



# **CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT**

**Public Meetings – March 12-21, 2002**

**Upper Mississippi River - Illinois Waterway System  
Restructured Navigation Study**

**April 2002**

**Prepared for:**  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
St. Paul District  
190 Fifth Street East  
St. Paul, MN 55101-1638

**Prepared by:**  
URS Corporation, Inc.  
7101 Wisconsin Ave.  
Bethesda, MD 20814

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 WORKSHOP OVERVIEW .....	2
1.2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES.....	2
1.3 PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT .....	2
<b>2.0 WORKSHOP PROFILES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 ATTENDANCE.....	5
3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....	5
<b>4.0 CONTENT ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1 INTRODUCTION .....	6
4.2 ANALYSIS BY CATEGORY .....	8
4.2.1 Economics .....	8
4.2.1.1 Barge traffic models .....	8
4.2.1.2 Rate schedules .....	8
4.2.1.3 Alternative modes of transportation .....	8
4.2.1.4 Benefit cost ratio analysis.....	9
4.2.1.5 International competition.....	9
4.2.1.6 Who really benefits?.....	9
4.2.2 Engineering.....	10
4.2.2.1 Safety.....	10
4.2.2.2 Design.....	10
4.2.2.3 Service provided with/without project.....	10
4.2.2.4 Flooding .....	10
4.2.2.5 Cost estimate .....	10
4.2.2.6 Innovation.....	11
4.2.3 Environmental Concerns.....	11
4.2.3.1 Cumulative effects.....	11
4.2.3.2 Effects of increased traffic/lock extension .....	11
4.2.3.3 Floodplain management .....	11
4.2.3.4 Pooled river concerns .....	12
4.2.3.5 Corps mitigation for damages.....	12
4.2.4 Study Management .....	12
4.2.4.1 Time frame .....	12
4.2.4.2 Report/Study.....	12
4.2.4.3 Funding.....	13
4.2.4.4 New structure/Focus .....	13
4.2.4.5 Public Involvement.....	13
4.3 ANALYSIS OF COMMENT SHEETS .....	14
4.3.1 Do you agree with the restructured study's emphasis on collaboration? .....	14
4.3.2 Do you agree with the restructured study's emphasis on economic and environmental sustainability? .....	15
4.3.3 Is there a specific option that supports economic and environmental sustainability that you think should be considered?.....	15
4.3.4 Provide any additional comments.....	16
4.3.5 Breakdown of all responses to check box statements .....	16
4.4 ANALYSIS BY LOCATION .....	17

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
2-1 Meeting Dates and Locations .....	3
3-1 Meeting Attendance .....	5
3-2 Meeting Participation .....	5
4-1 Percent of Statements by Category.....	6
4-2 Percent of Question Type by Category.....	6
4-3 Question 1 Responses by Category .....	14
4-4 Question 2 Responses by Category .....	15
4-5 Question 3 Responses by Category .....	15
4-6 Question 4 Responses by Category .....	16
4-7 Responses to Check Box Statements.....	17
4-8 Percent of Question Type by Location .....	17
4-9 Percent of Statements by Location .....	17

## LIST OF APPENDICES

### Appendix

A	Navigation Study Presentation
B	Summary of Public Questions
C	Summary of Public Statements
D	Summary of Public Comments
E	Peoria, Illinois
	E1 Minutes
	E2 Transcripts
	E3 Original written statements
	E4 Comment Sheets
F	St. Louis, Missouri
	F1 Minutes
	F2 Transcripts
	F3 Original written statements
	F4 Comment Sheets
G	Bloomington, Minnesota
	G1 Minutes
	G2 Transcripts
	G3 Original written statements
	G4 Comment Sheets
H	LaCrosse, Wisconsin
	H1 Minutes
	H2 Transcripts
	H3 Original written statements
	H4 Comment Sheets
I	Davenport, Iowa
	I1 Minutes
	I2 Transcripts
	I3 Original written statements
	I4 Comment Sheets

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Through a cooperative effort of the New Orleans, Rock Island, and St. Paul Districts, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps of Engineers) held a series of five public workshops related to the Upper Mississippi River – Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study (UMR-IWWS). The workshops which started on March 12, 2002 and extended through March 21, 2002, were held in Peoria, Illinois; St. Louis, Missouri; Bloomington, Minnesota; LaCrosse, Wisconsin; and Davenport, Iowa. The workshop locations were selected to provide the greatest accessibility to interested parties in the study area.

