

**Upper Mississippi River – Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study**  
**50<sup>th</sup> NECC/ECC Face-to-Face**  
**August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2005**  
**Moline, IL**  
**Holiday Inn**

**1. Attendees:**

Richard Astrack - CEMVS	Bob Clevenstine – USFWS	Paul Rohde – MARC 2000
Butch Atwood - ILDNR	Mark Cornish – CEMVR	Tim Schlagenhaft - MNDNR
John Barko - CEERD	Jon Duyvejonck – USFWS	Bernie Schonhoff – IADNR
Ken Barr - CEMVR	Al Fenedick – USEPA Reg5	Rebecca Soileau - CEMVP
Gretchen Benjamin -WIDNR	John Hey – IADOT	Chuck Spitzack - CEMVP
Mark Beorkrem - MRBA	Marvin Hubbell - CEMVR	Max Starbuck - NCGA
Terry Birkenstock -CEMVP	Nicole McVay – CEMVR	Janet Sternburg - MODOC
Doug Blodgett - TNC	Rick Nelson – USFWS	Holly Stoerker - UMRBA
Jack Carr - CEMVR	Roger Perk - CEMVR	Chuck Theiling - CEMVR

**2. Calendar:**

- **August 30-31** – Pool 18 Water Level Management Public Open Houses – Keithsburg and Burlington
- **September 8<sup>th</sup>** – Barge Fleeting PDT – Value Engineering and Quality Management Workshop – Quad Cities
- **September 12-13** – MARC 2000 annual meeting
- **October 2<sup>nd</sup>** – Bank Erosion Team Conference Call
- **October 19-21** – Institutional Arrangements Workshop – St. Louis, MO
- **November 4<sup>th</sup>** – Bank Erosion Team Meeting – Quad Cities
- **Nov 15<sup>th</sup>** – NECC/ECC – Radisson Riverfront Hotel – St. Paul, MN – 9AM-5PM

**3. Actions Items:**

- **NECC/ECC** should provide feedback on the monthly report to Spitzack.
- **McVay** will send out the most updated list to the NECC/ECC mailing list.
- **Barr** will provide an ecosystem schedule similar to the one shown for navigation.
- **MVR** will have economist develop a simple document describing the indexing process and containing a table of the indexes and how they have been used.
- **NECC/RMC** should provide the Science Panel with information as to what they want from FY06.

- **Soileau** will send a list of questions about adaptive management to the Science Panel.
- Science Panel (**Clevenstine**) will respond to these questions and send them to the NECC/ECC and stakeholders by the October IA workshop.
- **NECC/ECC** members should provide UMSL comments to Jack Carr before the next NECC/ECC meeting.

#### 4. Notes:

##### **Introductions and Opening Remarks**

Celebration of the 50<sup>th</sup> NECC Meeting. Nicole made the Final Draft of the new NESP brochures available.

##### **NESP FY05 Status and FO06 Funding Scenario and Draft Work Plan – Spitzack** (Attachment 1 – PowerPoint, Attachment 2 – FY05 Work plan, Attachment 3 – FY06 Work plan)

**Spitzack** said that the information on the slide 2 is what will be on the Summary Work Plans submitted by the Project Delivery Team (PDT) Team Leaders (TL) which will be updated quarterly. Slide 3 is current FY05 financial obligation – we are trailing our plan by some amount – in May and June we took some management actions to increase work actions. We should see the effects of this in Aug and Sept and should be close to our work allowance by the end of the fiscal year. Slide 4 is the FY05 status on Navigation Efficiency tasks. Switch boats and Mooring cells got a late start so aren't able to expend all that was assumed at the outset. Slides 5-7 are the FY05 status on Ecosystem Restoration tasks. Floodplain restoration: without an authorization we were not able to execute as much work as initially expected; however we are working on design agreements with partners. Pool Water Level Management: we are doing more monitoring in Pool 5. Schinnemann Chute: some of the tasks were moved to Adaptive Management. Slide 8: Programmatic Now should be around 1.8 million. The difference between the High and Low Estimates needs to be narrowed down immediately. There may be additional Corps funds available, but first the gap needs to be closed so we can determine if the program needs extra funding. Slides 9 and 10 are to provide examples of 2 projects. Slides 11-15 are budgetary estimates for FY06 assuming a \$12M work allowance. There are no new projects with this estimate. Slides 16 and 17 are examples of FY06 quarter predicted activities. Slides 18 and 19 showed the program timeline and illustrated the challenge of the funding stream as described in the *Feasibility Report*. Slides 20 and 21 discussed the need for preparing schedules for the first increment – this would be a long range planning and communication tool and the annual and quarterly reports would be shorter range planning and communication tools. Slide 22 discussed Corps Internal Management. The remaining slides showed items for consideration on the Corps' Principles for Integrated Management of the UMRs.

