time ran their tows cut back to save on fuel cost which is factor to running any company.
- How can alternatives be considered when there is a lack of information about system wide environmental impacts?
What are the costs of mitigating negative impacts from alterations to river stream?
- I think the people involved on the study did a great job.
- The Corp has the information delegated by Congress.
The delegation was not adequate for total health of river.
Thank you Corp.
Congress should require scheduling since only 4 major barge companies are involved. Listen to Mark B.
- I didn't feel that most of the questions were answered except by partial answers.
I also feel that the (independent) that was leading was too much Corps leaning.
- We need bigger and better locks to make the Midwest the most productive place it can be.
Alternative "G" makes the most long-term sense. The Corps has done a great job juggling all the different priorities but all of the economic assumptions are too conservative and we will be stifling the American forever if we give them anything less than the best transportation system in the world.
Refer to the vision statement for the Maritime Transportation System task force created by Dept. of Trans. Sec. Slater.
- I support alternative "H" as the best route to provide a reliable lock for the growth of the River Transportation System.
- I feel that no action is unacceptable. I consider plans E-H the only acceptable plans. By enlarging locks, and extending walls we increase the safety of locking operations for Corps personnel as well as navigation crews. The plans also greatly reduce the chance of a major environmental accident by increasing the safety of lock approaches. This could be analyzed by comparing accident rates on the Mississippi versus the updated locks on the Ohio River. Another reason to proceed with a plan is the fact that internal combustion engines are least efficient while idling towboats waiting for lockage will emit more pollution than a towboat underway.
- Please inform, we the public, on the Environmental issues studies that will be finished in another year through PBS or a capable news source. Too often only headlines, or snatches of Internet information plus reporters failure to follow up on a report, a letter, or even a phone number for us to get the information ourselves. Our group, we two women, brought the issues of environment, mussels, etc. and seemed to be not really understanding the "male" viewpoint.
- The analysis of impacts to other modes (rail, air, highway). Have you considered capital improvements needed to permit or eliminate impediment to the modes operating throatly. For example, replace the Arsenal bridge at lock and dam 15 to allow simultaneous rail, highway and barge movements. Are bridges in the study area with swing or lift spans being considered for replacement with proper clearance to permit unimpeded movement to tows on the river, as well as rail highway traffic across the river.
- As the global markets improve their transportation system the U.S. needs to aggressively work to improve theirs. There are large environmental issues that need to be address and I hope the Corp stays on top of those issues as the system expands the river environment is in a sense, relatively new because of the changes the locks have made since the installation.
- Strongly support plan G or similar plan-lock-river transportation is most Environmental friendly and cost effective mode of transportation commodities not moved on river will move elsewhere (rail and truck) at higher costs economically (higher costs environmentally). Continued increases in barge transportation requirements help keep transportation costs low and without lock rehabilitation those costs will rise and trickle down through the economy to the consumer in higher prices goods and

- services new 1200' locks will be beneficial to all.
- I support alternative "H".
The alternative of "No action" should include the cost of maintaining the locks involved in each alternative.
- I strongly support plan H. This is the best plan and will achieve the best results both now and in the years to come.
- Support project H.
- Question: Will there be only one recommendation give to congress, or will they get to choose an alternative?
I don't think the river can be turned back to a "river". We built the river into a navigation system and it needs to be improved with expression using the alternative G or H.
I want to repeat a comment made in our small group: "The cost expensive alternative is one-half the cost of a B1 bomber."
- Repair all navigation system.
Support alternative H.
- A very emotional issue but when you look at the alternatives and the good of the Midwest we need at least to reward it. Thank you for looking at this.
- As a farmer, I support improvements to the lock system, plan H.
- I am a Midwest grain farmer. Without making the river more modern we will not be able to compete into the 21st century. It needs to be done!!
- This county seems to have few opportunities to spend tax dollars to earn more tax dollars. Airports don't do this, bombers don't do this. I hope Congress understands this is a great opportunity to invest.
I support plan G!! (or H)
- I support plan G, first choice, or plan H, second choice. Build the new system now! Any further delays will increase costs in the future.
- Build the 1200' locks!
- Why are the public meetings not scheduled in cities on the Mississippi such as Dubuque? The towing industry is only consumer on the Mississippi River. Many people who's livelihoods are derived from the Upper Mississippi, such as commercial fishers, marina owners and hotel/restaurant owners, will be affected by damage to the natural resources due to increased navigation. At least one meeting should be held in the northern part of Iowa where these businesses are located.
- This meeting schedule is rigged! You, (Corps), avoided the river city of Dubuque because it is environmentally much more friendly than the Quad Cities or Des Moines. Dubuque had the highest attendance at the pre-Navigation study meetings and was not included for purposeful reasons.
This biases all your Iowa impute!
Is the Corps going to mitigate for the zebra mussels the barges brought?
- I applaud the Corps' initiative to have these meetings. It allows an opportunity for all people to voice concerns and views. It is important in the U.S. that meetings such as this be held.
The facilitators both at the breakout session and main sessions did a good job (on a decisive issue) of keeping discussion structured and moving forward.
- I support plan H. It is the best long-range alternative, both economically and environmentally.
- Plan H!