The purpose of this Content Analysis Report (CAR) is to document the workshop proceedings and public comments and analyze the communication that occurred at the workshops between the Corps of Engineers and the public. Section 2.0 profiles the workshop agenda and process, and Section 3.0 presents the level of participation and public comment during and after the workshops. Section 4.0 distills the major questions and concerns voiced at each workshop and describes the dominant tones and themes. Various appendices contain complete documentation of the workshop proceedings, public comments, and listings of the major comment themes. This CAR presents an analysis of the comments, questions, and information submitted by the public through one or more of the following avenues:

- Citizens had the opportunity to provide statements in both written and oral form during the public involvement meetings.
- Time was allocated for questions to be asked of the representatives from the Corps of Engineers and others involved in the restructured study.
- Comment sheets were provided to all in attendance at the public meetings, which gave citizens another opportunity to answer specific questions and comment further if they desired.
- For those unable to attend a meeting, letters were also requested as a means to offer input into the conversation.

The statements and questions are organized into four basic categories: environmental, economic, study management, and engineering. These categories were further divided into subcategories as described in Section 4.0. The responses to the comment sheets are also discussed in Section 4.0, although they are categorized slightly differently than the statements and questions.

Overall, there was a good mix of people concerned with economics and environmental issues of the project. Most people also had words to offer regarding the study itself. The statements were more heavily weighted towards economic and environmental concerns, rather than the engineering and study management topics. Economic and environmental issues made up about 84% of the statements. The questions, on the other hand were more closely weighted. Economics, the environment, and study management each made up about 30% of the questions, with the remaining 10% engineering related.

The economic concerns included: barge traffic models, rate schedules, alternative modes of transportation, benefit/cost ratio analysis, international competition, and the distribution of economic benefits.

The engineering concerns included: safety, design, with and without project service levels, flooding, the development of the cost estimate, and innovation.

The environmental concerns included: cumulative effects, effects of increased traffic and lock expansion, floodplain management, pooled river concerns, and Corps of Engineers mitigation measures.

The study management concerns included: time frame, the results of the report/study, funding of the study, the restructured focus, and public involvement.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Through a cooperative effort of the New Orleans, Rock Island, and St. Paul Districts, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps of Engineers) held a series of five public workshops related to the Upper Mississippi River – Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study (UMR-IWWS). The workshops which started on March 12, 2002 and extended through March 21, 2002, were held in Peoria, Illinois; St. Louis, Missouri; Bloomington, Minnesota; LaCrosse, Wisconsin; and Davenport, Iowa. The workshop locations were selected to provide the greatest accessibility to interested parties in the study area.

The public was informed of the workshops via the February 2002 Study Newsletter (with a distribution of over 9,500), the web site, the study's toll-free telephone number, and news releases that were sent out to broadcast and print media in the study area. Media kits were given to media personnel who attended the meeting.

### 1.2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

As part of the Navigation Study, the Corps of Engineers had developed an initial list of alternative scenarios for reducing delays to commercial navigation. (The alternatives are listed in Appendix A, Navigation Study Presentation.) The objectives of the workshops were to:

- Present the alternative scenarios as well as the study findings that led to them.
- Summarize the history of the study and present the objectives of the restructured study.
- Answer public questions through a structured question and answer period
- Give diverse interested parties an opportunity to express their views.
- Reach an understanding of public opinion regarding the new emphasis on economic and environmental sustainability

### 1.3 PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this Content Analysis Report (CAR) is to document the workshop proceedings and public comments and analyze the communication that occurred at the workshops between the Corps and the public. Section 2.0 profiles the workshop agenda and process, and Section 3.0 presents the level of participation and public comment during and after the workshops. Section 4.0 distills the major questions and concerns voiced at each workshop and describes the dominant tones and themes. Appendix A contains the slideshow presentation and text. Appendices B through D contain a categorization of the public questions, statements, and comments. Appendices E through I contain the minutes, transcripts, and original statements and comments from each workshop.

## 2.0 WORKSHOP PROFILES

The dates, times, and locations of the workshops are contained in Table 2-1. All of the meetings began at 6:30 p.m. and concluded at approximately 9:00 p.m.

TABLE 2-1

### MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Navigation Study Workshops

DATE	LOCATION
March 12, 2002	Peoria, Illinois Holiday Inn
March 13, 2002	St. Louis, Missouri Marriot Airport
March 19, 2002	Bloomington, Minnesota Ramada-Airport
March 20, 2002	LaCrosse, Wisconsin Best Western Midway
March 21, 2002	Davenport, Iowa Best Western SteepleGate Inn

Each of the workshops used the following format:

#### (1) Opening Remarks (15 minutes)

At 6:30 Bill Wiedman introduced the meeting structure, procedures and basic information. He then introduced the project manager, Denny Lundberg.