##### **Questions/Comments:**

- **Barr** asked about the monthly reports to the NECC/ECC. **Spitzack** said that we got out one letter but did not get out the next monthly newsletter – we need to work on this. **Barr** asked for the group to give feedback on the monthly report.
- **Beorkrem** asked about a list of TLs and PMs – there was a discussion of the Excel list that contains the PMs, State and FWS reps. **McVay** remained the group that she still needed IL and IA reps. She will send out the most updated list to the NECC/ECC mailing list.
- **Beorkrem** said that the Corps is struggling to finish the first round of major rehabilitation. He asked if there were any plans for the second round of major rehabilitations. **Spitzack** replied that the plan was for 1 rehabilitation per year but that hasn't been working – he didn't know the exact status now. **Carr** said that there are still some reports waiting for approval and there are also some second round reports that are completed. **Barr** said that in the *Feasibility Report* it was assumed that due to more traffic there would be a 25-year cycle of major rehab. **He thought this should be an agenda item of for the next NECC meeting.**
- **Nelson** asked when the Senate would take up WRDA again. **Rhode** said that the Senate is in break and they will be back on Sept 6<sup>th</sup>. After that it is anyone's guess; it will depend on the Supreme Court nomination. The earliest would mid-Sept. **Benjamin** said she talked to Sen. Kind's aide and she thought that the earliest would be late Sept. due to the fact that there are still several Appropriation Bills that haven't been signed.
- **Benjamin** asked if there was available funding in the IWW Trust Fund. **Spitzack** replied that the schedules shown today were developed with an assumption of full funding. **Benjamin** asked if there was a similar table for ecosystem. **Barr** said yes and he would get that to her.
- **Benjamin** was concerned that the 15-year funding increment for ecosystem and navigation seems different than the Feasibility Study. She thought that in the *Feasibility Report*, Navigation Efficiency and Ecosystem Restoration received almost the same funding. **Barr** said that both were indexed to the current prices based on the funding levels established in the *Feasibility Report* and that we need to do a better job of explaining these numbers. He said that he would ask the economists to come up with a spreadsheet that would be helpful to everyone.
- **Barr** asked Spitzack to talk about what came out from the House. **Spitzack** said that the House WRDA Bill has been approved in the House and that there are some small differences between that and the Reviewed Senate Bill. **Stoerker** added that there were some minor changes to the advisory committee, timing of the reports, and referencing the *Feasibility Report* vs. the *Chief's Report*.

### **FY06 New Project Selection/Criteria for framework for refining the Selection Process and Criteria for Future Years – Barr**

**Barr** opened by saying this is a round table discussion. He said that Chuck Spitzack asked the team to come up with FY06 estimates based on an assumed \$12M program with about ½ goes to each sub-program (Nav Efficiency and Ecosystem Restoration). Given this assumption, only the existing projects will be able to use that money. However, if we get additional monies, approaching a \$20M program that is based on the

Senate recommendation, we can do additional efforts. How do we decide what to do next? The Science Panel is developing some tools for sequencing, but those tools are not available yet. Projects should originate with the River Teams. The dialogue with the Science Panel and their tools will help facilitate the River Resources Teams (RRTs), but the decisions should ultimately come from the RRTs. Previously the NECC/ECC has been making the technical decisions. We are at a position now that the technical issues should be moved to the RRTs and that the NECC would phase into the RMC to address more systemic issues.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

