

## **DRAFT**

### **NESP – Project “N” Systemic Barge Fleeting Plan Teleconference 15<sup>th</sup> July 2008 10:00 to 11:15**

#### **Participants:**

Industry: Lynn Muench, Larry Daily, George Foster, Lee Nelson, Brent Nissen, Jim “Goat” Patterson, Randy Simmons

Corps: MVP (St. Paul) – Bruce Norton, Paul Machajewski; MVR (Rock Island) – Dorie Bollman, Wayne Hannel, Leo Keller, Dennis Shannon, Gary Swenson; MVS (St. Louis) – Brian Colgate, Alan Edmondson, Ray McCollum

**Purpose:** 1) To discuss the existing fleeting/mooring mapping that was sent out for team review on 15 May 2008. 2) To discuss improvements to the mapping product and the review process. 3) Discuss the next steps/planning tasks for Project ‘N’

#### **Action Items:**

1. Dorie Bollman – Arrange 3 mapping review team meetings based on St Paul’s model. Coordinate through the RRCT (MVR) and RAT (MVS) and include appropriate members of the Project N team. These teams will review the existing mapping for the Miss. River in MVR, Miss. River in MVS, and the Il Waterway in MVR and MVS. Target completion: 15 Sept 08.
2. Dorie Bollman – Send out memo to Project N team that defines the project mission, the purpose of the mapping review effort prior to the meetings reference in #1 above.
3. Dorie Bollman – Get a copy of the Barge Fleeting Plan done for the Chicago area.
4. Paul Machajewski – Provide the results of the MVP mapping review effort, Fleeting criteria, and GIS mapping structure to Dorie Bollman for dissemination to the project N team prior to the meetings reference in #1 above. Target completion: early August.
5. Dorie Bollman – Set up a date for team site visit to a St. Louis area port facility with George Foster and an impacted site with FWS. Purpose of site visits is to increase each team members knowledge and understanding of the issues that we are trying to resolve with this plan, to foster dialog necessary for plan completion.
6. Dorie Bollman – Work with team to define terms such as fleeting, mooring, etc. which is essential for development of our project report/plan.
7. Dorie Bollman – Work with District GIS rep’s to unify the mapping template for all mapping amongst the 3 Districts

### Meeting Minutes (Major discussion topics):

1. Mapping – Industry thought the mapping was confusing, inaccurate, and incomplete. District rep's explained the source of the information displayed on the maps and in the tables. MVR used: 1991 GIS data, industry reports (Jeffboat, etc), aerials, personal experience, some permits, and sub-reports generated during the navigation study. MVS used: old permits, data from industry contacts, and focused on port authorities. The Corps understands that some ownerships and activities change over time, but we are not necessarily informed of those changes. Additionally, the regulatory database is imperfect. Fleeting and mooring activities occur on the UMR system, frequently without a Corps permit. We are striving to improve the mapping information and the accuracy of the data, thus the request for collaborative review.

Nelson explained that the Navigation workgroup of MVP's River Resources Forum met at the end of July with appropriate members of the project N team to review the maps. Dick Lambert, MN DOT hosted this meeting. Participants included the US Coast Guard, WI & MN DNR and DOT's, and the Corps. This review was very effective. Nelson suggested that this model be used in the two downriver Districts. There was general consensus among the participants that this was a good idea. Bollman will coordinate with the POC's for MVR's RRCT and MVS's RAT to arrange a similar interagency, interdisciplinary review of the maps. This interagency review will include representatives of industry. MVR lead contacts for the Mississippi River will be Larry Daily and Brent Nissen. MVS lead contacts for the Mississippi River will be George Foster and Goat Patterson. MVR/MVS lead contacts for the Illinois Waterway will be Goat Patterson and Brent Nissen. All agreed that revising the existing mapping and tables is necessary before moving on.

2. Fleeting capacity formulas – Nelson suggested that each district should come up with fleeting capacity formulas for different sections of the river based on river constraints. This information is essential to determine whether market demands are being met. Capacities may be difficult to determine for grandfathered fleets or fleets that are not under any Corps permit. The subject of total capacity and practical capacity was discussed. This subject will require more discussion in the future.

3. Environmental degradation from fleeting/mooring activities - Muench presented industry's concerns that they would like to see specific scientific reports showing environmental damage from fleeting activities. Bollman summarized the recommended plan from the Nav study and the stipulation in the Record of Decision that the Corps will complete a systemic barge fleeting plan. Various "Green reports" and the Environmental Impact Statement from the Nav study effort were produced on shoreline erosion, wave wash, cumulative impacts assessment from fleeting on the river, etc. and environmental/natural resource professionals have provided their experience and judgment. Bollman explained that the systemic planning effort is focused on finding some balance between industry's needs to operate profit making businesses and resource

protection. The goal of the fleeing plan is find methods to accommodate fleeing/mooring activities yet avoid, minimize, or reduce impacts to mussel beds, fish spawning habitats, forested resources, endangered species, banklines, and other valuable habitats as both the navigation system and the ecosystem are recognized by Congress as important national values. NESP funding is limited. Further scientific analyses for this planning effort is very unlikely.

4. Criteria for new fleeing site development. Nelson suggested that we need to either ID potential sites for barge fleeing or make criteria for a new site. Might be better to make criteria instead of guessing on good sites. Past discussions with industry led to conclusion that identifying future potential fleeing areas was not desired by the industry. The fleeing plan can include a section that details necessary permit/survey requirements for approval of new fleeing sites. Daily proposed a 30 to 60 day time frame for each District work group to set up criteria for existing or new fleeing. Nelson commented that St Paul's work group example could be shared. Machajewski will forward to Bollman. Criteria for new development can be discussed at the existing mapping workgroup meetings. Discussion resulted in general agreement that criteria for determining future sites would be most beneficial, rather than specific site identification.

5. Mission clarification – Muench would like a memo from Dorie that explains clear team mission and future goals. Bollman can provide this information with the announcement for the workgroup meetings to discuss the existing mapping.

6. Other Items:

A. Muench – Chicago District has a barge fleeing plan. Darren Melvin would know how to get a copy of that plan. Bollman will coordinate and secure a copy.

B. Bollman – Regulatory is here today to address the false impression that all fleeing activity occurs under permits.

C. McCollum – Will the Fleeing work groups discuss maps over teleconference, by email, or in face to face meetings? Face to face meetings would be advantageous.

D. Bollman – Confirmed a time to call George Foster regarding finalizing date for a port facility site visit in the St. Louis area.

Dorie Bollman

NESP “N” Systemic Barge Fleeing Plan, Team Leader