#### (2) Formal Presentation (45 minutes)

Denny Lundberg gave a formal presentation describing the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System Restructured Navigation Study. The presentation included a brief history of navigation study activities between March 1993 and January 2000. It also covered the events leading up to the restructuring of the navigation study, which covers the period between February 2000 and August 2001. The presentation also discussed the new restructuring of the navigation study, which started in August 2001 and will continue with the Interim Report due July 2002 and the Feasibility Report due 2004. Denny Lundberg then introduced the members of a panel who would answer questions from the public.

Appendix A contains the complete presentation text and slideshow.

#### (3) Question and Answer Period (1 hour)

The public submitted written questions which were then distributed to the Corps of Engineers, other Federal agencies, State agencies, and other stakeholder representatives. The respondents took turns reading the questions out loud and then answering them while Bill Weidman moderated the question and answer period as needed. A court reporter recorded the proceedings.

Appendix B contains a complete list of all the questions asked by the public.

#### (4) Statements (1 ½ hours)

Bill Weidman moderated the statement period while individual members of the public were each allowed approximately three minutes to make their statement. As with the question and answer

period, a court reporter recorded the proceedings. In addition, those making statements were asked to leave any written statements with the Corps public involvement staff.

Appendix C contains a summary list of all the oral and written statements; Appendices E, F, G, H, and I contain the full written statements separately for each meeting.

**(5) Closing**

Bill Weidman thanked the audience for coming, and encouraged them to fill out a comment sheet before they left.

Appendix D contains a summary list of all the comment sheets; appendices E, F, G, H, and I contain the full written comments separately for each meeting.

### 3.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The effectiveness of the workshops can be assessed from many perspectives. The best approach to evaluating the quality of public involvement in these workshops is to combine a quantitative and qualitative assessment of each workshop. This section measures public participation quantitatively through indicators including attendance, participation, and responses to the workshop comment sheet. The qualitative analysis of the comments and questions received from the public are discussed in Section 4.0.

#### 3.1 ATTENDANCE

The estimated attendance at the Navigation Study workshops is presented in Table 3-1. Since participants were not required to register, the figures presented are approximate headcounts.

TABLE 3-1

#### MEETING ATTENDANCE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Workshop Location	Estimated Attendance
Peoria, Illinois	141
St. Louis, Missouri	83
Bloomington, Minnesota	65
LaCrosse, Wisconsin	143
Davenport, Iowa	230
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>662</b>

The level of public participation during and after the workshops is illustrated in Table 3-2.

TABLE 3-2

#### MEETING PARTICIPATION U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Location	Number of Questions Asked	Number of Statements Made	Number of Comment Sheets
Peoria, Illinois	36	15	80
St. Louis, Missouri	27	24	46
Bloomington, Minnesota	49	23	19
LaCrosse, Wisconsin	65	29	74
Davenport, Iowa	81	29	89
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>308</b>

Tables 3-1 and 3-2 show the varying levels of attendance and participation across meeting sites. Overall, the numbers represent a significant level of public involvement and effort from the members of the public to get across their opinions. Even allowing for a high amount of overlap in Table 3, it appears that at least 50% of the attendees voiced their concerns through at least one of the means available.

## 4.0 CONTENT ANALYSIS

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section contains an analysis of the comments, questions, and statements submitted by the public through one or more of the various avenues:

- Citizens had the opportunity to provide statements in both written and oral form during the public involvement meetings.
- Time was allocated for questions to be asked of the representatives from the Corps of Engineers and others involved in the restructured study.
- Comment sheets were provided to all in attendance at the public meetings, which gave citizens another opportunity to answer specific questions and comment further if they desired.
- For those unable to attend a meeting, letters were also requested as a means to offer input into the conversation.

Some members of the public submitted opinions in multiple methods, and several people expressed similar opinions on many of the issues. This report has been prepared to avoid redundancy and to summarize the main concerns expressed by the public.

In this report, the comments, questions, and statements of public opinion are discussed as a whole rather than individually by each meeting site. There are certain trends that exist in the opinions expressed, and the objective of this report is to capture those trends and let them lead the discussion. In order to accomplish this task, the trends are based first on the overall concerns and then by the more specific issues. The statements were more heavily weighted towards economic and environmental concerns, rather than the engineering and study management topics. Economic and environmental issues made up about 84% of the statements, as shown in Table 4-1. The questions, on the other hand were more closely weighted. Table 4-2 shows the breakdown of the questions by category across all meeting sites.

TABLE 4-1: PERCENT OF STATEMENTS BY CATEGORY

ARGUMENT	Grand Total	
	Count	Percent
Economic	74	62%
Environmental	26	22%
Other	20	17%
Grand Total	120	100%

TABLE 4-2: PERCENT OF QUESTION TYPE BY CATEGORY

CATEGORY	Grand Total	
	Count	Percent
Economics	77	30%
Engineering	21	8%
Environmental	79	31%
Study Management	81	31%
Grand Total	258	100%

The statements and questions have been categorized in the following manner:

1. Economics
  - Barge traffic models

- Rate schedules
  - Alternate modes of transportation
  - Benefit cost ratio analysis
  - International competition
  - Who really benefits?
2. Engineering
    - Safety
    - Design
    - Service provided with/without project
    - Flooding
    - Cost estimate
    - Innovation
  3. Environmental
    - Cumulative effects
    - Effects of increased traffic/lock extension
    - Floodplain management
    - Pooled river concerns
    - Corps mitigation for damages
  4. Study Management
    - Time frame
    - Report/Study
    - Funding
    - New structure/Focus
    - Public involvement

The responses from the comment sheets vary by each question, and it is more sensible to present the responses accordingly, by question and categorized answers:

1. Do you agree with the restructured study's emphasis on collaboration?
  - Concerned that collaboration interests are not balanced
  - Concerned that collaboration is too time consuming or too difficult a task
  - Agree or strongly agree with collaboration
  - Neutral
2. Do you agree with the restructured study's emphasis on economic and environmental sustainability?
  - Agree or strongly agree
  - Neutral
  - Need more emphasis on environment
  - Need more emphasis on economics
  - Disagree
  - Concern that the study is taking too long
3. Is there a specific option that supports economic and environmental sustainability that you think should be considered?
  - Build 1200 foot locks
  - Sustain a healthy river
  - Scheduling and/or lock management
  - Use non-structural measures
  - Leave locks at 600 feet or use R&D or other options
4. Provide any additional comments. The general feedback to this question can be categorized as:

- Economics are the most important issue
- The environment is the most important issue
- Project management concerns (the study is taking too long)
- Other

## 4.2 ANALYSIS BY CATEGORY

### 4.2.1 Economics

#### 4.2.1.1 Barge traffic models

The barge traffic models raised concern among members of the public. The initial models forecasted significant upward trends in commodity traffic over the next 50 years. It was mentioned that this is not consistent with the recent trends of traffic growth over the past two decades. Traffic on the river since the 1980's was said to be relatively unchanged. This is closely associated with another common concern that the data used in these models is now 10 years old, and needs to be updated to capture current economic conditions.

Several people expressed concern with the methodology used in these models. The modeling was done using previously approved Corps of Engineers models, as opposed to taking the recommendation of the National Research Council. This led to questions of the accuracy of the methodology, as well as to suggestions of alternative approaches, such as:

- Spatial models that incorporate world supply and demand;
- Delphi techniques used to forecast based on detailed expert surveys; and
- Including some probabilities with each scenario.

#### 4.2.1.2 Rate schedules

The effect on rates throughout commodity transportation was a major concern of both barge companies and farmers. The barge companies are very concerned with the effects of the with and without project outcomes on the going barge rates. To many, the lack of improvements could make barge transport more costly, due to the increased delays.

Farmer's have concerns with two sides of the rate issue; what will happen to their costs and what will happen to the prices they can charge. There is much concern over the increase in farmer's costs. There is a need for the Mississippi River to be able to compete with the rail companies. Many farmers ship their products by rail, but the rail rates are largely determined by the competition that the rail companies face from the barge companies. In order to avoid adverse effects on small local farming communities, the river transport needs to remain competitive with the rail transport.

#### 4.2.1.3 Alternate modes of transportation

There was a fair amount of discussion related to the use or competition from alternate modes of transportation. Some members of the public were concerned with the effects of the increased truck traffic that could result from the lack of improvements. For example, how would this affect the local communities, economically and environmentally? Others expressed concern for the already limited rail road terminals.

It was pointed out that barge transportation of commodities is the most efficient means of transportation, in both cost efficiency and fuel efficiency. The amount that can be carried on one barge would fill over one hundred trucks. A modal shift analysis showed that the closing of a portion of the river in Minnesota to navigation would lead to several hundred additional trucks on the roads each day, and the associated costs that come with that.

The other side of the argument that was made involved the different subsidies that transportation groups receive. Some felt that the barge companies and river transport already received enough support from the government, and should bear additional costs for the project. And, it was also suggested that more recent studies show that the efficiency gap between barge and rail transport is closing, and may have even shifted to favor rail as a result of technological advances.

#### **4.2.1.4 Benefit cost ratio analysis**

The benefit/cost ratio analysis that was done for improvements to the river resulted in about a 5:1 ratio. This was a concern of several attendees of the meetings. The following is a list of items that were called into question about the ratio:

- Does it consider construction costs?
- Does it factor in the subsidies to the industry as costs?
- Does it take into account the benefits that could be achieved from avoiding tow waiting time?
- Does it account for the costs of the family farmer if the improvements are not made?
- Does it consider the costs of lost crops each year as a result of the delays?
- Does the analysis include the jobs lost or created as a result of the decision to move forward with the project?
- Does it consider ecological costs?

It is also important to note that several comments were addressed to the affect that the Corps used the models that they used because they were able to overstate the economic benefits.

#### **4.2.1.5 International competition**

It was argued that the improvements to the waterway are entirely necessary in order for the United States, and its local communities and farmers, to continue to compete into the future with South American countries on the global market for grains and other farm products. The long-term viability of the agriculture industry depends on these locks in order to more efficiently move their export commodity so that they can maintain lower, more competitive costs. The cost advantages of cheap transportation allow local farmers to compete with the cost advantages of cheap labor in South America.

On the other hand, it was suggested that competition may not be the proper approach to dealing with the producers in South America. It could be economically and environmentally beneficial to form cooperative relationships with other grain producing and exporting nations. This could allow the U.S. and others to more favorably use the natural resources.

#### **4.2.1.6 Who really benefits?**

Questions and statements were repeatedly mentioned on the topic of who would really benefit from the lock expansions. The opinions were on all sides of the argument. Several members of the public felt that the benefits would end up in the hands of the farmers, while others felt that the improvements would simply let the farmers maintain where they are.

Other citizens were of the opinion that the barge companies and the large exporters were the only ones that stand to benefit in the way of economic profits. But, it was also mentioned that the local communities stand to benefit. Some made certain not to overlook the job opportunities that such a project creates. These jobs would certainly have a positive impact on the communities, and benefits of the project would, in this light, extend beyond just those who use the river.

## **4.2.2 Engineering**

### **4.2.2.1 Safety**

It was observed that too much emphasis has been put on the economic and environmental issues surrounding the construction of new locks. Safety concerns are just as important as a justification for the project. The current lock length of 600 feet requires vessels to undergo the double-locking process. The double-locking process has caused injuries and deaths to crewmembers in the past. Evidence from the replacement of Lock 26, Melvin Price Lock, has shown the numbers of injuries dramatically decrease since the project.

Other safety arguments include that it is safer to upgrade the locks than to rely on other modes of transportation. This type of argument is based on the fact that the more freight shipped on barges, is simply more freight that will not need to be trucked.

Safety was also used as an argument against scheduling lockages. The barges currently operate safe and slow, but if forced to maintain a schedule this could change. This makes the lock improvements a safer option.

### **4.2.2.2 Design**

A few members of the public expressed interest in any dredging that would be associated with the project. Concerns included:

- The placement of islands formed from dredged material;
- Whether dredging of the Illinois River would be included in the project; and
- Whether new equipment made by Caterpillar would be used with the project.

There were also several members concerned with the placement and effects of mooring cells at the new locks.

### **4.2.2.3 Service provided with/without project**

The levels of service that could be provided, with, and without, the lock improvements were a frequent topic of discussion. Citizens wanted to know if new locks are not constructed, can the Corps provide the existing levels of service into the foreseeable future.

Some were also interested in what would happen if only some of the locks are constructed. Wouldn't this cause the existing locks to have to operate at higher levels in order to realize the benefits from those that have been extended?

An opinion was offered that for 50 years the Corps has been making repairs, and patching together the locks; it is about time to replace them all together.

### **4.2.2.4 Flooding**

There was also concern of flooding or flood prevention as a result of the project. Most importantly, the public wanted to know what anticipated effects the project would have on flooding. How would the proposed guide walls influence the prevention of flooding? Specifically, what effects would the project have on flooding for the Upper Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers?

### **4.2.2.5 Cost estimate**

There was concern over how the cost estimate was developed. Members of the public were interested in how the project cost estimates were developed, and whether this estimate needs to be upgraded with the

restructured study. Specifically, it was questioned whether recalculations would include cost savings from rehabilitation costs, as recommended by the NRC.

#### **4.2.2.6 Innovation**

Several comments addressed the issue of innovation in design and its impact on waterway navigation. These seem to stem from the fact that no other transportation industry relies on infrastructure that was built in the 1930's. It was also pointed out that innovation has been lacking for 50 years. There were suggestions of improvements to both the barges and the locking systems. The locking systems have been functioning on the same design for the past 50 years, and it was suggested that it may be time to improve that aspect rather than build new locks of the same sort.

To make the barges more environmentally friendly, it was proposed that additional thought be put into research and development of more effective and less disruptive propulsion.

#### **4.2.3 Environmental Concerns**

##### **4.2.3.1 Cumulative effects**

Several people expressed interest in learning more about how the cumulative effects will be addressed in the study. The most common question was 'will the report include the effects of 150 years of dams, dredging, and dikes?' The repeated concern for this expresses the public's desire for this to be the case.