- **Schlagenhaft** asked what the \$800k for Adaptive Management would be spent on. He thought it would be monitoring, but there is monitoring in the individual projects – so \$800K is a lot of money for planning. **Barr** replied that the monitoring in the individual projects is pre- and post-monitoring for that project. Adaptive management it is more systemic monitoring. How do we assess the impacts of multiple projects on a reach – this is more adaptive management. Linking the TABS model with ecosystem models
- **Schlagenhaft** asked about the \$500K for the Ecosystem Restoration Management Plan. How does this all fit together? **Barko** said that there are a lot of different management actions that have to be developed. He added that he will be addressing this in his talk. **Barr** added that he and Hank debated which areas get funded by which projects. There is overlap between the two. One item is to decide what tools we need to use “in the sandbox.” **Spitzack** in considering selection criteria for new projects. He added that Ken just said this would come up from the River Resources teams to this forum (NECC/RMC) and we need a process for sorting this out. **Barr** said that the Science panel doesn’t pick projects but it will give us tools to help us do this.
- **Stoerker** asked if the \$12M assumption was for General Investigations (GI) or Construction General (CG). **Astrack** said that this was assumed to be GI/PED funding. Even if we get an authorization we would also need CG funds appropriated to do CG work. **Spitzack** added that it would be highly unlikely to begin construction in FY06, but what we really need to focus on is being prepared for FY07.
- **Stoerker** said it occurred to her that it would be really good to talk concretely as to how the money for Adaptive Management and other science is being used. For many, science is disposable, so we need to have a strong understanding of what we are trying to do and what we have done with that money.
- **Astrack** asked how we make the decisions systemically. What happens if one river resource team comes up with a good idea for their reach or the river, but maybe systemically we need to put money in another part of the river? How will it be decided to fund the particular projects forwarded by a particular RRT? **Barr** said that these discussions would be held annually by the RMC.
- **Stoerker** asked about EMP and NESP. **Spitzack** said that once the NESP is authorized it makes sense that there is one systemic plan for both. We should be able to use what EMP has learned to develop both of our tools. **Perk** said that he has been talking with others in EMP and that he sees it the same way as well.

- **Spitzack** said that we need to develop a timeline for these meetings.

### **Adaptive Management – Barko**

(Attachment 4 – Power Point)

Slide 4: **Barko** discussed that there is an economic component to the ecological value of the river system. Slide 6: NRC suggested that “initial management actions” be defined as experimental. The Science Panel agreed that this would be valuable and noted that many EMP projects would also fall into this experimental designation. Slide 7: the majority of the objectives in 2005 are based upon the recommendation of the science panel from 2003. Slide 8: The Science Panel is chaired by Barko and Johnson. Slide 9: The Regional Support Team consists of individuals who are steeped in local concerns from their reaches of the river. Every time we meet it is a combination of these teams. Slide 14: The Science Panel will be meeting with the SET tomorrow and learn how project selection and sequencing decisions are made for EMP. He said the team understands that there are numerous reasons for how decisions are made, including political and funding reasons. These will be taken into consideration in the final recommendations. Slide 17: Bob Clevestine is the lead on the NESP Report Card. Slide 22: John gave SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, time-bound) objective example.

- **McVay** asked if those SMART objectives were developed for system, reach, or site specific? **Theiling** said that this wasn’t filled out, but rather was developed in order to allow the PDT’s to determine what is appropriate for a specific project – allows better communication between the biologist and the engineer.
- **Beorkrem** asked how biologists who are oriented to sites agree upon reach and systemic plans and goals. **Barko** said that this is a difficult task and will be addressed by the Science Panel in 2006. **Soileau** said that this is what the SET is going to be working with. She also brought up the issue of where people need to be the same, and where they need to be different, when looking at the different levels of coordination. This shows the importance of the River Management Council.
- **Beorkrem** said that the State DNR’s are also going to have to change the way that they look at goals and objectives.