Please return this comment sheet to the registration desk as you depart.

Thank you for attending this workshop and contributing to the discussion.

Figure 1:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER-ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS
JULY/AUGUST 1999

(1) Please indicate which public workshop you are attending:

0.0%; 0 St. Louis, MO	0.0%; 0 Bettendorf, IA	0.0%; 0 St. Paul, MN
0.0%; 0 Quincy, IL	100.0%; 22 Des Moines, IA	0.0%; 0 No Answer
0.0%; 0 Peoria, IL	0.0%; 0 La Crosse, WI	

(2) This workshop provided an opportunity to gain information and a better understanding of the study's initial alternatives

18.2%; 4 Strongly Agree	9.1%; 2 Neutral	4.5%; 1 Strongly Disagree
54.5%; 12 Agree	13.6%; 3 Disagree	0.0%; 0 No Answer

(3) This workshop provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the initial alternatives.

22.7%; 5 Strongly Agree	0.0%; 0 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
68.2%; 15 Agree	4.5%; 1 Disagree	4.5%; 1 No Answer

(4) Please provide any additional comments you wish to make about the study's initial alternatives.

-
- I think it would be a good idea for the people from the Corps to face those asking questions and making comments rather than looking at the front way or the floor or just looking uncomfortable. If you want people to trust your evaluations and studies you must give them the consideration you get when you are addressing the crowd. When the public comment period started, your participation stopped. Do you actually believe people will think you are interested in their comments when you're looking the opposite way? Integrity is the real question. When you look guilty people will assume you are.
 - Where is the retroactive alternative? We need Ag, business reps to address and question.
 - Taxpayers cannot make an informed decision without knowing all the costs they are asked to cover (channel maintenance, rehab of dams, normal maintenance, operations, mitigation, lock improvements).
 - I am upset by your apparently basic assumption that the river's highest value is for transportation and that the value would be increased by increase traffic.
As a member of the public you said "owned this system", I don't like what the Corps has done to my river.
 - We cannot adequately have objective information if only the Corps viewpoint and proposals are given.
Yes, a super job was done to allow all viewpoints in the small session (workshops) but what will happen to that input? The answers given in the Q's and A's were a snow job defending the Corps. It was obvious that the plans to build will go forward.
 - We used a format, breakout session, that was much better suited for groups of 6 instead of 12 or more. Far to few participants came with an open mind. Too many were here to talk instead of listen, learn, and objective evaluate alternatives.
 - The environmental groups are better organized. Improving water transportation helps the U.S. balance of payments problems.
 - It is great our forefathers had the foresight to build the Mississippi River lock and dam system. Now it is up to our generation to improve it.
 - This workshop also provided opportunities for people to "get on their soapboxes" and "preach" about things totally unrelated to the Mississippi River and potential projects intended to be discussed.
 - I'm disappointed that the information was not complete before this meeting.

Grain will be transported somehow. Our environment should not suffer.