Many members of the public were also interested in what will define the baseline for measuring the environmental impacts. Suggestions were made as to why the baseline should be 1930 or even 1850, as opposed to using present conditions. In order to account for the cumulative impacts of navigation on the environment, several people felt it was important to account for the past as well as the present and future. This stresses the large concern to account for the decades of damage that has already been done.

##### **4.2.3.2 Effects of increased traffic/lock extension**

One of the most prevalent concerns is the environmental effects of the project, and the increased traffic that is driving the need for the project. An important issue that was brought up was what, if any, effects have been documented from the Ohio River lock improvements? It was pointed out on a few occasions that this should be an excellent source of data sampling to analyze the environmental effects of this project.

There was much concern for wildlife and habitat that could be adversely affected by the project, such as plant, bird, and fish species that live and feed off the river.

A couple of mitigating environmental arguments were also made. It was noted that there would be much less churning as a result of less waiting and splitting of tows. Less waiting time also means less barge congestion; therefore disturbing less fish and wildlife.

##### **4.2.3.3 Floodplain management**

Although a wide variety of individual environmental concerns were raised, the topic of floodplain management was mentioned several times. It was pointed out that the river has already lost half of its original floodplain as a result of the navigation control structures on the river.

Several people were interested in how the 9 foot channel will affect the floodplain and the agricultural land surrounding the river. Others were interested in assuring the regeneration of floodplain forests. And, some were also concerned for the interests of floodplain farmers. The public expressed concern that these issues needed to be incorporated in the study.

#### **4.2.3.4 Pooled river concerns**

Another individual concern that was raised several times was the affects of the pooled river. One of the major concerns here was for the fish that may be affected by an altered habitat. Is it natural for the fish to live in an area that they may not otherwise migrate to?

The other major concern in the pooled areas of the river was the sedimentation. It was pointed out that this is one of the more important problems associated with the pooled areas. There seemed to be a desire for the Corps to have a plan to control sedimentation in the pooled river.

#### **4.2.3.5 Corps mitigation for damages**

There were several questions and opinions offered regarding what efforts should be taken by the Corps of Engineers in order to mitigate any environmental damages. These ranged from proposing alternatives to the lock improvements, to increased funding for environmental concerns.

It was suggested by a few people that efforts be taken to avoid having to increase the lock lengths. Some were interested in limiting the number of barges, using alternative means of transportation, focusing the efforts on innovation to make barge transport more efficient, and using schedules in order to avoid locking delays.

An issue that was mentioned several times was an environmental trust fund. Many people wanted to see this being increased and more widely used to mitigate past and present environmental damages caused by river navigation.

Other concerns included:

- When will the public be able to see clear info about specific mitigation?
- Are there any problems that could not be mitigated?

The general stance is that the desires of the navigation industry need to be balanced with the needs of the environment.

#### **4.2.4 Study Management**

##### **4.2.4.1 Time frame**

The time frame of this already exhaustive study was a concern of most people who participated in the meetings or otherwise expressed their opinions. In fact, this seems to be an area than many people were emphatic with their comments.

The major issues were:

- how long will it be until construction actually begins;
- will the project be done on time;
- why is this not done yet; and
- are there any ways to speed up the process?

Through these concerns on the time frame of the project, the majority of the public stressed the bottom line need to complete the study and move forward based on the decisions.

##### **4.2.4.2 Report/Study**

Several comments and suggestions were made concerning the report and the results of the study. The most pressing concern was what would be included in the report.

It was repeatedly suggested that the report include an independent peer review or an independent expert review. Included in these suggestions was that this review be done by the National Research Council, or that the study be monitored by the NRC.

In addition to this, there was a general level of curiosity regarding what the Corps of Engineer's expectations are of Congress from the interim report.

#### **4.2.4.3 Funding**

There were a variety of concerns regarding the funding of the study and of the project itself. These ranged from the more general complaints that too much money has already been spent due to the amount of time that the study is taking, to the more specific details of who pays for what portions of the project, and why.

A few people commented that the barge companies stand to benefit at the expense of the taxpayers. A couple others suggested that barge companies should share a portion of the cost.

Others were concerned that there was not enough funding for the environmental portions of the study, and some members of the public were interested to know who would pay for the ecosystem restoration programs.

Most of the comments regarding funding were coupled with other opinions, and the funding comments seemed to be a means for people to stress their concerns.

#### **4.2.4.4 New structure/Focus**

The overall feeling from the public was that the Corps of Engineers new structure of the study should move things in the right direction. Very few people expressed opinions that only economics or only the environment was important. Most people realized that there needs to be a balance of all the issues involved in the navigation improvements, and they also realized that this is the goal of the restructured study. In general, there was approval, but also a moderate level of skepticism as to whether or not the study would go as planned.

There was some level of concern over the focus of the project. It was commented that the budget still only allocates 10% towards environmental aspects of the study and the project.

#### **4.2.4.5 Public involvement**

There was a great desire for continued public involvement. It was suggested that a follow-up meeting be arranged at another point during the process, possibly after the interim report is available. The public also wanted an opportunity to comment on the interim report, whether or not a follow-up meeting occurs.

### 4.3 ANALYSIS OF COMMENT SHEETS

This section provides an account of the responses that members of the public gave on the comment sheets that were made available to them at the public meetings. These comments are much clearer if categorized and described by the actual question that was asked, rather than attempting to fit each response into one of the categories above.

Each section will display a table of how the comments are categorized, and then will provide a general summary of the common opinions. It is important to note that each table and each question does not have the same amount of responses. This is because not all comment sheets were completed with responses to each question, and because some comments are categorized into more than one category.

Following this, a table has been included to present the breakdown of answers to the check box questions that preceded the open answer questions on the comment sheets.

#### 4.3.1 Do you agree with the restructured study's emphasis on collaboration?

TABLE 4-3: QUESTION 1 RESPONSES BY CATEGORY				
	AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE WITH COLLABORATION	NEUTRAL	CONCERNED THAT COLLABORATION INTERESTS AREN'T BALANCED	CONCERNED THAT COLLABORATION IS TOO TIME CONSUMING OR TOO HARD TO DO.
PEORIA, IL	51	20	15	9
ST. LOUIS, MO	25	12	8	9
BLOOMINGTON, MN	13	5	3	2
LACROSSE, WI	45	13	23	5
DAVENPORT, IA	59	21	11	13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>38</b>

A large majority of the respondents agreed with the new emphasis on collaboration, as evidenced by column 1 in Table 4-3. There were no respondents that clearly disagreed, but there were several who expressed concern that the interests are not balanced, or that they were skeptical of the outcome.

The general consensus of those who are concerned that collaboration interests are not balanced is that the environment will not really have equal weight in the decision making process. There is also a general level of skepticism that the study will not follow through with the collaborative interests.

For those answers classified in the fourth column of Table 4-3, there is a general feeling that something needs to be done soon. Many of these comments reflected that they like the collaborative efforts, only if they are not making the process even more burdensome.

It is also important to note that there were several responses from people who were not disappointed with the original study. Of course, many of these people are the same ones that just want to see something happen soon.

**4.3.2 Do you agree with the restructured study's emphasis on economic and environmental sustainability?**

**TABLE 4-4: QUESTION 2 RESPONSES BY CATEGORY**

	<b>AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE</b>	<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>DISAGREE</b>	<b>NEED MORE EMPHASIS ON ECONOMICS</b>	<b>NEED MORE EMPHASIS ON ENVIRONMENTAL</b>	<b>CONCERNED THAT IT IS TAKING TOO LONG</b>
PEORIA, IL	40	19	2	13	7	9
ST. LOUIS, MO	18	14	2	8	7	1
BLOOMINGTON, MN	12	3	0	4	5	0
LACROSSE, WI	55	12	3	12	15	1
DAVENPORT, IA	44	26	10	12	13	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>14</b>

The majority of the respondents are in favor of the emphasis of the restructured study, but they are almost evenly split as to which aspect needs greater attention. In this sense the comments balance each other out. As in the previous question, there were also some skeptical comments expressed. Some people imply a lack of trust of the Corps study because of the previous economic studies.

**4.3.3 Is there a specific option that supports economic and environmental sustainability that you think should be considered?**

**TABLE 4-5: QUESTION 3 RESPONSES BY CATEGORY**

	<b>BUILD 1200' LOCKS</b>	<b>LEAVE LOCKS AT 600' OR USE R&amp;D OR OTHER OPTIONS</b>	<b>SUSTAIN A HEALTHY RIVER</b>	<b>SCHEDULING AND/OR LOCK MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>USE NON-STRUCTURAL MEASURES</b>	<b>NO RESPONSE</b>
PEORIA, IL	18	9	5	2	3	51
ST. LOUIS, MO	7	4	6	1	0	29
BLOOMINGTON, MN	2	2	1	0	0	15
LACROSSE, WI	12	14	10	4	5	43
DAVENPORT, IA	16	10	4	2	1	60
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>198</b>

Only a small percentage of responder's included an answer to this question on their comment sheets, and again the responses were well mixed. People that were in favor of building the 1200 foot locks generally cited economic reasons, transportation efficiency, and environmental concerns. Not all of the comments were one-sided. Many people that support building the longer locks also support efforts to sustain a healthy river and continue to seek alternative options. There were also many comments reflecting concern that the environment should be the top priority, and no further improvements should be made until the health of the river can be guaranteed.

**4.3.4 Provide any additional comments.** (The general feedback to this question can be separated into four categories.)

TABLE 4-6: QUESTION 4 RESPONSES BY CATEGORY					
	ECONOMICS ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE	THE ENVIRONMENT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE	THE STUDY IS TAKING TOO LONG	OTHER	NONE
PEORIA, IL	18	6	10	13	34
ST. LOUIS, MO	7	5	6	6	19
BLOOMINGTON, MN	2	3	1	3	10
LACROSSE, WI	12	12	1	17	33
DAVENPORT, IA	19	8	6	9	47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>143</b>

This was a very open-ended question, and many of the answers reflect that. The comments that can be classified into the first three columns of Table 4-6 generally present the same opinions that have been presented through the other comments. There are, however, some ideas that have been classified as “other” that are unique and deserve mention. One comment, which had been brought up elsewhere, is that the Corps needs to get the states involved in the decision making and planning process. This will ensure greater public participation, and greater attention to the concerns of the population directly affected. Several others, whose comments were categorized as “other”, expressed disappointment with the information presented at the meetings. Many responders also stressed the importance of “thinking outside of the box” and working with groups outside of the Corps of Engineers in order to bring new ideas and increase involvement in the project.

**4.3.5 Breakdown of all responses to check box statements**

The following statements were presented on the comment sheets for feedback. Table 6 presents the percentage breakdown of the responses to the statements all meeting sites.

**Statement 1:** This meeting provided an opportunity to gain information about the restructured study.

**Statement 2:** This meeting provided an opportunity to gain a better understanding about the restructured study.

**Statement 3:** This meeting format provided ample opportunity for everyone to offer comments about the study.

**Statement 4:** The information provided on the displays was valuable in helping me understand the study.

**The goals of this study should be:**

**Statement 5:** Have a balanced sustainable approach to navigation and the environment.

**Statement 6:** Improve the efficiency of the navigation system.

**Statement 7:** Restore the river habitat.

**Statement 8:** Sustain a healthier ecosystem.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
STATEMENT 1	24.0%	64.0%	6.8%	0.6%	0.3%
STATEMENT 2	22.9%	66.2%	7.5%	2.7%	0.7%
STATEMENT 3	33.2%	55.6%	8.6%	2.2%	0.4%
STATEMENT 4	13.8%	53.5%	26.0%	5.2%	0.4%
STATEMENT 5	36.4%	42.5%	13.3%	3.2%	1.5%
STATEMENT 6	55.2%	22.2%	11.8%	7.3%	1.3%
STATEMENT 7	36.6%	29.6%	23.0%	7.3%	3.5%
STATEMENT 8	43.4%	31.5%	20.3%	4.2%	0.7%

Table 4-7 is presented with percentages rather than counts because, unlike the open-ended questions, the check box statements were completed for all respondents. In general, the responses show that the majority of people either agree or strongly agree with all of the statements. In fact, the percentage of people who disagree is low for all eight statements. The responses to the first four statements reflect the opinion that the public was satisfied with meeting. The responses to statements five through eight supports the balanced approach of the restructured study.

#### 4.4 ANALYSIS BY LOCATION

The analysis in the preceding sections covered all of the meeting locations. It is also important to take a brief look at the differences across locations. To do so, Tables 4-8 and 4-9 provide a breakdown of the types of statements and questions that were asked at each location. An overall trend of the statements is that they tended to focus more on the economic issues at hand. This was true of each location with the exception of LaCrosse, which had about an even share of economic and environmental statements. The types of questions were also consistent across locations, with the exception of St. Louis, where there were a much higher percentage of environmental questions asked than at the other sites.

TABLE 4-8: PERCENT OF QUESTION TYPE BY LOCATION

CATEGORY	Bloomington		Davenport		LaCrosse		Peoria		St. Louis		Grand Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Economics	14	29%	26	32%	23	35%	9	25%	5	19%	77	30%
Engineering	6	12%	10	12%	2	3%	3	8%	0	0%	21	8%
Environmental	18	37%	16	20%	20	31%	11	31%	14	52%	79	31%
Study Management	11	22%	29	36%	20	31%	13	36%	8	30%	81	31%
Grand Total	49	100%	81	100%	65	100%	36	100%	27	100%	258	100%

TABEL 4-9: PERCENT OF STATEMENTS BY LOCATION

ARGUMENT	Bloomington		Davenport		LaCrosse		Peoria		St Louis		Grand Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Economic	12	52%	21	72%	14	48%	11	73%	16	67%	74	62%
Environmental	3	13%	3	10%	13	45%	1	7%	6	25%	26	22%
Unknown	8	35%	5	17%	2	7%	3	20%	2	8%	20	17%
Grand Total	23	100%	29	100%	29	100%	15	100%	24	100%	120	100%