**Barko** continued on slide 23: the report card is part of project evaluation and is very important. He also showed how these are applicable to the different scales of projects and objectives in the system. Slide 29: the definition of Ecosystem Services as defined by the U.N. Millennium Report as shown on the slide. Slide 30: there is a connection between ecological services and adaptive management. Slide 36: the system-wide monitoring and management plan needs to develop site specific first; but it is very important to develop system-wide plans as well. He asked the NECC/RMC to provide information as to what they want from FY06; the Science Panel wants some input. He wants to avoid the scenario that the Science Panel goes off in one direction but the NECC demands they go in another.

### **Questions/Comments:**

- **Benjamin** said that she and Stoerker have talked about how do we communicate to the public what has been done, what are the outcomes and how do we tell them

we aren't achieving specific to funding levels? Will the Report Card Help with this? **Clevenstine** said that this is the entire point of the Report Card. To help with communication. You will be able to see the gross assessments as well as drill down to specific reasons for those ratings.

- **Stoerker** said that she got the impression these are general goals and objectives for the river. How can we assess what a particular program is doing to meeting those goals and objectives? We need to document the successes of **THIS** program. **Clevenstine** said that one of the report card elements is a public perception – are you meeting the Public's perceptions. It also needs to have a program performance criteria – how well is EMP, 519 and NESP doing. **Barr** said that a lot of our monitoring for the site-specific will be observing and documenting the specific benefits that we are getting from the projects.
- **Stoerker** asked how we begin to explain to the public what we want them to invest in – they invest in a program, not a particular action.
- **Beorkrem** said that if we have a buy-in on a specific system-wide objective then the states may change what they are monitoring; the IL CREP may change their objectives if the States have the buy-in.
- **Soileau** said that we will have to report back to Congress on the success of the NESP. In that reporting can we point back to those report cards? Tie your funding stream for NESP back to the report card. You would be able to say which parts were contributing to which parts of the report card.
- **Spitzack** said that we need to do what Holly is recommending to tie the outcomes to the report cards – specific outcomes from the NESP outcome. **Stoerker** said that one of the criticisms of EMP is that we do not have a clear way to measure the success of the program with goals and objectives – not able to describe its value and contribution. The argument that we don't have enough money is not the right argument.
- **Clevenstine** added that he hopes we are not forgetting HNA. We should be reporting back to Congress as to the progress on these acreages.
- **Schlagenhaft** said that ecosystem goods and services is a very important component of the report card. The Report card should really focus on the ecosystem services. Better water quality, water supply and more ducks to hunt would mean more to the public.
- **Beorkrem** said that concerning our competitiveness with other programs across the country, if we are establishing a process for measuring and reporting our successes then we are really doing well – over a 5-10 year period we are going to be pretty competitive as to why we are getting the answers that we are and if they are good answers.
- **Cornish** asked how the Science Panel and the PDT fit together. How do they communicate directly and how does the science panel give information to the PDT's? **Barko** said that Soileau will be discussing this next. Right now the science panel is working with the Pool 5 PDT and will finalize their recommendations based on this action. We think that we work very closely together. **Soileau** said that this seems to be the same recommendations from IA. The Science panel will provide information rather than approval to the RMC, river resource teams, and PDTs.

- **Cornish** asked about conflicts between the science panel and the PDT... if the collaborating groups don't see eye to eye. There are sometimes a broad group of views that come out of the individuals in the science panels – what does the PDT do? **Barko** said that it will resolve itself. He used the SET as an example. **Spitzack** said that it is the same as any other PDT – you get technical input from many different areas, and it is up to the PDT to decide what to do with it and keep higher-ups informed. If someone doesn't like what the PDT is doing then they will tell you.
- **Schonhoff** – If goals and objective are the most important objective for the Science Panel then we need to figure out what we have, what we need, and how to measure it. He asked which of the previous items is missing. **Stoerker** asked how we accept the goals and objectives. **Barko** said that the first science panel drafted up the 81 goals, sent it out for review and then published this. **Spitzack** said that this will be a recommendation from the Science Panel. Then they will have to be taken back to the agencies to get feedback.
- **Stoerker** asked if the coordination is the Science Panel's duties or are they just science. **Soileau** said that the Science Panel should bring it to the RMC and this should be discussed among the stakeholders and the final product would be determined at the RMC with the Science Panel. **Beorkrem** said that this will need to have a much more involved stakeholder effort – we need to have buy-in by going back out to the public and get their feedback – we need to budget for this. **Spitzack** agreed that the public needs to be informed and have opportunities to provide feedback.
- **Benjamin** said that when she drove down she noticed how healthy Pool 9 looks. In general, no matter what the conditions are on the river, this Pool is always better than other pools. She thought it would be a good idea to study areas that are healthier than others and determine what makes it better. **Barko** said that was a good idea. First document what you know about Pool 9 and what processes you think are happening. Then you go out in the field to verify what you thought you knew – then apply this to other pools.
- **Soileau** asked how the Science Panel view input from the river resources teams. Have you been able to get those teams perspective? **Barko** said that the Regional Support Teams are providing that regional input to the Science Panel.