- As important as agriculture commodities are to our world trade as a nation and more importantly to Iowa, we need to improve our river transportation system.
- I'm glad I don't have the Corps' job. Good luck getting this project done.
- If we are talking about transportation of commodities, water is only one way. The government should represent all methods of transportation not narrowly focusing on the lock n dams. The economic benefits are not spelled out. Who benefits, I'm pretty sure it won't be the Iowa farmer.
- Much study has gone into "locks and dams" alternatives. Environmental impact does not appear to have been given nearly as much study or emphasis. I don't want my tax dollars going to subsidized large corporations and their barges.
- Only preliminary results were presented. No information was presented on the methods and data behind the preliminary results.
- The study's information on costs and benefits seemed questionable to me. The cost of site-specific replacement does not reflect true costs to the river system and habitat in total. The benefits, I believe, will be limited to big organization, business, but costs will be done by all citizen in 2 ways. 1. tax dollars spent on the project and 2. cost in terms of loss and damage to the natural resources.
- The only plans acceptable are those with no habitat replacement costs. Let's not make it any worse. Highways (in good repair) already exist to transport goods and grains. Let the river return to its natural state.
- Was not a satisfactory challenge to the export model of economy-grains are always going to be underpriced to the farmer, especially small. If you or the Congress want to help the farmers let them diversify, let them grow hemp for diesel fuel and then we are being conned into believing that the U.S. Army does not do the bidding of the Military corporation. Where is all this stuff going?

Please return this comment sheet to the registration desk as you depart.

Thank you for attending this workshop and contributing to the discussion.

Figure 1:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER-ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS
JULY/AUGUST 1999

(1) Please indicate which public workshop you are attending:

0.0%; 0 St. Louis, MO	0.0%; 0 Bettendorf, IA	0.0%; 0 St. Paul, MN
0.0%; 0 Quincy, IL	0.0%; 0 Des Moines, IA	0.0%; 0 No Answer
0.0%; 0 Peoria, IL	100.0%; 53 La Crosse, WI	

(2) This workshop provided an opportunity to gain information and a better understanding of the study's initial alternatives

15.1%; 8 Strongly Agree	15.1%; 8 Neutral	3.8%; 2 Strongly Disagree
50.9%; 27 Agree	9.4%; 5 Disagree	5.7%; 3 No Answer

(3) This workshop provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the initial alternatives.

18.9%; 10 Strongly Agree	17.0%; 9 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
52.8%; 28 Agree	7.5%; 4 Disagree	3.8%; 2 No Answer

(4) Please provide any additional comments you wish to make about the study's initial alternatives.

-
- The modernization of the waterway infrastructure is necessary for farmers and industry to remain competitive. Barge transportation is still the most efficient, economic, and environmentally safe mode of transportation. As a result, I support alternative H.
 - Let us hope the C.O.E. encourages all interested parties to curtail lobbying efforts before Congress regarding the extension of locks etc., until the navigation study is completed by 12/2000. What is the specific breakdown of how the \$1 million was spent on the environment vs. the economic side?
 - Concern about additional traffic on waterway causing accidents would be minimal compared to rail and truck accidents carrying same product.
 - I would like to see alternative H pursued as the most advantageous to the most people.
 - If plan H is done be sure to do environment improvement as well.
 - I suggest doing a real environmental impact study. Open all locks and dams and let the river flow freely and naturally. Then see what happens to the environment without them.
 - This process is set up to decide which way the lock and dam system will be expanded. It does not consider the alternative of no expansion.
The presentation just listed how much money the expansion would cost. It did not inform about the process - what the various environmental impacts would be. It spoke only for traffic.
It has been said that earlier meetings (1995) wanted more about environmental impacts. I feel you still have not given this enough study.
 - We need to see the environmental impact statement before considering these alternatives! Without it the choice cannot be made because effects are hidden.
 - Don't turn our great river into a barge canal.
 - All alternatives focus on direct navigation impacts. What about mitigation of secondary long-term impacts? As for example, reduced flow in back channels, bank retreat and sedimentation, degrading of natural environment and diversity and historic properties.
 - If any locks are increased to 1200', it seems that the bottlenecks will just be relocated and more 1200' locks will be asked for. I expect to see a larger increase in barge traffic than is presented. Barges disturb the sediment in the river, the water is much cleaner during non barge traffic periods.
 - I represent 5 million American Farmers and Ranchers. For us to compete in world markets we need action on updating transportation on both the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. In my mind the no action plan is not an option. We need either options D-H to stay competitive. I agree with Marc 2000 that option H is the best! Thank you!
 - All of the improvements should be implemented as soon as possible for the benefit of our domestic

- commerce. Specifically I support alternative H.
- I feel that more benefits should be used on the Illinois River, grain delivery points will be designated on the Illinois River by the Chicago Board of Trades.
- The information provided was incomplete and disappointing. It was presented as a basis for decision which it could not be.
- The opportunity to provide comments on the alternatives was limited due to lack of environmental cost of analysis and presentation of the assumptions used for economic analysis in terms of dollars to the economy. The format was good for solicitation of comments from everyone, however, due to the bias of the information presented intentionally or unintentionally the participants could not make well informed comment. Rather, many appeared to be expressing their "gut" response to the alternatives presented.

Specific concerns and comments on alternative presented: Construction costs under estimated for lock and guide wall extensions, and traffic forecast is unrealistic. What makes this economic analysis better than previous estimates? For example, the prediction of traffic increases done for other studies (i.e. Great, UMRS Comprehensive Management Plan) have not been realized. The actual increase in the last 20 years is less than many of the predictions made 20 years ago.

- I would like to see the Mississippi River's locks and dams system remain as they are, or alternative A.

I feel that this river is overburdened and that its value is not merely in its commercial value its rich ecological diversity is irreplaceable.

While I recognize its value in moving products downriver, we need to acknowledge its capacity.

- Barges use fuel for engines which in turn emit pollutants just as bad as any other form of transportation. You need to also add the barges impact on the river's ecological system-which is already taxed. Oil in the river is a problem, both from spills and operatory factors. Larger barges increase the chances of tragic spills and accidents as does traffic increases. These are costs too, as is loss of habitat, wildlife etc. I support alternative A or B.
- 1. Workshop offered a forum for all to state their opinions about things about which they had original-to-more hard facts.
2. Workshop facilitator (in our room) had little background on the issues to help him frame statements and questions.
3. Overall, use of facilitator is very effective!
Thank you for hosting!
- A good meeting. I think you're looking at all option/alternatives. My belief is that there is no way we can move anything cheaper, or safer than on water. These people that want to move it (grain, coal, fertilizer etc.) by rail or truck will then be the first people to complain about noise, pollution, accidents, traffic congestion, beat up roads etc. And I wish they could understand trying to estimate out 50 years that no one can come up with pinpoint accuracy. Your doing a great job!
- The study should be complete before alternatives are considered.
- Economic assumption of constant rail rates is not feasible if volume moves from river to rail. Volume moving to rail/trucks causes more safety issues with population on US roads. Highest cost for not doing anything will be an individuals such as farmers, energy users, etc. It's not a corporate vs environment issue!!
- The natural resource has traditionally paid the debt left over by everyone else. It cannot continue to do this indefinitely. The cost is difficult to quantify but the cumulative costs continue to accrue over the years. Debt is easier to present than to pay, prevention of damage is wiser over fuel, long term there's mitigation of damage. These meetings were premature, you need the information on the table in a more balanced way. Public resources and distribution of them need to take the cost of operation and maintenance of the navigation system into account.
- What if dollars won't be able to mitigate the loss to the river's ecological health. At some point the loss of the river's environmental integrity will not be brought back by money. We will have to make a decision to restore river to maintain the pieces or let it go. I don't think many people would allow us to let the river go to a point that is only a shipping canal with carp, zebra mussels and purple loose strife.
We are probably close to a crossroads on the river. This study is looking at improving the capacity of navigation traffic but at this point the river's environment is probably at its capacity.
- When can we get the total economic impact of the alternatives. Operation and maintenance costs as well as environmental impacts cost?