### **Institutional Arrangements – Rebecca Soileau**

(Attachment 5 – Power Point, Attachments 6 & 7 – handouts, Attachment 8 – Read Ahead)

River Management Council (RMC) has become River Council (RC) based upon comments on the Concept Plan regarding concerns on breadth of responsibilities of the different IA teams. Slide 8: there is a need to really get more stakeholders involved – including industry. Rebecca said that she had heard from EPA that they thought the States should co-chair the RC so it wouldn't just be the Feds.

Rebecca talked about the 2 diagram: This lateral format helps to get away from the idea that the UMRBA seem to be over the other groups and that the Federal Principal Group

was not in control of the RC. Items that are faded out are ideas that are not currently in existence. Those that are solid currently exist in some form or another. The Communication Panel is not over the RC; that is just where it fit on the diagram. There has been some discussion regarding good use of time in the RC. How can the navigation or ecosystem representatives make good use of time at a meeting that may contain both items? This has been discussed but needs more work.

- **Schlagenhaft** asked about the workgroups for LTRM. He asked Rebecca to explain what they would be doing. **Soileau** said that this is the A-Team and that they provide input to the EMPCC. If the EMPCC is part of the RC then the A-Team becomes a workgroup that inputs to the RC.

The next diagram was developed for internal Corps communications.

- **Astrack** asked who the Corps Regional Management was. **Spitzack** said that this is the 3 districts working together with MVD but the specifics haven't been worked out. There was some discussion regarding PDT's – in these diagrams the PDT's are part of the districts.

**Soileau** continued. With the Science Panel, she said that it would be adaptive. If a particular stakeholder group felt that the Science Panel was not impartial or was missing their needs then it is possible to change the composition, or goals, of the Science Panel.

- She asked Barko if he felt the Science Panel could/should call a meeting about Adaptive Management. **Barko** said that the Science Panel could initiate development of this area and then share that with stakeholders for recommendations and improvements of these ideas.
- **Theiling** said that one idea would be for the Science Panel to have an annual meeting to meet with stakeholders and PDTs. **Beorkrem** said that it is easier to have 1 meeting and have people come to you, but it is much more effective to go out to people where they are.
- **Barko** asked Soileau to send the list of questions about adaptive management to the Science Panel and they could attempt to answer them. These answers could be sent out to the NECC/ECC and stakeholders. **Clevenstine** said that his group could develop a white paper that makes a recommendation as to what adaptive management is and what needs to be done at each step. It will be up to the stakeholders to decide how to meet those needs. He said he wouldn't have that paper for the meeting in 2 weeks, but Rebecca said it would be helpful to have it by the Oct. Meeting.

**Soileau continued.** Slide 27 – Regional Principal Group

- **Sternberg** asked if this was a new proposed grouping– is this GLC? **Spitzack** said that this is a meeting rather than a formal group – get them to a meeting once a year to share what is going on at the upper level. The States may feel that this is fulfilled with the UMRBA. At the Federal Level this may be the Federal Regional Directors. The Federal Regional Directors have said it may be beneficial to meet with the state people as well.

**Soileau continued.** Slide 30: there was some question about the definition of Stakeholder in this slide – Rebecca said that her use of it here was very broad – COE, Federal, State, and public. Slide 31: she was hoping that each agency could bring their

agency annual calendar to the Fall IA meeting (budget cycle, EMP annual requirements). That would help get the information to the entire group. That way each agency understands when the other agencies need information to make decisions.