- Please submit EIS for independent review by other river agencies, USFWS, WDNR, EPA, or a combination of all.
Determine cumulative environmental impacts before you proceed and before you ask again for public comment.
The public will not support any plan that is not endorsed by all river management agencies.
Meetings were loaded by barge and ag. industry...but you already knew that...didn't you!
- I don't like the feelings of being in a discussing group salted with Corps plants. I feel like my integrity has been violated.
I am also very upset that I had to drive 80 miles and I only live 10 miles from the river.
The DesMoines meeting is an insult to all those living along the river between LaCrosse and Bettendorf.
- I support alternative "H" as the best and cost effective, as well as environmentally safe means to secure a solid and effective transportation system into the 21st century.
- I support to plan H!
- Why are you hauling sand out of pool 7 up the river to Trempeleau, when we need it to restore our shorelines and beaches.
Who makes the decision to have and stock pile sand (i.e.. Dakota Island) rather than restore the beaches and islands along the river. (i.e.. Pool 7)
What happened to the Recreation Beach Maintenance Plan Pool 7??
Restore and refurbish our shorelines and islands on the main channel, not just the backwaters!
I'm tired of all the multi million dollar studies, NOW lets have some action.
- How will disbursement of the Federal monies be equally shared with the barge community, Corps maintenance, fish and wildlife, shore protection, landowners and the recreational (boating, camping, hunting, fishing, etc..) Why is the barge community receiving more money and studies than the respect of the river (keep it a river not a canal!!)? Put x-amount of dollars in for maintenance of a natural river with backwater and island.
Need beach refurbishment plan attended too!! ex. pool 7 = 1987 recreation beach, maintenance plan pool 7.
From Savanna Illinois north the river is special.
- UW-L Main hall not a good place to have meeting although room was large enough, and cool enough. It was not readily handicapped accessible and everything should have been held in one place. It seems as though the COE is afraid to have everyone hear everything attendees have to say.
Alternatives not really presented to understand the real cost and the real environmental impacts.
Would have liked better explanation of cost benefit ratio.
However format was a big improvement over a meeting like this, several years ago in Prairie dv Chien.
- This is very complex issue and the alternatives are not presented in a way as to understand their real cost or impact. Therefore the opportunity to gain useful information regarding the alternative is quite limited.
- Address the fact we have to compete with a South America.
- I am a farmer, it has been very good for me to have the good barge services.
- Is the COE listening to more than one voice? No meeting in Dubuque, but a meeting in Des Moines.
Concern: How would proposed lock expansion downriver from Wisconsin affect barge traffic in Wisconsin? Would increased traffic resulting from any of the proposed alternatives translate into increased barge traffic in Wisconsin. Wisconsin's economy is much more dependent upon recreational activities - not barge traffic. WI doesn't need more barge traffic on the Mississippi. How much more wear and tear can the river endure?
I favor alternative A. It's better environmentally (than present practices) and I do believe that there is a need to do something for navigation. However, until the COE runs the financial figures for the "No action alternative", the COE must not pursue any of the A - H alternatives.
As a taxpayer, I am concerned about the outrageous costs associated with alternatives C-H.
Additionally, none of the alternatives are environmental opportunities for the state of WI and their citizens. And with the limited shipment of bulk commodities by river navigation, none of the proposed alternatives are economic opportunities or for WI residents. Produce the figures for the no action alternative. If Corps can't justify the needs on an economic basis, then project must be dropped. If making 50 year projections is "extremely difficult if not impossible", than COE shouldn't be making

- these projections.
How many negative environmental impacts can the COE mitigate? Will COE mitigate cumulative losses of habitat? The environmental aspects of the Nav. study are inadequate and incomplete. Is there enough money in the inland waterways trust fund to pay for half of the costs associated with any of these alternatives? How can the COE and/or responsible parties, assure that enough funds will be available from the trust fund to pay the freight on any of the proposed alternatives.
If the COE can provide the figures to substantiate that the "no action alter
- I am a farmer and I'm in favor of alternative H. Being located in the center of the country we need a way to reach the markets at a competitive price.
- The EIS should have been complete before this meeting was held. I strongly support plan H, any funding that is federally obtained should be matched to EMP projects over a 10 year period.
- There is a cost of doing nothing, to the farmer, government, shippers and country. We need improvements to the system. I strongly agree with alternative H.
- The most important thing we can do for our children is maintain a strong economy that builds wealth and creates jobs. The economy has been founded on agriculture for generations and will continue to be. Agriculture depends on efficient transportation. Other countries are trying to duplicate our transportation system. We cannot allow ourselves to be relegated to a second rate grain supplier to the world, or our economy will suffer. Strong economies fund good government and environmental funding. We will require both in the future. Build option H!
- Need much more information which is labeled at this meeting as "in process" or "under development".
- We need improvements in the river for movement of our grain.
- I don't see the costs justify potential benefits.
Seems like a project to keep the Corps busy and the barge company's happy through their massive subsidies.
- I am strongly against any modifications that would increase the lock or barge traffic. Your estimates of traffic to the year 2050 neglect to consider the effect of siltation and depth loss to anything but the main shipping channel. Channel depth and straightening to accommodate 1200 foot barges will only hasten the loss of water surface in anything but what will become in featureless drainage tube. I am in favor of fishing increased transport needs to privately owned railways, which represent a more cost effective way to not spend my tax dollar, and this is the best way to ensure maximum cost effectiveness for my tax dollar.
I say no to any increased locks, length or tow traffic.
- I was impressed with study facts assembled by the Corps. Improving efficiency by lengthening locks is the thing to do. Environmental impacts minimized Economic benefits are considerable.
- I support options to improve barge traffic on the river. I produce corn and soybeans for cash markets. Low transportation costs are essential. Exports must compete globally, our improvement of our infrastructure in imperative. Moving commodities by barge traffic controls costs of competing transportation on rail and semi.
- As a farmer I am very much in favor in up grading the lock and dam system. We need to be competitive in transportation costs to survive in the upper Midwest.
- The COE needs to amend the "Nav. Study" to include national "Presidential initiatives" such as U.S. Dept. of Transportation- "Marine Transportation Systems," "Serving Rural America," "Towards a Sustainable America."
The Iowa Grain Study model is not workable to any state but "Iowa". COE needs to meet with MPLS and Chicago Board of Trade to improve the grain model.
Need to include environmental impacts from other modes of rail, truck, pipelines, under the river. Economic model needs to include the extra barges in the river fleet caused by lock delays. Estimate 1/3 of fleet not needed once lock delays are removed.
The U.S. needs to improve the inland waterways locks and dams in order to compete in international trade. Both Europe and South America are improving their river systems for economic development and International trade. These countries support river navigation, why not the U.S.?
- Leopards do not change spots-when is army COE going to flat-out admit they are pawns of the barge companies and do not care at all for anything but barge traffic? Quit trying to B.S. the public about doing good things for anyone else!
- I'm not sure the cumulative environmental effects had been adequately included. I'm also not sure

- that the Corps' estimate of future grain traffic takes into consideration the effect of climate change on Midwest agri. over the next 50 years.

Please return this comment sheet to the registration desk as you depart.

Thank you for attending this workshop and contributing to the discussion.

Figure 1:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER-ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS
JULY/AUGUST 1999

(1) Please indicate which public workshop you are attending:

0.0%; 0 St. Louis, MO	0.0%; 0 Bettendorf, IA	100.0%; 25 St. Paul, MN
0.0%; 0 Quincy, IL	0.0%; 0 Des Moines, IA	0.0%; 0 No Answer
0.0%; 0 Peoria, IL	0.0%; 0 La Crosse, WI	

(2) This workshop provided an opportunity to gain information and a better understanding of the study's initial alternatives

16.0%; 4 Strongly Agree	4.0%; 1 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
76.0%; 19 Agree	0.0%; 0 Disagree	4.0%; 1 No Answer

(3) This workshop provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the initial alternatives.

36.0%; 9 Strongly Agree	0.0%; 0 Neutral	0.0%; 0 Strongly Disagree
60.0%; 15 Agree	0.0%; 0 Disagree	4.0%; 1 No Answer

(4) Please provide any additional comments you wish to make about the study's initial alternatives.