- **Sternberg** is concerned that if this workshop has new people at the meetings it will take a lot of time to bring those people up to speed.
- **Barr** said that these letters need to be cc'd to the NECC representatives. **Soileau** said that it would also be sent to the volunteers. **Stoerker** said that it should be cc'd to the EMPCC as well.

## **Floodplain Restoration – Project Representatives**

### **Root River – Schlagenhaft**

(Attachment 9 – presentation, Attachment 10 – Handout, Attachment 11 – Read Ahead)

**Schlagenhaft** said that there was a lot of discussion in the MNDNR on what it means to be a cost-shared partner, how far up the Root River they could go... etc? Root River drains three counties in MN, has high quality trout streams as tributaries. There have been a lot of problems with flooding and levee breaches. The State is interested in pursuing this as a floodplain restoration project under NESP. Goals would be to acquire land from willing sellers either as fee title or conservation easements. Convert farmland to forest, prairie, wetland, etc. Improve existing forest, prairie, and wetland.

### **Questions/Comments:**

- **Schonhoff** asked what kind of outputs they are expecting. **Schlagenhaft** said they are hoping to increase connectivity, and reduce downstream flooding impacts, reduction of sediments.
- **Beorkrem** asked Barr to remind the group why we are trying to identify areas to restore without scientific input. **Barr** said that the *Feasibility Report* identified 35,000 acres in an opportunistic manner – these projects still have to be evaluated and designed to provide ecological improvements. He is still concerned that there are some issues with completing 35,000 acres in 15 years. **Beorkrem** said that he is not at all concerned that we are going to have trouble to get those 35,000 acres due to the fact that there are 37,000 acres available on the Middle Miss. He is concerned that the Corps is circumventing the process. How can we pick “low hanging fruit” when we don’t have our systemic goals and objectives identified? We are getting our cart before the horse. Once we commit to this project it may be many years before we start on another new project. Once we have identified the systemic needs for each river reach then there is enough information for the River Resource Teams to make a decisions and the RC to make the systemic decisions.
- **Stoerker** asked if Schlagenhaft had any idea as to the cost of this project. **Schlagenhaft** said no – there are 4,000 acres identified – but there is no way to know when those properties will be for sale. However, we need to develop a plan, so State may begin to acquire the land as it becomes available.
- **Schlagenhaft** also responded to Beorkrem that we should be working on identifying areas where we want to do the work and begin to do the legwork for

those areas. He views this as an experiment to see how we can begin to design a project.

- **Beorkrem** said that this is another issue – how do we evaluate a plan that may take 20 years to implement. **Barko** replied that you would have to apply models on the front end. **Soileau** recommended that this experiment be documented as a whitepaper so others know what the process is.

**Benjamin – Pierce County Island Restorations – Upper Pool 4 – above Lake Pepin**  
(Attachment 12 – presentation, Attachment 13 – Read Ahead)

The project contains elements of bank stabilization, moist soil units, reforestation. The State owns the land and can go to cost-sharing immediately.

There were no questions or comments.

**Blodgett – Emiquon West**

(Attachment 14 – ReadAhead 1, Attachment 15 – ReadAhead 2)

The Emiquon West Drainage and Levee District is owned jointly between FWS and TNC. It sits behind the Emiquon East site – more removed from the river and is about 1,200 acres. There are two tributary streams that bound it – these are completely leveed off. This is a good learning opportunity – begin to start looking at reconnectivity. Small tributary streams – see what impacts watershed activities have. Be able to easily measure outputs. We could learn a lot on this and provide guidance to us for later. **Barr** said that it would also be an early challenge to figure out how we do agreements with FWS and NGOs. **Blodgett** added that it is adjacent to a HWY – so a great public education opportunity.

**Questions/Comments:**

- **Birkenstock** asked how much the project would cost. **Blodgett** thought that the land cost was about \$5million and restoration was about \$2M but he wasn't sure.

**Feedback on Communications Meeting – Simmons –**

(Attachment 16 – Presentation, Attachment 17 – Presentation Text)

There were no questions or comments.

**Appointment Scheduling (UMSL Draft REPORT) – Carr**

(Attachment 18 – Presentation – Slides 1-14)

This study was done using existing conditions. This study is complete. Should the Corps or others wish to pursue the recommendations of additional study it will require additional funding. Jack said that if members of the NECC/ECC have comments on this they should get them to him before the next NECC/ECC meeting.

**Questions/Comments:**

- **Astrack** said that the Department of Homeland Defense has contacted the Corps regarding the fact that the barge vessels are moving around without security know where they are. This study may also have to be peer review, or have an independent technical review. If the conclusions stand, then we do not need to pursue appointment scheduling. However this study does recommend relooking at appointment systems for degraded conditions or greater traffic levels. Another issue is if you should track the tows or the barges for security reasons.
- **Stoerker** said that she is not sure how this report will be used by the NECC/ECC. **Barr** said that this study was not done to meet NESP needs. **Spitzack** said that there are still decisions to be made as to what the ECC will do with this information.

### **3:45 – Re-Evaluation Study – Carr**

(Attachment 18 – Presentation – Slide 15)

#### **Questions/Comments:**

- **Astrack** said that we were required to do a reevaluation study of our economic models. If these studies are peer reviewed and accepted then we can use these new tools, models, and data to rerun our economic assumptions.

#### **Next meeting – Barr**

The next meeting is scheduled for Nov 15<sup>th</sup> – Radisson Riverfront Hotel – St. Paul, MN 9-5. He recommended that we relook at this pending authorization.

#### **Barge Fleeting – Bollman –**

(Attachments 19 & 20 – Handouts)

The Barge Fleeting Plan was recommended in Alternatives B-E. The PDT's goal is to end up with some suitability maps to help facilitate fleeting activities, without impacting critical resources. The plan will be a useful tool for regulators. She assumes that the maps will have a gradation of suitability. The maps are not meant to be legal or zoning documents. They are not meant to supersede the Regulatory or Real-estate processes – just identify areas that may be easier or harder to acquire regulatory permits. On the Draft PDT list - If there is a question mark behind someone's name that means that she hasn't received confirmation regarding membership on the PDT. She is still in the process of identifying the key players. Certainly, no one will be excluded, but she needs a reasonable sized group as well as a responsible group to review documents and attend meetings. For FY05, the team's goals are to complete the Project Management Plan (PMP), have the Quality Management/Value Engineering Workshop, and determine our project and report formulation process. The workshop will be on September 8<sup>th</sup> here in the Quad Cities. The team's FY06 goals are to collect and assemble data for GIS, identify critical data gaps, resolve data gaps, hold public meetings, and develop a draft document. One issue is to resolve the question of the plan's coverage – ILWW Cal-Sag, Kankakee River, Miss – do open River? These decisions will be resource driven. We

will also have to address shoreline impacts – we will probably have higher level of evaluation in federally or State owned land vs. privately owned land. The plan will be more focused on aquatic resources than terrestrial resources, particularly in areas of no federal land ownership. We need to control plan expectations. The study allocation is \$400K so the work effort will be based on existing data. This is a 3-year effort.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

- **Beorkrem** said that he would like to be on that PDT – MRBA
- **Nelson** said regarding the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet under “Critical assumptions and constraints” there was a fleeting plan draft developed under LTRM – he wasn’t sure if it was ever published. – Contact Jody Millar.
- **Hey** asked if this report would do a survey of the current permitting practices up and down the river. **Bollman** replied that this is not meant to circumvent the current regulatory process. Given the scope she does not think that would part of it. But after further discussion she saw the possibility of documenting the different State and Corps procedures.

#### **Closing Remarks:**

- **Rohde** – Sept 12-13 MARC 2000 meeting
- **Max** – NCGA has been busy with Energy Bill, WRDA, and CAFTA.
- **Benjamin** – Jim Fisher will Gretchen’s replacement
- **Beorkrem** – Angela Anderson is resigning and I will take her place in MRBA
- **Cornish** – Mitigation SAV Sampling – for the fisheries component, they are making the net this fall. They are asking for malcologists to get together to write the scope. Lock 22 data is available
- **Nelson** – FWS is getting a new director – may be Dave Hall.