- The assumption that rail rates will only move with inflation if locks go away is false. As a regional RR transportation provider we are constantly being reviewed by MN's 3 class-1 RR's as to river rate structures and volume activity. When market share goes to our favor immediate rate action is taken (lower rates) by class 1 long-hand carriers. If the river and regional RR's go away you eliminate the natural check and balance that exists today. Given the class 1's situation with regard to Wall Street there is no doubt that without river competition rates will rise until, and move with, Wall Street's desired return on investment. Which is in America a growing number, again without a competitive option these class 1's will attain a rate of return (raise front rates) to satisfy stock holders and Wall St., and as we all know they are never satisfied with corporate rate of return.
- MN needs a full boating river system.
On the ag. supply side (future), the river provides vs economic advantage of about 10 million.
Without ag., the existing locks and dams will require some expenses. Let's make the river efficient for everyone (recreational vehicles)
I support alternative H.
- For a prosperous heartland the river must be maintained and improved. Agriculture has to have an efficient way to get inputs, supplies and export commodities.
- Alternative H is a proposal that would be a plan to propose.
- More should have been included on the cost of no action, not only lost economic activity but maintenance and repairs on current system.
- Still not enough information to make a judgment about the alternatives, not much environmental information/costs available. Annual cost were a 50-year amortization but does that include with keep and operational costs? What was included in the benefit figure and benefit to whom? Not enough information, and therefore I do not have much confidence in the figures. I would only be for alternative A or B at this time until more is known. Please go slow and only add when more is known, and when it is absolutely needed. The farm and economic situation can changed either way.
- The study has been continuing, however some of the issues have not been looked at . More time should be spend on looking at the problems that will be caused without the expansion, competition is necessary for farmers to get their lowest cost transportation service to world materials.
- Very informative workshop! Thank You!
I think the Corps is doing a good job of looking at all sides of this complex opportunity. The river system is an asset that must be protected for all citizens, boaters, hunters, fisherman, farmers and consumers.

- It would be my recommendation that the citizens of the U.S move forward with alternative plan H to help keep us competitive in the world economy
- Strongly support alternative " H," seems to be the best choice for the long term. Should make very clear the economic support of shifting transportation modes for all commodities moving on the river not just grain.
- The study's determination of net benefits needs to be reviewed. It would be my opinion the net benefits under all alternatives to improve navigation would be much greater. Also the no change/action alternative should carry a cost as the system degrades over time.
- The study focused on environment, I believe we could have a larger impact over the Mississippi River by controlling topsoil erosion, pollutants, etc. of the total Mississippi Watershed for the dollars spent protecting one or two wildlife species. We have seen a lot of improvement in water quality and believe we can approach water quality condition prior to civilization which would be a major impact on wildlife, recreation, health concerns. For all of the U.S., and the damage we flush into the Gulf of Mexico, we will never get back to a free river. I believe barge traffic impact is minor vs. other major concerns. I support proposal H and would like to see more focus upon a bigger environmental concern, or more bang for our tax dollars long as we have a surplus. Build Now!!
- It makes no difference whether the COE recommends small-scale measures or longer locks if the net result is to allow increased barge traffic and a retention of the unnatural, high-water levels that the existing locks and dams have maintained for 60 years. The Corps has yet to fully, adequately assess the long-term effect of the existing commercial navigation system on the ecology of the UMR and Illinois rivers.
- I strongly support alternative plan H. I believe river transportation is environmentally sound and economically feasible. I feel very strongly that we must upgrade and improve the lock and dam system for our farmers to remain competitive. I do have concerns about the assumption used to drive the net annual benefits. I would encourage you to use more "real world" assumption.
- To give out the most comprehensive initial information, why were alternative modes of transportation not evaluated on environment costs, upgrades not fully evaluated and mentioned? Considering an option "do nothing" exists, not providing this information does not allow for a full-picture based decision.
- Would appreciate an alternative with greater amount of updating, however realities of Congress would temper any further expansion.
- Lets leave the river as is, we have already damaged it almost beyond repair. Lets not lose our river, we only have one! Use other means no matter the cost, then we will have the river for other generations to see and enjoy, you can't build another one.
- I prefer option A as it would do the most to respond to the navigation needs on the river. I believe the multi-purpose nature of the river requires adequate investments in navigation, as well as environment.
- The U.S's ability to compete in the world market must be maintained. If the advancements made by others are not considered in the study the effect of no action will be realized. There by dramatically affecting the futures impact to our economy.

The claims that rail rates won't increase as other rates such as barges increase is wrong. Obviously the COE needs to further research this issue.

- Please see attached sheet!

Please return this comment sheet to the registration desk as you depart.

Thank you for attending this workshop and contributing to the discussion.

Figure I: