

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER - ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM

NAVIGATION STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

LA CROSSE, WISCONSIN

AUGUST 4, 1999

Public hearing held at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, Main Hall, 1725 State Street, La Crosse, Wisconsin, on the 4th day of August, 1999, commencing at 8:30 o'clock p.m., before Nancy J. Johnson, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Wisconsin.

A P P E A R A N C E S		
	STATEMENT BY:	PAGE
1		
2		
3		
4	JIM MILLER	55
5	TOM HOWE	59
6	BARBARA FRANK	62
7	GARY JOACHUM	65
8	FRED FUNK	66
9	BOB KRUEGER	68
10	JIM HENSEN	71
11	LARRY LARSON	76
12	RUSSELL EICHMAN	79
13	JIM SCHROEDER	83
14	SOL SIMON	85
15	JOHN STEELE	89
16	JEFF ROBERG	90
17	CHRIS BRESCIA	92
18	PAUL BURTELS	99
19	TONY BINSFELD	102
20	DAN LARSON	104
21	DAVID ANSBURY	106
22	MARK BURKRUM	107
23	MARK SCHULTZ	112
24	MARY ANN HADLICK	113
25	There were no exhibits marked.	

1 BILL WIEDMAN: Those of you that are
2 gathered near the door, if you will come in
3 and sit down.

4 DAVE: Thanks, Bill. Appreciate
5 it. What we're going to do is we'll take
6 questions, like Bill said, from the different
7 work groups, address those questions that are
8 most appropriate for them to answer. I'm
9 going to go through a few of them right now.

10 One is what methodology or criteria
11 were used to assess potential benefits, and
12 what we utilized for the Corp Water Resources
13 Study is principal guidelines that were put
14 together during the Reagan administration
15 during 1983, but had previous history with
16 that. And as part of that, we assess water
17 use source needs, four criteria. One is the
18 national economic development criteria that
19 you heard us talk about during the
20 presentation, environmental quality criteria,
21 regional development criteria, as well as
22 other social effects, so that's the overall
23 criteria that we take a look at.

24 And similar is the question, what
25 are the two or three main factors that will

1 determine what, if any, alternatives will be
2 chosen. Again we're going to look at those
3 criteria or account categories through our
4 Water Resources Plan.

5 What happens to all of these
6 comments that we receive during these public
7 workshops right now for the question and
8 answer period, as well as later on during the
9 formal comments? We have a stenographer
10 putting that documentation together. We have
11 the information and these questions and the
12 team will go through all these papers and
13 what the stenographer is taking down and wade
14 through that to glean all the information we
15 can, as we go through the final formulation
16 process and considerations to develop the
17 recommended plan, so it is important
18 information.

19 BILL WIEDMAN: Let me add something
20 to that. The independent contractors go
21 through all the information. We do a content
22 analysis and we do the best job we can of
23 saying, here's what, here's what we see are
24 the major issues, concerns, and stuff that
25 were raised during the meeting. We turn that

1 over to the Corp, so we'll take all this
2 information we're capturing at the end of
3 each of the meetings as we go, so we have a
4 deadline to turn all that in.

5 DAVE: Thanks, Bill. Denny, would
6 you like to address the engineering
7 question?

8 CORPS MEMBER: Yeah, one question
9 here, how much study and thought has been put
10 behind improving the operational efficiency
11 of the system rather than extending the
12 locks?

13 And we actually did quite a bit in
14 this area, more than has ever been done in
15 any navigation study. We started this effort
16 by getting together a diverse group of
17 industry representatives, Coast Guard, Fish &
18 Wildlife, a lot of the resource agencies,
19 and, of course, the Corps, and we
20 brainstormed, how can we make this system
21 more efficient, not only from the structural
22 side, but the nonstructural side; not only
23 from the Corps facility, but from what
24 industry does right now. We went through and
25 identified about 92 measures and went through

1 a very extensive screening process that
2 looked at both qualitative and quantitative
3 processes to screen those down, which are the
4 results you saw here today. If anybody is
5 interested, I have a report with me that goes
6 through in a lot of detail what each of those
7 measures are, and, like I say, there is 92,
8 and that report is available. If you want to
9 come up after the meeting I can talk to you a
10 little more about it and give you information
11 on how to get it.

12 Thank you, Denny.

13 Ken, you ready to talk about some
14 environmental questions?

15 CORPS MEMBER: I have six cards
16 here, I guess, predominantly dealing with
17 environmental issues. The first question is,
18 bank erosion is a big problem for the methods
19 of maintaining bank and islands.

20 What I can tell you about bank
21 erosion, for this study we took a multi,
22 sorry, we took a multidisciplinary team of
23 hydrologists and geomorphologists and put
24 them in the river up in the Twin Cities and
25 they went down the entire river, all the way

1 to the confluence of the Ohio and then they
2 also went down the entire Illinois River and
3 what they did as they went along, is they
4 mapped the condition of the bank line for
5 that whole system and we turned that now into
6 a series of maps and GIS products.

7 In addition to that, they stopped at
8 71 sites and looked in detail to say is wind
9 wave causing most erosion here, is it
10 overbank flooding and piping that's causing
11 most erosion, or are commercial navigation
12 craft causing erosion, perhaps recreation
13 craft, so using that information we went back
14 and looked at the entire system again and we
15 have a series of atlases. I have one of them
16 here. And anyone interested certainly can
17 stop after the meeting. A series of atlases
18 that identify where we think increased
19 navigation traffic will contribute to bank
20 erosion.

21 The follow on question is, well, so
22 what? A free flowing natural river erodes
23 and deposits, erodes and deposits, so what we
24 did is we overlaid these bank erosion spots
25 with information we had on what types of

1 resources were there? Is it a hardwood
2 forest? Is it a city park? Is it somebody's
3 levee? Is it somebody's backyard? So we've
4 been able to quantify the nature and kind of
5 resources there.

6 Another issue in terms of bank
7 erosion are archaeological sites. Are the
8 areas that are likely to see additional
9 erosion, do they contain significant
10 archaeological sites, and we have all of that
11 that we can present to the EIS and suggest
12 ways then to protect those areas in the
13 future.

14 The second question is, why didn't
15 the Corps Of Engineers compare environmental
16 impact of barge traffic relative to rail and
17 truck?

18 I know we didn't present everything
19 that we had here today in those five or six
20 environmental slides, but one of the ongoing
21 studies is for each one of these alternatives
22 A through F that Dave has shown to you, were
23 basically looking at -- he showed you how
24 much additional water transportation traffic
25 we think we'll have. We're also trying to

1 tease out of that data, if we don't do
2 anything, how much additional train traffic
3 will we have? And three areas of particular
4 concern are fuel use emissions and accidents
5 and hazardous spills, so once we have an idea
6 of how much additional train traffic would
7 occur if we didn't make these improvements,
8 we would compare the fuel use and emissions
9 of that with the fuel use and emissions from
10 the barges. We would also look at areas
11 where EPA is already suggesting we may be at
12 or near some air quality standard limits and
13 look and see if we actually have enough
14 additional particulates to exceed some of
15 those limits, so it is a component of our
16 study.

17 The next question has to do with
18 what we've come to term cumulative impacts.
19 It says, why don't environmental studies
20 assess the long-term environmental impact of
21 the operation and maintenance of the
22 navigation system locks and dams, the nine
23 foot channel project.

24 Certainly in our first round of
25 meetings in 1994, that was the question that

1 we heard the most and many, many, many
2 times. In consideration of that, Colonel
3 Cox, then Colonel Cox basically looked at the
4 study as we had it designed and made a
5 determination that we certainly had
6 underestimated how much effort should be put
7 into the cumulative impact component, so
8 around March of 1995, I think it was, we
9 reprogramed about a million and a half
10 dollars, mostly from the engineers, to try to
11 get a handle on what happened when we took a
12 free flowing river 60 years ago and put in a
13 series of 30 locks and turned it into a
14 series of lakes and rivers, lakes and rivers,
15 lakes and rivers. We used aerial photography
16 from the 1940s, the 1970s, and around 1989,
17 and basically had a team of experts. We
18 hired geomorphologists from the University of
19 Wisconsin in Madison. We had seven transport
20 experts that we hired from out in Colorado,
21 out west, consultants, private consultants,
22 and we had a Dr. Nacato from the Institute of
23 Hydraulic Research was an expert
24 hydrologist.

25 They worked in conjunction with a

1 couple ecologists, Chuck Thighland from the
2 EMTC and Dr. Steve Hartel from Oak Ridge,
3 Tennessee, and basically went through a one
4 and a half, two year process, and said, for
5 each of these pools, this is areas where
6 we've seen loss of back waters. This is
7 areas that we've seen loss of islands. They
8 tried to consider, from a geomorphic
9 perspective, why that was happening and then
10 after they quantified it for the past 50
11 years they tried to project forward for the
12 next 50 years.

13 This report has just now gone out
14 two weeks ago to the resource agencies, the
15 DNR, the EPA, Fish & Wildlife for their
16 comment. Probably in about three months it
17 would be released to the public, but it's a
18 real important backdrop and the issues for us
19 really is we're talking about going eight
20 boats a day, perhaps 12 boats a day in pool
21 13.

22 An important context is perhaps so
23 many bluegill would be killed with those
24 additional four boats a day, but what's going
25 to happen to the bluegill from these other

1 factors? Are we gaining or losing bluegill
2 habitat elsewhere than Pool 13?

3 So that's an important backdrop for
4 any decision that we make in terms of the
5 improvement and allowing for the increased
6 traffic.

7 The third question, to what extent
8 was the US Fish & Wildlife Service consulted
9 regarding the environmental aspects of the
10 navigation study, i.e., EMP monitoring
11 program?

12 Actually the Fish & Wildlife
13 Service, now the USGS has been involved in
14 various aspects of this study. The question
15 here has to do with the Environmental
16 Management Technical Center and the USGS Fish
17 Research Center that's right here in
18 La Crosse. Very early on we realized that
19 there had been at that time five to six years
20 of monitoring data already collected and that
21 there was an EMT program of long-term
22 monitoring that was going to continue, even
23 beyond the end of this navigation study, so
24 we sat down with scientists from the EMTC and
25 looked at the types of data they were

1 collecting and how that could be of use for
2 us, and they also were looking at the types
3 of data we were going to collect under the
4 navigation study, so we had that initial
5 up-front coordination to make sure there was
6 no overlap.

7 Other ways that the EMTC has been
8 involved is we've used their scientists to do
9 some of the fish sampling, some of the plant
10 work that has gone on, that Tip will
11 basically show you in some of his slides, so
12 we used them basically as expert contractors.

13 Another component in the Fish &
14 Wildlife Service is the compliance arm, and
15 the Rock Island Field office of the US Fish &
16 Wildlife office has responsibilities for
17 endangered species and the coordination act
18 report concerning environmental resources and
19 they've been a very important member of what
20 we call the Navigation Environmental
21 Coordinating Committee. We've met 26 times
22 now and there's representatives from the five
23 state DNRs as well as EPA, Fish & Wildlife
24 Service. So that's a big role the Fish &
25 Wildlife Service has played.

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 Here's the toughest question,
2 probably. At what point do we say enough is
3 enough? That the river has been fully
4 exploited and can bear no more?

5 Certainly NEPA, I think, was put in
6 place to try to help federal agencies in the
7 public to make those decisions, so the tools
8 that you've seen today and the considerations
9 that we're making, we're trying to get a
10 sense, if we make no additional improvements
11 to this navigation system, what's that going
12 to mean, what's the river going to look like
13 in 50 years? If we do make these
14 improvements, what does that mean to the
15 economy in the Midwest, what does that mean
16 to the future of the river? And it's this,
17 basically this process through all the public
18 interaction, and the NEPA review process and
19 then, finally, Congress's choice, if we try
20 to lay this information on the table, so that
21 those types of decisions can be made.

22 Why has the process been designed
23 such that the environmental studies are not
24 complete?

25 It certainly wasn't our intent to

1 have the studies not complete at this phase
2 in the game. A certain amount of this is
3 kind of a feedback approach. Basically for
4 our impacts of navigation traffic, the
5 economists have to settle on the values that
6 will feed into their models and then run
7 their models before we have some sense of how
8 traffic might change on the system, and all
9 our direct effects and environmental models
10 then take that traffic and basically run it
11 through and try to determine what kind of
12 impact is this going to be on larva, fish, on
13 plant beds, muscle beds, on bank erosion, and
14 so on and so forth, so often while you're
15 finding environmental kind of lagging behind
16 in the end, you do have to have some feedback
17 from the engineering and the economists
18 before we can complete our job. But I will
19 tell you right from day one of the study,
20 environmental aspect of the study has been
21 able to get the most resources, that flume,
22 the 1 to 25 scale flume that you saw there,
23 we started building that on about the third
24 day of this feasibility study, so it
25 certainly was not by design that we tried to

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 not have this information available, and I
2 think we're sharing with you tonight our
3 current status and more information will be
4 coming out in the next few months.

5 That's all of the questions I have.
6 Thank you.

7 DAVE: Thanks, Ken. I would like
8 Rich Manguno to come up and address economic
9 questions.

10 CORPS MEMBER: I have a couple of
11 questions here that go together, and,
12 interestingly, these are questions that we've
13 been getting pretty much every night in our
14 series of workshops. The question is, what
15 is the cost benefit of the no action
16 alternative, including maintaining the
17 existing system? And a similar question is
18 why didn't the Corps put a cost on the no
19 action alternative, for instance, lost
20 benefits for grain farmers due to high
21 costs.

22 The cost benefit, if you will, of
23 the no action alternative, really should be
24 viewed in this way. We identified some
25 benefits, some transportation efficiencies

1 that could be gained by pursuing the various
2 measures that were described earlier tonight,
3 so the cost of the no action alternative
4 really is those benefits, those
5 transportation efficiencies that wouldn't be
6 realized if those measures were not
7 implemented.

8 And sort of a side question here
9 about the benefit cost of maintaining the
10 existing system. We spend approximately 150
11 million dollars a year maintaining the locks
12 and dams on the upper Mississippi in the
13 Illinois waterway. We're estimating that the
14 savings, transportation savings only,
15 produced by that system exceed 650 million
16 dollars a year, so that's about five and a
17 half to six BC ratio on maintaining the
18 existing system, and, as I said, that
19 includes only the transportation efficiency
20 part of the equation.

21 It doesn't include benefits that
22 would accrue from recreation use or from
23 water supply considerations for some local
24 communities.

25 Next question I have here is how

1 close to maximum capacity is the current
2 system at its most restricted point?

3 If you think about capacity in terms
4 of how many lockage cycles are physically
5 possible to complete in a given period of
6 time, that's the notion of capacity. Then
7 somewhere around 80 plus percent is, is the
8 maximum. How is the question phrased here?
9 How close to the maximum capacity is the
10 current system, so something in excess of 80
11 percent on the lower part of the system. The
12 locks, in the range of sites 20 through 25
13 are approximately at 80 percent, slightly
14 greater.

15 How is the Corps going to include
16 international competitiveness into the
17 recommended plan? Another question that has
18 come up in a number of these sessions.

19 Specifically and implicitly
20 international competition is not built into
21 the modeling efforts or into the traffic
22 projections that we have. However, when it
23 comes time to decide on the recommended plan,
24 the effects of international competition as
25 they would bear on the US standing as a

1 leader in grain exporting, as well as any
2 balance of payment considerations, would be a
3 couple of factors that would be qualitatively
4 assessed in deciding the recommended plan.

5 Another question is, is the Corps
6 going to reevaluate the elasticity of demand
7 on the Illinois River?

8 Uhm, I think what this question is
9 about pertains to the way that we've defined
10 or attempted to define the shapes of our
11 demand, our demand for world transportation.

12 We've used data that we've had or
13 were able to obtain from Iowa to help us in
14 defining what the shapes of these curves
15 are. And we've used that Iowa data and
16 applied to it to a broader geographic region
17 than just Iowa.

18 And the question has come up, how
19 appropriate is using that Iowa data for other
20 locations? Specifically in the state of
21 Illinois as it applies to traffic on the
22 Illinois waterway. We're in the process now
23 of using different values to come up with
24 alternative specifications, alternative
25 shades of these demands curves, and we're

1 doing those evaluations right now, so I guess
2 the answer to the question is, yes, we are
3 specifically looking at that issue.

4 Question is, why no projects above
5 Lock 14?

6 The measures or the alternatives
7 that were presented earlier tonight were put
8 together specifically with the notion of
9 trying to find those groups of individual
10 measures that perform the best with respect
11 to benefits and cost. As we went through the
12 very large number of possible combinations
13 that are out there, because we're looking at
14 potentially 38 different lock and dam sites
15 and a number of different types of
16 improvements that would be possible at all of
17 these sites, the combinations get quite
18 large. So what we have tried to do then is
19 to combine these things in a way that, that
20 perform the best from a transportation
21 efficiency perspective, and when we've gone
22 through this exercise, the improvements that
23 have been discussed here tonight above Lock
24 14 didn't produce transportation efficiencies
25 that were at least equal to the cost of

1 implementing those measures, so that's the
2 reason why you saw no measures above Lock
3 14.

4 With the exception, I should say, of
5 mooring cells, I believe, at site 12. Those
6 did show benefits that were greater than the
7 cost of implementing those particular mooring
8 cells at that site.

9 Question is, where are the studies
10 on alternative transportation modes? Ah,
11 those are in progress. We're doing work
12 right now to, to look at a couple of
13 different things.

14 One is the relative effects of
15 transporting commodities over different
16 modes, water versus rail, specifically, and
17 highway. We're looking at those things with
18 respect, specifically to fuel consumption and
19 emissions and accidents and spills. As I
20 said, that work is in progress, and will be
21 completed within the next couple of months.

22 The last question I have here is,
23 how will product move if project is not
24 built? Will entire transportation system be
25 self-limiting? What is the cost to

1 production system if other modes are used?

2 If measures to expand the capacity
3 of the waterway system are not pursued, there
4 still will be some increase in traffic on the
5 waterway. The question earlier dealt with
6 the existing capacity and where current
7 bottoms are with respect to that. We're not
8 at 100 percent of the capacity of the system,
9 so we will see some increase in traffic on
10 the waterway if no measures are pursued.

11 If no measures are pursued, however,
12 there will be some component of the projected
13 volume that we anticipate that obviously
14 can't move on the waterway and we'll have to
15 do something else. Now, that something else
16 may involve transportation by another mode,
17 perhaps rail, to the New Orleans area for
18 export. Some might go to the Pacific
19 northwest by rail for export through the
20 river system there, and some of the volume
21 will perhaps go into uses other than to
22 export grain, to processing, food processing,
23 to ethanol production. Those sorts of
24 things.

25 And there were a couple questions in

1 here still, I guess. What is the cost to the
2 production system if other modes are used?

3 The production system here I guess
4 is referring to, to grain production, I
5 think. The question is not specific on that
6 point.

7 If that's the intent here, the
8 impact would be that some transportation mode
9 with a higher cost would be used to move that
10 volume of commodity. The economic analysis
11 is based on the premise that production will
12 be the same with or without the improved
13 grain production.

14 Where and how that production is
15 moved and in what proportions, essentially,
16 is the consequence of how much, if any, of
17 these measures are actually implemented.

18 BILL WIEDMAN: Do you have a couple
19 more or would you like to open it up to the
20 floor?

21 CORPS MEMBER: No, those are the
22 questions from each team.

23 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, I would like to
24 open this up now again for the question and
25 answer, but requesting either clarification

1 or some technical information from our
2 expertise that's here.

3 We have two microphones available.
4 We're using those because we want to make
5 sure the reporter gets the data.

6 VOICE: Good evening. My question
7 goes to Ken, the environmental specialist
8 here. That last question that you heard was
9 when will we know the river has had enough.
10 And I didn't hear you answer that question.
11 You might want to rephrase it and maybe you
12 would answer it more clearer for everybody?

13 Uhm, a lot of people are here
14 because they've seen what the Corps has
15 already done to the river. They've seen the
16 river ecosystem go on a very downward slide
17 over the years that they've been on the
18 river, and you answered that NEPA, which, for
19 everyone here, stands for National
20 Environmental Policy Act, which basically
21 requires federal agencies to do Environmental
22 Impact Statements to evaluate their effects
23 on the environment. You, Ken, stated that
24 NEPA covers that, so we're looking at that.
25 Ken knows that the last time that the Corps

1 did an Environmental Impact Statement on the
2 operation and maintenance of the river, which
3 was in the early 70s, and that concluded that
4 the navigation system was good for the river
5 and good for the river's ecosystem, and.

6 BILL WIEDMAN: Your question is?

7 VOICE: My question is, Ken, when
8 will we examine that? You know that a 1.5
9 million dollar study doesn't nearly even
10 scratch the surface of that issue. When will
11 the Corps really look at what existing system
12 is doing that, because that's the concern of
13 people here, is that we need to look at what,
14 how we're destroying the river now before we
15 make the problem worse.

16 CORPS MEMBER: Basically, as you
17 all know, because you attended previous
18 meetings, this study is specifically focused
19 at increases to reduce delays at the locks
20 and dams, so we have been very narrowly
21 focused on what the alternatives to reduce
22 that delay would go do to the environment.
23 We have an increase in traffic, what might it
24 do to fish, plants, mussels, and so on and so
25 forth.

1 Again, as I said in that previous
2 question, it's an important backdrop to
3 really try to understand, are we near some
4 ecological threshold of collapse, and the
5 Cumulative Impact Study, I think, gives us a
6 good backdrop to try and make a decision
7 between, I think what we saw in today's
8 slide, 6 boats a day in Pool 8 or 9 boats a
9 day in Pool 8.

10 Sal's question is, yeah, but what
11 about all those other things that the Corps
12 is doing or perhaps other people are doing on
13 the river? When are we going to address
14 those? There are certainly a number of other
15 ongoing initiatives that at least I think go
16 to some great hope. In the environmental
17 management program right now, funds have been
18 reprogramed to do a habitat needs
19 assessment.

20 I think that, both from an
21 ecological perspective and a societal
22 perspective, will help give us an
23 understanding of what we may want the river
24 to look like in 50 years.

25 There are other programs going on.

1 Certainly the St. Paul District, Rock Island
2 District, St. Louis District have very
3 extensive channel maintenance planning
4 programs. We're looking at the channel
5 maintenance needs over the next 40 years and
6 environmentally acceptable and responsible
7 ways to handle channel maintenance
8 activities.

9 Again, other agencies, federal and
10 state agencies, have similar programs, so is
11 there this one big initiative right now
12 that's looking at all the needs and all the
13 uses of the Mississippi River? No, it's not
14 there, but I think partly as a result of this
15 system study getting going and all the energy
16 that came out of that, we do have a lot of
17 good parallel efforts that are addressing
18 some of those issues.

19 BILL WIEDMAN: Thanks.

20 VOICE: Kind of a follow up to that,
21 recreational use creates a pressure on the
22 system too and have we evaluated at what time
23 the overuse for recreational activities
24 creates a breakdown and a problem
25 economically, logistically on the entire

1 system?

2 CORPS MEMBER: Specifically the
3 consideration of lockages to accommodate rec
4 vessels is incorporated into the economic
5 analysis. Given the way rec lockages occur
6 right now, we'll have several boats in the
7 chamber per cycle. There is still the
8 ability, however, to put more or put
9 additional vessels into the chamber for a
10 given cycle, so, given what we anticipate the
11 possible increase in rec traffic to be over
12 time, we don't think that additional lockages
13 would be required to actually accommodate
14 that traffic.

15 VOICE: How about the conflicts in
16 the main channel?

17 CORPS MEMBER: Another proponent of
18 the study, we actually went out and we tried
19 to map out for the entire system where
20 different classes of watercraft transport
21 move, like the great big yachts in the main
22 channel, bass boats into the backwater, and
23 so on and so forth. We did a tour, basically
24 a lot of resource boats on the river, and we
25 mapped out all those areas, and then in

1 addition to that, we tried to look at some of
2 the population dynamics and tried to project,
3 basically, how many, how much recreation
4 traffic will there be on the system 10 years
5 from now, 20 years from now, 50 years from
6 now, so that's all rolled in then to part of
7 our environmental study where we're concerned
8 with sediment resuspension as well as the
9 effects on plants from recreation craft and
10 especially where you have out by the main
11 channels those effects, we're looking at what
12 kind of compounding effect there will be both
13 in recreation and the navigation traffic, so
14 it is a component of our study. It's not
15 quite complete yet.

16 The Corps recreation traffic
17 forecasts are complete and published on our
18 web site as well as the navigated areas, but
19 we're just now trying to finish up the
20 physical effects and environmental effects of
21 this recreation traffic.

22 BILL WIEDMAN: Thanks. Next.

23 VOICE: I live over in Shore Acres,
24 and there's a turn bridge for the railroad.
25 It was supposed to be, under the Truman Hobbs

1 Act to be replaced. Now the barges come
2 down, and it takes them just as long to go
3 through that bridge as they go through the
4 lock and dam. Is this bridge another
5 structure along the river that's going to be
6 replaced so that the barges can go smoothly
7 down the river? And, also, in the future, if
8 you lengthen these dams, locks and dams, are
9 the barge lines going to go to 18 and 21
10 barges?

11 BILL WIEDMAN: So you have two
12 questions.

13 VOICE: Yes.

14 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay.

15 CORPS MEMBER: We talked about the
16 small scale measures, and in the presentation
17 we talked it was a hundred measures that we
18 had, and as part of that brainstorming
19 session that we had back in 1994, early on in
20 the study, improvement measures away from the
21 lock sites were discussed, as well as
22 recognizing that there are other restrictions
23 on the system. But as we are looking at the
24 overall systemic assessment and what's best
25 to move the traffic, what improvement

1 measures are best to move the traffic through
2 the system, the chief bottlenecks on the
3 system, on the existing locks, and we put
4 them into focus, but we recognize that
5 there's other items out there.

6 VOICE: If you have a power failure,
7 if you had a power failure on that bridge, or
8 along here -- last year we had a storm. The
9 power went out. The barge sat in front of my
10 house and idled for three hours and it takes
11 the barges at least a half hour to go through
12 that bridge. And that's -- are you going to
13 replace the bridge or not? That's my
14 question? Yes or no?

15 BILL WIEDMAN: The second question.

16 CORPS MEMBER: I was going to let
17 Terry from the operations.

18 CORPS MEMBER: As far as that
19 railroad bridge, I have no idea whether they
20 are planning on doing any upgrades to that,
21 you know. They, I haven't talked to the
22 railroad in that regard at all. I know it's
23 a problem, that they have a heck of a time
24 making that bridge down there, but, you know,
25 I would have to check with the railroad as

1 far as what their plans are for that in the
2 future. I have no idea on that.

3 CORPS MEMBER: I believe the second
4 part of the question was in regards to
5 increasing the number of barges that they are
6 moving up the system in the future. The
7 river up at this end of the system, due to
8 the specific constraints, that would limit
9 above a 15 barge tow certainly down through
10 the river and below 27. There are barge
11 configurations that are longer.

12 VOICE: Hi, can you hear me?

13 BILL WIEDMAN: Yes.

14 VOICE: Two things. We live on the
15 river at Pool 7 in Dresbach, and we have two
16 issues. Our main concern is the bank
17 erosion, and not only the barges. We've said
18 it has to do with the current and the buoys
19 that are very close to our shoreline where
20 the barges can come up very close, plus large
21 boats with big waves that are just taking the
22 banks away also. So those, that's one
23 component.

24 And, number two, besides the bank
25 erosion, number two, is the islands.

1 Dresbach Island, we've been trying to restore
2 it and to maintain it as much as we can. And
3 we --

4 BILL WIEDMAN: And your question?

5 VOICE: My question is we want
6 sand. We would love to see them have the
7 sand put back on the island, and right now I
8 would like to know why the Corps is taking
9 the sand right, right in Pool 7, right by the
10 lock and dam and hauling it all the way up,
11 not only to the Dakota island now, not just
12 stockpiling it up there on that huge
13 stockpile they have there, now they are
14 taking it all the way up to Trempealeau, but
15 we're begging for it. Begging for it on our
16 shorelines and Dresbach island, but we cannot
17 get it because then the Corps says the DNR.
18 We have to go through the DNR. But I'm real
19 tired of this. And this is a study from
20 1987, Recreation Beach Maintenance Plan.
21 1987. And we still don't have any islands.
22 Our islands are disappearing, and I don't
23 know who is doing boating, but there are no
24 islands left.

25 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, I would like to

1 have the operations people answer your
2 question and then you can, in the statement
3 time you can also elaborate more on the
4 concern you have.

5 CORPS MEMBER: As far as the sands,
6 there is a section in Fountain City that
7 takes care of all the dredging on the river.
8 I'm not part of that. I'm more operations of
9 the locks themselves, but.

10 VOICE: But who does answer that?
11 This is the same thing I get every single
12 time. I don't handle this, he does. It goes
13 around and around and we cannot get anything
14 done.

15 CORPS MEMBER: There's certain --

16 VOICE: Between the Corps and the
17 DNR, nothing.

18 CORPS MEMBER: There's certain
19 disposal areas that we have to abide by, as
20 far as where we can dispose of this sand and
21 we just can't dispose of it anywhere we want
22 any more.

23 VOICE: Why not?

24 CORPS MEMBER: The approved disposal
25 areas are the areas at Dakota and Trempealeau

1 and that's where the sand in Pool 7 goes, to
2 one of those two sites.

3 VOICE: Why not back to the island
4 where it came from? Practicality. Why can't
5 it go back?

6 BILL WIEDMAN: It sounds like we've
7 got your question recorded and I would make
8 sure that the Corps responds to that. I
9 understand they have some constraints where
10 they can take care of that, but specifically,
11 would you make sure that you identified
12 yourself.

13 VOICE: I've got a barge in my front
14 yard, sir.

15 BILL WIEDMAN: Sir, you had a
16 question back there?

17 VOICE: Little bit of a question,
18 little bit of a statement.

19 BILL WIEDMAN: Let's stick to the
20 question part of it and then we'll get to the
21 statement.

22 VOICE: Someone questioned that
23 you're going to design this river system for
24 the next 50 years, and have you considered
25 that the environment changes every five?

1 Have you considered that agriculture changes
2 every three? Have you considered that the
3 public use changes in less than ten? These
4 are the impacts that you need to change the
5 way you work with it. I want you to look at
6 that one.

7 BILL WIEDMAN: So your question is
8 are they considering those changeable issues
9 in their forecasting and some of the benefits
10 and costs?

11 VOICE: Yes, sir.

12 BILL WIEDMAN: And if the rest is a
13 statement, again, I would like to keep this
14 part for question and answers, then we'll
15 move to statements.

16 VOICE: One of the other questions
17 that I have is, is that the Corps Of
18 Engineers, in it's infinite wisdom of trying
19 to go through this relentless process that
20 barges are not as efficient because of the
21 way they separate them into locks and dams,
22 you'll check that in places in Europe that
23 they are using electricity in various
24 voltages to do the tightening of things or
25 hydraulics. Did you have any success with

1 the industry in looking at some of the
2 advanced technologies that could be utilized
3 to save them some of the times and provide
4 for the safety in that type of operation.

5 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay.

6 CORPS MEMBER: Okay, I guess the
7 first part of your question was talking about
8 planning to the next 50 years and that's a
9 long planning stretch certainly. Certainly
10 it's, you have to, to make projections off
11 that far, and what we envision coming out of
12 this study is, is we have done our analysis
13 over a 50 year period, but we'll be looking
14 at a short term, over the next 15 or so years
15 as well as, as an environmental approach.
16 Certainly over time we will revisit that and
17 make sure that the needs continue to be met
18 and we need to do anything else on the
19 system, not only in regards to navigation,
20 but also continuing making decisions for the
21 environment in regards to the leverage.

22 CORPS MEMBER: Couple comments.
23 When we first got into this study, we met
24 with industry to try to find out what they
25 had been doing in terms of efficiency,

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 because, and, in fact, they have done quite a
2 bit over the years. Specifically there is a
3 lot of time taken up in the remake of the
4 barges and there's several devices out there
5 that industry has used and is implementing.
6 One is called power ratchet that takes a lot
7 less time to couple the barges together, so
8 they are, they are implementing those right
9 now, and we've included those in with our
10 study.

11 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, again, let me
12 just reiterate. The point of the question
13 and answer is to get either technical answers
14 or some clarification for you. If there
15 aren't continued questions, then we'll move
16 into a statement period, because I want to
17 make sure we cover the ground here. I think
18 you're next.

19 VOICE: Okay, I spoke with the
20 economist a little while ago, and, I'm sorry,
21 I don't remember his name, but I thought his
22 answer to my question at that time was very
23 interesting, and I would like if I could ask
24 it again for him to say it in public. What I
25 asked him was a little bit related to the

1 last question of when you're making
2 projections of 50 years, there's a lot of
3 variables that enter in.

4 With integrity as an economist, how
5 can you stand behind a single number as an
6 output? There are ranges. There are
7 variables. There are pluses and minuses that
8 have to go into anything that comes near a 50
9 year forecast. There's nothing in any Corps
10 publication, that I've seen, that gives
11 anything besides a single number. There are
12 no, well, it could be down this low or it
13 could be up this high, and this is the
14 average.

15 BILL WIEDMAN: So your question
16 boils down to?

17 VOICE: My question boils down to
18 and relates to his answer. As a decision
19 maker, could you put any credibility into the
20 numbers that have been presented to us
21 today?

22 CORPS MEMBER: The question was
23 posed earlier and I'll try to see if I can,
24 as carefully as possible, repeat the answer.

25 Projecting over a 50 year period is

1 a very difficult, if not impossible, thing to
2 do. But that's the environment that we find
3 ourselves in. We're evaluating a long period
4 of time, so we're forced to do our best in
5 estimating what will happen over that time
6 period. Now, because of the need to look out
7 so far, there are certainly uncertainties
8 surrounding any of the estimates that we
9 make. The information that you saw presented
10 earlier tonight essentially represents a
11 point estimate. There are no uncertainties
12 described in the specific values that were
13 used for various inputs or the consequences
14 of changing the values of those particular
15 inputs. We are looking specifically at that
16 issue of uncertainty and the implications of
17 that uncertainty regarding the formulation
18 process. The laying out of the alternatives
19 and the description of the benefits and costs
20 that go along with those alternatives.

21 Unfortunately we're not finished
22 with that part of the analysis yet. We're
23 doing it now. There is a lot of lead time,
24 logistically, in setting up the meetings that
25 we're going through now, these workshops.

1 And we had a decision to make internally.
2 When we knew we wouldn't have all the
3 information that we had hoped to have in time
4 for these sessions, whether or not to delay
5 these sessions, complete as much of the work
6 as we could, and then have a more complete
7 description of the alternatives, along with
8 the variability that might go along with
9 those, or to proceed with these workshops and
10 share with you the information that we have
11 as of now. And obviously the decision that
12 we made was to proceed with these workshops
13 and to share with everybody the work that
14 we've completed to date.

15 The last part of this, I guess, is
16 as a decision maker, what sort of position do
17 you find yourself in when it ultimately comes
18 time to say, you know, I support this or I
19 support something else when all we have is
20 the information that you've seen tonight.
21 And my response earlier was that, as a
22 decision maker, I would absolutely want to
23 have the benefit of all of this information.
24 I want to know what the uncertainties are. I
25 want to know what the consequences of those

1 uncertainties are in order to make an
2 informed choice.

3 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, thanks.

4 VOICE: In an answer to a previous
5 question, it was pretty much alluded to that
6 the Corps and the, working in concert and
7 cooperation with some of the other agencies
8 that are responsible for managing the
9 Mississippi as a resource. Uhm, in the US
10 Fish & Wildlife Service statement regarding
11 the Army Corps Of Engineers, Upper
12 Mississippi and Illinois System Navigation
13 Study from August of 1999, there's a few
14 comments that I need to pull out of it in
15 order for me to ask my question.

16 I quote, The service has been
17 strongly critical of the Corps' environmental
18 study design for the navigation study. The
19 current approaches taken by the Corps to
20 address these concerns are not satisfactory
21 to the service.

22 Without a commitment to respond to
23 the Service's concerns about O&M and tow
24 traffic effects, we will continue to reject
25 the findings of the Corps' navigation impact

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 analysis.

2 Now, is the Corps working in
3 cooperation and concert with the US Fish &
4 Wildlife Service to develop these studies or
5 are you not?

6 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, thanks.

7 CORPS MEMBER: The basic design for
8 the impact studies that we've shown today
9 actually evolved out of what was called a
10 plan of study for the second lock and lock
11 and dam 26, and at that time the St. Louis
12 District actually had the lead on pulling
13 together multiple agencies from the five
14 states. They worked hard for two years, came
15 up with some pretty good, 15, basically,
16 conceptual designs targeted at how can we
17 study fish impact? How can we study plant
18 impact? How can we study muscle impact and
19 so on and so forth.

20 Well, what we did in the navigation
21 study then in 1992 is we took the POS and we
22 extracted from those what we felt at the time
23 were the most critical studies to make a
24 reasonable choice between alternatives on
25 this study and we reconvened a group of EPA,

1 Fish & Wildlife service, and DNR biologists
2 appointed by their states into the Navigation
3 Environmental And Coordinating Committee.
4 They began to meet in December of 1992.
5 Again, we met 26 times since. The major
6 concerns that I have heard from the neck,
7 and, again, these are not, these are not
8 lightweight meetings. These have been major
9 investments of time from the state, the Fish
10 and Wildlife Service and EPA of attendees
11 that participate in these meetings.

12 The gist of it is the methodologies,
13 a lot of them are innovative, new
14 technologies, never been tried before, and
15 we've worked with them in the scoping
16 process. We feel that the message, and I
17 think they would say that the methods we
18 developed are appropriate methods to get at
19 the direct effects of navigation traffic.

20 The major shortcoming that we hear
21 from the Fish And Wildlife Service and the
22 state agencies, and some of them are here
23 tonight, and they'll correct me if I'm wrong,
24 I'm certain, is that they would definitely
25 desire more baseline data gathering.

1 In that letter, I think at one point
2 it says, an additional three to five years
3 for the data would be appropriate to assist
4 in making this public interest decision.
5 Okay, so they are totally opposed to the
6 methodology is an overstatement and perhaps
7 that letter didn't mean that and I'm not
8 certain.

9 VOICE: The letter is the official
10 statement from the US Fish And Wildlife
11 Service, and I don't think they would say
12 something that they don't mean.

13 CORPS MEMBER: Again, I can only
14 tell you the results and feedback from the
15 meetings. We've been at the meetings and at
16 the table. The need for additional field
17 data gathering is something that we think we
18 can handle and adapt with mitigation
19 approach. We also think that we are close to
20 having enough information to make a reasoned
21 choice between alternatives. What's going to
22 happen if we have eight boats a day versus
23 what's going to happen if we're going to have
24 twelve boats a day? I think if you put in
25 place good, avoid, minimize mitigation

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 measures, offset any negative impacts that
2 are being anticipated, that we can move
3 forward with the reasoned choices and
4 ultimately Congress will make that decision.

5 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, gentleman over
6 here.

7 VOICE: For me the economic
8 questions are fairly clear. Believe me, the
9 trouble I had with my checkbook, they need to
10 be clear and they need to be simple. I just
11 want to ask if two answers are going to be in
12 the Corps' report. One relates to who pays
13 for increased navigation and the other
14 relates to who gains, so in terms of who
15 pays, to me the issue is what is the
16 appropriate percentage for the taxpayer to
17 pay and what's the appropriate percentage for
18 the industry to pay? And I know that there
19 has been a tax that's been in place for years
20 and I think it's around 2 percent. But is
21 that going to be the same percentage over the
22 next 50 years? And is this an administration
23 call? And will the president or Congress
24 tell the Corps Of Engineers what that
25 percentage is going to be before the end of

1 this report?

2 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay.

3 VOICE: I would like to know that,
4 and also related to who gains? To me the
5 question is how much of the benefits are
6 going to be gained by big industry, Con-Agra
7 and those folks versus the farmer who
8 actually goes and grows grain, and will that
9 answer be in the Corps' report?

10 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, we'll answer,
11 there's two parts to that.

12 CORPS MEMBER: Okay, the first part
13 is in regards to who pays. Under the Water
14 Resources Development Act, the past Congress
15 has established the Waterway Trust Fund which
16 is a fund that's fed by a fuel tax from
17 commercial navigation and for any
18 improvements for major rehabilitation on the
19 inland waterway system. Fifty percent of
20 that cost is borne by the Inland Waterway
21 Trust Fund and the other 50 percent by
22 general revenues.

23 I'll turn it over for the second
24 part over to Rich.

25 CORPS MEMBER: The second part of

1 the question is who reaps the benefits of
2 this project? A number of entities really
3 share in the benefits -- the transportation
4 efficiencies that we're talking about here.
5 The shipper benefits, in part, the consumer
6 of the final products share, in part, and
7 producers, like farmers, share in this to
8 some extent as well. Our study has not
9 attempted to answer the question as to what
10 those proportions are to the various groups.
11 As we do our analysis, it's from very
12 prescribed procedure. It's the thing that
13 you've heard several times tonight, this NED,
14 National Economic Development, perspective,
15 so we're measuring these transportation
16 efficiencies from the national perspective as
17 they approve to the nation, so the question
18 as to specifically where and which groups
19 accrue the benefits of the various
20 improvements is again something that we have
21 not calculated.

22 BILL WIEDMAN: Thanks.

23 VOICE: I just had a question with
24 respect to the commodities movements. What
25 were the assumptions, the basic assumptions

1 with respect to the commodities movements
2 that were made as far as economic study and
3 were they different than the first shot at
4 the economic study?

5 CORPS MEMBER: There are, there is
6 quite a lengthy list of assumptions that go
7 into the traffic projections. The traffic
8 projections were done for us under contract.
9 Jack Faucett & Associates was the company
10 that performed the traffic projections.
11 They, in turn, subcontracted with various
12 other experts in specific commodity fields to
13 do specific pieces of the analysis, so
14 there's a number of different players, all
15 contractors hired by the Corps to make these
16 projections. Specific assumptions, as I
17 said, are, are quite numerous and, and
18 specific to each of the commodity groups that
19 are included in this traffic base. Now, I
20 will add that those reports are available and
21 are on the web page, if you're interested in
22 looking at those documents. There's a
23 summary report that gives you an overview for
24 each of the groups, as well as more detailed
25 volumes that cover each of the individual

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 groups in much more detail.

2 BILL WIEDMAN: Question.

3 VOICE: Well, I just, I think it's
4 kind of a question, maybe a statement too,
5 but one of you alluded to the fact that the
6 1970 or so operation and maintenance
7 Environmental Impact Statement concluded that
8 the construction of the locks and dams was a
9 positive thing for the river. And I'm not
10 sure that's true. I was kind of a coauthor
11 of part of that EIS and I think you may want
12 to go back and look at that, and, and maybe
13 review the, the actual impacts. I'm not sure
14 that's a good sound basis on which to, to
15 perhaps construct that about an expand and
16 existence.

17 BILL WIEDMAN: So that's really more
18 of a statement than a question.

19 VOICE: Obviously.

20 BILL WIEDMAN: You're questioning
21 the use of it, let's put it that way.

22 VOICE: Yes.

23 BILL WIEDMAN: All right.

24 CORPS MEMBER: I'm trying to
25 remember in what context it was in the

1 statement.

2 VOICE: Can you send me a copy of
3 that?

4 CORPS MEMBER: Okay, it was Sol's
5 statement.

6 VOICE: It's in the executive
7 summary. It says that the navigation system
8 is a good benefit for the river's ecosystem.
9 And my point was, that is the functional EIS
10 that they are operating under. If they are
11 only looking at the additional barge traffic,
12 they are saying, we have studied the issue of
13 how the navigation system affects the river.
14 We studied that in the early 70s, but if you
15 look at those studies, they are ridiculous.

16 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, thanks. We'll
17 open it up for one more question and then I
18 would like to shift into --

19 CORPS MEMBER: There was a second
20 part to the previous question that, as I
21 finished I realized I hadn't addressed. I
22 think it was from the traffic projections
23 that are behind the numbers that you saw
24 earlier tonight, the same as -- what was
25 referred to as the first study of the

1 original study. We've produced several
2 estimates of, of benefits and costs over the
3 last six or more months based on, on various
4 levels of detail of our inputs. Specifically
5 for the traffic projections, the stuff that
6 was used in the most early version of those
7 preliminary estimates is the same traffic,
8 same traffic projections that are part of the
9 numbers that you've seen tonight.

10 BILL WIEDMAN: Sir.

11 VOICE: Virtually all the
12 alternative plans that you have listed in the
13 document, there seems to be an increase in
14 the tows per day throughout the, throughout
15 the river system. Can you tell me how you
16 you've addressed the increase in potential
17 for hazardous spill due to the number, due to
18 barge accidents that will be increased by the
19 number of tows being pulled through per day
20 and if you could also describe to me any of
21 the cleanup efforts or the containment
22 efforts that may be advanced upon in the
23 future.

24 CORPS MEMBER: We used the Coast
25 Guard data on accidents and spills and we

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 went through, probably the length of their
2 records, and we're still working on that
3 issue. Primarily, it's taken a long time
4 because the data that we have does not show
5 any correlation between traffic and spills.
6 Now, part of that reason is because the
7 number of spills is so small, but another
8 part of that reason is because they change
9 the way they collect the data over time, so
10 we're still looking at that data and that
11 data will be in the final report.

12 VOICE: Okay, so you don't have a
13 definite answer for that then now?

14 CORPS MEMBER: The answer we have
15 today is we can't measure it, and, like I
16 said, we're still looking at it, trying to
17 pull the data out and come up with a finite
18 measure.

19 VOICE: And you will be using that
20 data as far as determining the impact of the
21 increased numbers of tows on the river then?

22 CORPS MEMBER: Certainly will.

23 BILL WIEDMAN: Gentleman behind you.

24 VOICE: The question was asked
25 earlier about who reaps the benefits and I

1 think the corollary question to that is who
2 pays the costs? If they are not the same
3 people, I think we've got a problem. Another
4 thing is, you are discussing the railroad
5 bridge as a bottleneck. The river is also a
6 bottleneck to the railroad having to open
7 it's gates, or, bridge, to let the barges
8 through. When you talk about improving or
9 replacing the bridge, you indicate, well, go
10 see the railroad. They are the ones who have
11 to do that. Is the barge company going to
12 pay for the upgrades to the river?

13 CORPS MEMBER: As part of paying for
14 the cost of the improvement, both new
15 construction as well as major rehabilitation
16 to the existing system, there's a fuel tax
17 that's paid. I think it's approximately 20
18 cents a gallon. And that goes into the
19 Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Fifty percent of
20 the cost of new construction is paid from
21 that Inland Waterway Trust Fund that comes
22 from the taxes. And then 50 percent is paid
23 by the general revenues of the treasury.

24 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, I would like to
25 maybe give you -- you've been sitting quite a

1 while -- a 60 second opportunity to stretch,
2 and then I would like to move into the
3 statement period, but before you stretch, let
4 me ask, so I get an idea of time allocation,
5 how many of you want to make a statement or
6 read a prepared statement? Get some idea.
7 Okay. Let's just take 60 seconds to stretch
8 for a minute and then we'll get into the
9 statement period.

10 (Break.)

11 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, a quick
12 calculation. Each person has five minutes.
13 If you have a prepared statement or you've
14 prepared some notes, please make sure the
15 Corps gets that information. You can either
16 give it to one of the ladies that are out at
17 the desk or if you want to give it to Dave or
18 one of members here, make sure we get a copy
19 of that information. That's important. So
20 we're using again the two mics. And it's,
21 you do not have to identify yourself, but it
22 is helpful for our court reporter if you do.
23 I'll start over here. I'll call one minute
24 when you have used four minutes.

25 JIM MILLER: My name is Jim Miller

1 and I live on Brice Prairie. We've got a
2 situation here, where, as I understand it,
3 the whole deal with these here -- now that I
4 am up here I can't think of what I want to
5 say.

6 All the lock and dam systems --
7 initially when they started the lock and dam
8 systems, the human cry to get the money for
9 this project was, we can control flooding,
10 and you can move merchandise. The big item
11 for the people in this country was, boy, if
12 you can control flooding, for God's sake,
13 give them the money, and they got millions
14 and millions and millions of dollars to build
15 these lock and dams. All well and good.
16 Since the inception of the lock and dams,
17 ever since they first started, they have
18 never ever been used for flood control. Not
19 once.

20 But the barge industry reigns
21 supreme. I think they own the river and they
22 are kind enough to let us look at it. We've
23 got a situation here, if you can lower the
24 water in this city 12 inches in a 24 hour
25 period, there's no way that you can tell me

1 that you can't use the lock and dam system
2 for controlling flooding. There is no two
3 ways about it. You most assuredly can. All
4 you got to do is take the water out before
5 the big water comes. But they -- this is a
6 lost item for these people. And,
7 consequently, the flooding costs the
8 taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.
9 And nothing is done about it, by the very
10 operation that was supposed to control it in
11 the first place.

12 Now we've got a situation here where
13 this MSU, or whoever it is, that was in the
14 paper on the 22nd of April, proposes a 1.1
15 billion dollar Mississippi plan. This is to
16 reactivate the Mississippi and make it pretty
17 much like it was before. As long as the
18 barge industry is in operation, this is a
19 lost item. This 1.1 billion dollars is going
20 to be absolutely wasted because of the barge
21 industry. And I brought this up before.
22 It's my understanding that the University of
23 Iowa made a study of the barge industry and
24 proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the
25 barge industry was absolutely and positively

1 obsolete, and has been for quite a while.
2 Every single thing that they haul can be
3 hailed faster, cheaper, and much safer by
4 another means, but this doesn't seem to be
5 considered by anybody. I don't know if
6 anybody in here has ever been at a loadout
7 for soybeans or for corn or whatever, but
8 they go to these loadouts and they pick, and
9 they pick up a whole semi and point it right
10 straight up in the air and they can empty
11 that thing in just a few minutes. Period.

12 Now it takes them five or six days
13 or more to load a barge. Then it's another,
14 what, five or six days to take it down to
15 where it belongs and I have no idea how long
16 it takes to unload, but I presume it's five
17 or six days. That's 15, 16, or 17 days to
18 handle a load of merchandise, when it can be
19 hailed to one direction and dumped in a
20 matter of minutes.

21 I don't understand what's going on
22 here.

23 But the barge industry, as everybody
24 knows, has been a problem, and one of the
25 biggest problems we've got on the

1 Mississippi, period. And anybody that knows
2 anything about the Mississippi is well aware
3 of this. And nobody is doing a damn thing
4 about it.

5 Thank you.

6 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Jim.

7 TOM HOWE: Thank you. My name is
8 Tom Howe, and I live at Route 2, La Crescent,
9 up in the bluff that is immediately above the
10 area where the tow of the barges come out of
11 locks at the Dresbach dam. First of all,
12 before I get into my remarks, I'm reminded of
13 county board meetings and other meetings of
14 the like, and I really am insulted in this
15 democracy where many meetings are conducted
16 with Roberts Rules Of Order, when the
17 chairman, not only at this meeting, but the
18 other meetings, where they spend all this
19 time with their people presenting facts,
20 answering questions, doing statistics, and
21 then when it's time for the taxpayers, who
22 really have more of a right at this
23 microphone than the people up front, are
24 told, you're limited to five minutes.

25 Now, how is it that you people can

1 determine that a man or woman coming to that
2 mic has only a five minute address to make?
3 I do not understand that, and I wish to God
4 at these public meetings they start
5 respecting the people out in the audience
6 that would like to talk at least one tenth of
7 the time of most of you individuals up
8 there. You better take that into
9 consideration in how you want to conduct your
10 meetings.

11 Now, I mentioned that I live above
12 the dam. For years I have looked down at the
13 area where the push machine is behind the
14 barges and coming out of the locks. And I'll
15 tell you people, I wish everybody here and
16 everybody that is interested in the river and
17 its environment would take a look at what
18 happens to the waters from a bluff above that
19 area. It's horrendous.

20 And you talk about your mock-up
21 models in a science lab and that, and you
22 talk about projections, but I can, I can sit
23 in my living room, and I can tell if the
24 diesel units in that tow are pushing harder
25 by the groan of the engines coming up to my

1 home, and, I'll tell you, nobody mentions
2 about these barges going into a head wind.
3 Nobody mentions in your group of people when
4 there's a cross wind, how that tow has to
5 straighten those diesel engines, and what I'm
6 getting at is, I hear people out in the
7 hallway saying, oh, they only drive within
8 the no wake law on that. No, not according
9 to what I hear from my home. And I hear, I
10 hear those engines groaning and grunting, and
11 I know when I hear that what's happening to
12 the shoreline and what's happening to the
13 aquatic life.

14 This woman that spoke earlier has
15 tried for years to keep her property line out
16 another 20, 30 feet where it was supposed to
17 be. You can't, you can't get to anybody.
18 You ask somebody that's connected with this
19 department, you got to talk to so and so.
20 You read in the paper, you see on TV here in
21 La Crosse that you people are going to
22 furnish rock to take care of this current
23 washing it away. Try it sometime. Try to
24 get ahold of that rock. It's nothing but
25 rhetoric.

1 BILL WIEDMAN: One minute.

2 VOICE: Thanks a lot. You're very
3 generous. I would like to have you guys
4 parade ten commercial fishermen across that
5 stage with their hip boots on and have them
6 tell you that there's very little impact on
7 what's been going on in the river in the last
8 60 years. You wouldn't want to hear what
9 they say. I worked with about four of them
10 in the brewery for 30 years. And I'll tell
11 you, it was nothing like what I've heard up
12 here tonight.

13 And I'll sum it up with one more
14 statement.

15 I'm not just saying this myself. It
16 comes from what many people have said, out of
17 the fish lab, out of the DNR, when they are
18 with people on the side and they don't have
19 worry about their job, their statement is the
20 US Army of Corps Of Engineers operating the
21 barges and the dams are totally out of their
22 element.

23 BILL WIEDMAN: Okay, thank you,
24 Tom. Ma'am.

25 BARBARA FRANK: I'm Barbara Frank.

1 I'm a longtime Sierra Club activist working
2 on the Mississippi River issues, among
3 others, and I'm from La Crosse.

4 The upper Mississippi River is a
5 tremendous natural resource. It's a fabulous
6 fishery and wildlife habitat. It's used by
7 hunters, fishermen, boaters, swimmers, bird
8 watchers, and by countless people drawn to
9 it's natural beauty who appreciate the great
10 scenic beauty as they hike, bike, boat, and
11 drive along its shores and valleys.

12 These environmental assets bring in
13 1.1 billion dollars in annual revenues to the
14 region. And they generate 12 million
15 visitors. In addition, 26 million people get
16 their drinking water from the Mississippi
17 River. The upper river is still relatively
18 natural, though it's showing significant
19 signs, rather, of being compromised and
20 degraded. Backwaters are filling in with
21 sedimentation. There's loss of river plants
22 and other habitat resources, invasive
23 species, water quality, to name some of
24 those.

25 But the river is also a navigation

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 system. We accept that. We recognize that
2 as one of its missions. But we're very
3 concerned that that be balanced equally with
4 environmental considerations. Biologists
5 tell us that the river is still stabilizing
6 from construction of the first locks and
7 dams. We don't want the present tenuous
8 balance to be disturbed. There are
9 inevitable conflicts that we need to address
10 and ones we already should have looked at
11 before we add more to them.

12 Longer barges and bigger locks and
13 dams certainly will create more problems in
14 addition to more traffic. We urge you to
15 defer the decision to expand navigation in
16 the upper Mississippi River. The EMP and
17 water level manipulation studies can all give
18 us, can give us all management know-how which
19 will better enable us to deal with navigation
20 and environmental resource conflicts.

21 The Corps Of Engineers last year
22 stated that this project was not economically
23 feasible. We need time to better evaluate
24 your new economic rationales. That's a
25 further reason for delay.

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 Thank you.

2 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Barbara.

3 Sir.

4 GARY JOACHUM: I'm Gary Joachum from
5 Claremont, Minnesota, board member of the
6 Minnesota Soybean Growers Association and
7 also the American Soybean Association. This
8 here, 1999, about three million dollars worth
9 of soybeans, that is at the farm level, will
10 be exported through the port of New Orleans.
11 Most of those are grown north of the Ohio
12 River. And in the 1930s, when the current
13 system was designed, that total was exactly
14 zero. About 20 years ago, the South
15 Americans started to invest big time in their
16 infrastructure and they've spent hundreds of
17 millions of dollars on their shipping, and
18 port, and port facilities. One of the major
19 advantages that the United States producer
20 has been our infrastructure, our railroads
21 and highways, especially the Mississippi
22 River. Because of this, and to maintain the
23 US producers ability to compete on the
24 worldwide scale we think it's vitally
25 important to improve the river and to

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 maintain it. Therefore we support the
2 Alternative H among these scenarios that you
3 have listed.

4 Thank you.

5 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Gary.
6 Sir.

7 FRED FUNK: Fred Funk, Onalaska,
8 Wisconsin. I've been active in river affairs
9 for close to 30, 40 years, and I've been a
10 great believer, quite frankly, in
11 maintaining, and many of you have heard me
12 say that I consider this a multipurpose
13 resource, and I believe that this resource is
14 really big enough and diverse enough to fill
15 the needs of commercial navigation,
16 recreation, as well as wildlife, within
17 limits, if it's managed right. And I
18 emphasize, within limits.

19 My personal opinion is that the
20 addition or recommendation of 1,200 foot
21 locks is not within limits. And I say this
22 for this reason. My biggest concern with the
23 1,200 foot locks is the result that barges
24 are going to be lengthened. We have now
25 three abreast, five deep. They cannot

1 navigate this upper Mississippi River with
2 that length of barge. Now, I heard one of
3 the gentlemen earlier say that they won't use
4 the larger barges up here, but I can say this
5 -- that if the navigational industry is
6 powerful enough to spend these billions of
7 dollars for 1,200 foot locks, I believe they
8 are powerful enough to straighten our upper
9 Mississippi River and if this river is
10 straightened to accommodate longer barges,
11 then we have lost everything that we've
12 worked for for the last 40 years in the way
13 of protecting our environment and maintaining
14 this diverse environment here in the upper
15 Mississippi River.

16 I am fully in accord with more
17 efficient means for handling commercial
18 navigation and keeping abreast of the
19 economic development of Midwest. However, I
20 feel there are other alternates and they were
21 briefly discussed in the plans, and I am
22 going to write for them, as far as
23 efficiency. If you look at the current
24 operation of the lock and dam system up here
25 and compare the modern industry, it is

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 archaic. It's absolutely archaic the way
2 they slowly pull barges through those locks
3 and I feel that there are many, many other
4 ways to efficiently increase navigation by
5 increasing the speed in which we can lock our
6 barges through. And therefore I strongly
7 oppose the electing of any locks to 1,200
8 feet either on the lower river or on the
9 Mississippi River.

10 Thank you.

11 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

12 BOB KRUEGER: I'm Bob Krueger, Dodge
13 County, Minnesota, farmer that's got two sons
14 at home to carry on my operation. I traveled
15 a hundred miles to be here tonight. I want
16 to compliment the Army Corps of Engineers for
17 realizing the need to update the locks and
18 dams on the upper Mississippi and the
19 Illinois River. This upper Mississippi and
20 Illinois River system needs to be modernized
21 so business and agriculture producers can
22 compete in the world market for the next 50
23 years. I believe the recreation needs the
24 river to be updated also. We farmers realize
25 that there's going to be times for repairs,

1 just as now two locks are being repaired.
2 This causes delays in getting our products to
3 our customers and time is money. Any delays
4 going through the locks or waiting to go
5 through the locks are paid by the producers
6 by getting less for our grain. Today the
7 basis for handling charges on grain
8 transportation are similar to harvest time.

9 An example, I go to Winona with my
10 semi, and many of the corn basis is 15 and a
11 half cents per bushel. Today the basis is 50
12 cents per bushel. That's less money for
13 farmers to circulate in the local
14 communities. The dollar turns over six or
15 seven times when a farmer gets the money.
16 Since time began, change has taken place.
17 Most of us don't like change, but it happens
18 anyway.

19 I'm in my 50th year of farming.
20 This rented farm has used improved practices
21 as they became available -- tile drainage,
22 improved crop varieties, better control of
23 weeds, and the crop system, as well as better
24 utilization of fertilizer system and better
25 systems of machinery.

1 In 1950 my yields were 12 bushel on
2 soybeans, last year I raised 50 bushel per
3 acre. Corn yields have changed from 60
4 bushel to over 170 bushel in those 50 years.
5 This increase in yields will continue. Any
6 improvements to our river transportation
7 system will take time, 10 or 12 years to go
8 through the entire system. We need to get
9 started now.

10 With good weather, good yields, 4.6
11 percent of people in the world live here. We
12 can't use all of what we produce here. There
13 are people that need our food and our
14 products. We must have a transportation
15 system that can move our products to get
16 them.

17 BILL WIEDMAN: One minute.

18 BOB KRUEGER: Rail lines are getting
19 fewer and farther apart. People are also
20 tools to the improvement of rail traffic.
21 The DM & E Railroad is a example. The only
22 other alternative left is truck, and our
23 highways are crowded now. Do you know that
24 15 barge tow hauls grain from 870 semi
25 trucks. If they were bumper to bumper, they

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 would be eleven and a half miles long. How
2 would you like to get in that line when you
3 go home from work?

4 We must improve our locks to cause
5 less delays. Seventy-five percent of our
6 soybean exports leave by the Mississippi
7 River.

8 Thank you.

9 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you. He was
10 waiting over here, then I'll come back over.

11 JIM HENSEN: My name is Jim Hensen.
12 I'm with the Fish And Wildlife Service here
13 in La Crosse and I work on the upper
14 Mississippi River, national wildlife, and
15 what I would like to do is read the Service's
16 statement regarding the Army Corps of
17 Engineers Upper Mississippi and Illinois
18 System Navigation Study. Mr. Hidel referred
19 to it during the question and answer period.
20 I thought I would read the whole thing for
21 folks here.

22 The condition of fish and wildlife
23 resources on the Upper Mississippi River
24 System are inextricably linked to the
25 operation and maintenance of the US Army

1 Corps of Engineers UMRS Nine-foot Navigation
2 Channel Project. Much of the debate between
3 navigation proponents and opponents,
4 concerning the Corps of Engineers recently
5 released navigation improvements
6 alternatives, has been framed in an "all or
7 nothing" perspective; either you are for
8 navigation improvements or against them.
9 Navigation proponents have been criticized as
10 being insensitive to the environment and
11 navigation opponents have been accused of
12 being naive with respect to the Midwest's
13 economic needs. This is unfair to all
14 concerned, no matter how they view the
15 river.

16 Just as the navigation project needs
17 improvements to keep it functional and
18 effective for navigation traffic, so does the
19 ecosystem need improvements to keep it
20 functioning and effective for fish and
21 wildlife. While the Corps of Engineers has
22 made a case that the waterborne
23 transportation system is in decline, there is
24 also ample evidence that the UMR ecosystem is
25 in decline. The question is really how to

1 balance the needed improvements, to keep the
2 navigation system functional and effective,
3 with the need for improvements to keep the
4 ecosystem functional and effective. The
5 Service believes we can have both, but not
6 without a Corps commitment to address and
7 rectify operation and maintenance impacts, as
8 well as increased traffic impacts.

9 The Service has been strongly
10 critical of the Corps' environmental study
11 design for the navigation study. Based on
12 the results of studies thus far, we do not
13 believe there is sufficient information to
14 determine the significance of increased
15 navigation traffic upon UMR fish and wildlife
16 resources. The results of such attempts are
17 reflected in the indeterminate results of the
18 recent draft report on main channel fish
19 impacts. Since study initiation, the Service
20 and the five UMR state natural resource
21 agencies have argued that the cumulative
22 effects of the existing navigation project's
23 operation and maintenance activities must be
24 quantified and compensated. The Corps has
25 repeatedly been advised that additional time

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 was needed to collect the vital field data to
2 run navigation impact models.

3 The current approaches taken by the
4 Corps to address these concerns are not
5 satisfactory to the Service. Other UMR
6 organizations and groups have similar
7 concerns. Concern over this issue will
8 likely increase in coming months and possibly
9 lead to delays in study approval. Such
10 delays will not be well received by the
11 navigation industry. All of this sounds like
12 a prescription for an economic and ecological
13 train wreck.

14 Despite these serious concerns, the
15 Service believes the information needed to
16 analyze systemic effects of traffic and O&M
17 can be collected without impacting the Corps'
18 timetable for needed improvements. A
19 significant amount of engineering and design
20 will be conducted in the coming years. There
21 is no known reason, (other than bureaucracy)
22 that decisions regarding the navigation
23 effects must be made now. Why can't the
24 necessary environmental information be
25 collected over the next few years while

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 advanced engineering and design are being
2 performed? Necessary mitigation would be
3 implemented through an adaptive approach.
4 Mitigation would be implemented as impacts
5 are identified over time and we learn more
6 about navigation and natural resource
7 interactions. We also recommend that a
8 systemic program be implemented to avoid and
9 minimize O&M effects. Without a commitment
10 to respond to the Service's concerns about
11 O&M and tow traffic effects we will continue
12 to reject the findings of the Corps'
13 navigation impact analysis. It would also be
14 nonproductive for the Service to participate
15 in any mitigation planning activities that
16 require the estimation of mitigation costs
17 using output from the Corps' impact models.

18 In 1986, Congress declared the Upper
19 Mississippi River a nationally significant
20 transportation system and a nationally
21 significant ecosystem. The Congressional
22 mandates and missions of the Corps of
23 Engineers and Fish Wildlife Service relative
24 to the Upper Mississippi River are thus
25 inextricably linked. It is incumbent upon

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 both agencies to demonstrate leadership and
2 resolve mutual navigation and fish and
3 wildlife issues. The Service is optimistic
4 that we may avoid a protracted agency dispute
5 if we begin a heart-to-heart dialogue about
6 these issues now, rather than later.

7 Thank you.

8 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you.

9 LARRY LARSON: I am Larry Larson
10 from Sargeant, Minnesota. Member of a farm
11 family, corporation with my brother, and we
12 have three sons, and we also have a
13 commercial feed and grain elevator at
14 Sargeant and crop about 1,800 acres of land.
15 We raise, we also raise hogs and turkeys.

16 Our farming operation started in
17 1938 when my father began farming and my
18 brother and I started in the 60s and our sons
19 have come in the last few years. We have a
20 mission in our family to build our business
21 in this climate, that we can continue to keep
22 it within the family operation, but this
23 means that we have to make changes and
24 recognize where those changes need to come
25 from over time to keep operating. We have

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 made a lot of changes the last few years.
2 We've had to increase volume in our
3 production in order to keep the efficiencies
4 of production so that we can operate and that
5 our sons can be involved.

6 And the river system has been a
7 major part, really, of our life for quite a
8 few years because we've been shipping grain
9 down the river for quite a few years. We've
10 had a couple scares over the years when the
11 water was too high that we couldn't get the
12 grain over here because we couldn't ship it
13 or the water got too low and that was pretty
14 scarry for the entire area. We work with a
15 lot of farmers in the area in grain marketing
16 and risk management also and the rail has
17 left us in our area. I don't see how it can
18 come back because any time you try to build
19 something, the community stops it anyway.

20 And, of course, I do feel that the
21 barge traffic is -- I'm concerned about the
22 environment, but the barge traffic will
23 certainly burn a lot less fuel that goes into
24 the -- the pollutants in the air, and you can
25 move a lot larger volume, a lot less effort,

1 and without the continued use of the
2 Mississippi River, then we would be down to
3 railroad and truck and costs would go up
4 more.

5 If we were closer to the Gulf and we
6 could truck it there, that would be fine, but
7 we're kind of landlocked up here without the
8 Mississippi River, and so I think it's very
9 important to the entire community that the
10 system be updated and changed.

11 If you think about -- I think also
12 that the projection as to what the changes
13 for the future are for the next 50 years are
14 pretty conservative. I think it's pretty
15 hard to see what's going to happen, but 60
16 years ago Robert said we produced about 60
17 bushel corn. I think it was probably even
18 less than that, and we didn't have any beans,
19 and we fed everything, and they were using
20 the river then. Now we produce 150 bushel of
21 corn and 50 to 60 bushel of soybeans, and
22 with the technology moving as rapidly as it
23 is, I don't think we can comprehend what's
24 going to happen in 50 years, so I think we're
25 very conservative on that part, and so I

1 would be in favor of these changes.

2 Thank you.

3 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Larry.

4 RUSSELL EICHMAN: My name is Russell
5 Eichman and I'm the executive director for
6 the Upper Mississippi Waterway Association.
7 We're a trade association of barge providers,
8 barge users, recreational marinas, and
9 private individuals.

10 Freight transportation, as you know,
11 is a drive demand, meaning that commodity
12 only moves when it has more value elsewhere
13 than where it currently is. Moving of
14 freight traffic will increase as the
15 population increases, simply because more
16 people will need more of the essential goods
17 and services. And if freight does not move
18 by barge, it will move by some other mode,
19 which pollutes the environment more.

20 Now, the Upper Mississippi Waterway
21 Association supports the Corps' Alternative
22 listed as number H in today's handout.

23 Having said that, we have some
24 concerns about the Corps' information they
25 used to substantiate some of the other

1 alternatives.

2 Number one, the Iowa source data
3 used to determine the demand for grain were
4 arbitrarily given values depending on the
5 distance from the river. The values assigned
6 on grain demand were determined without any
7 empirical testing and are too conservative.

8 Number two, the Corps Of Engineers
9 has used an, has used an expert elicitation
10 panel to set these parameters. Interviews
11 with those panel members revealed
12 disagreements over what was agreed to. In
13 fact, all agree that the conclusion that
14 should have been used from the panel was that
15 more need should be given to determining
16 elasticities. These experts should be given
17 additional time to, to clarify the reports
18 that were put in the issues.

19 Number three, the Iowa Grain pools
20 cannot be used to determine demand
21 elasticities on the Illinois River.
22 Historically other researchers have shown
23 that the demand elasticities on the Illinois
24 have been half of that on the Mississippi.
25 The Corps' model needs to be adjusted

1 accordingly.

2 Number four, the maximum willingness
3 of shippers to pay for barge freight is set
4 in the Corps' model assumption with the
5 restriction that rail freight rates will not
6 increase as or with barge freight increases.
7 This is absurd. Interviews with barge
8 companies and shippers who utilize both rail
9 and barge challenge this assumption as being
10 erroneous.

11 Finally one of the key assumptions
12 that may be too conservative resolves around
13 the future of grain production capabilities
14 with the growing use of production
15 agriculture improvements focussing on quality
16 and yields. Over the next 50 years new
17 technology will increase production beyond
18 historic levels. Key groups such as the US
19 Grain Council have already begun adjusting
20 their models to reflect this increase,
21 potential increased production potential.

22 And number six, all these point, all
23 these points lead to the concern that the
24 overall benefits assigned to alternatives or
25 assigned to key alternatives with capital

1 improves are incorrect.

2 And we've got several concerns
3 regarding improvements on the Illinois
4 River. I will defer my time to some of the
5 other people, because I will have this
6 handout available to your people at the
7 desk.

8 But we have two further comments
9 concerning where we are and where we need to
10 go.

11 The Commercial Navigation Industry
12 will ask the Corps to consider our underlying
13 concerns and request an additional
14 consideration of yet unstated alternative.
15 This alternative provides for ten 1,200 foot
16 locks on the Upper Mississippi. And two
17 1,200 foot locks on the Illinois with mooring
18 buoys as appropriate. We do not yet know if
19 this alternative is economically justified,
20 but it may be if the proper assumptions are
21 utilized.

22 And finally, the Industry will
23 request that the Corps evaluate the concept
24 of new 1,200 foot locks versus lock
25 extensions, against the backdrop of 300

1 million in current deferred maintenance on
2 the Upper Mississippi region. We believe it
3 is bad policy to merely extend locks when we
4 can't even perform the necessary maintenance
5 on existing 60 to 70 year old structures.

6 Thank you.

7 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you.

8 JIM SCHROEDER: My is Jim
9 Schroeder. If you can't understand me, it's
10 probably because my teeth are chattering from
11 sitting in the icebox.

12 I don't need the whole five minutes,
13 in comparison to the gentleman that thought
14 he needed the whole evening.

15 I farm in Mower County. My son is
16 now on the farm. I'm semiretired. I help
17 them. We would like to be able to continue
18 farming. I thank the Corps for doing the
19 study. I think they've done a commendable
20 job. Gentlemen, in spite of getting torn
21 apart here tonight, I think you've done a
22 commendable job. I think you've got work to
23 do yet and I think you admitted that. Some
24 parts aren't even finished. We just want to
25 be able to keep marking our products.

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 It was alluded to that it can be
2 shipped other ways. In Minnesota, trucking
3 to the Gulf is not an option. Trucking in
4 Minnesota is only to be used to get to the
5 optional ways of hauling corn, and that's
6 either the river or the railroad. Trucks can
7 get you there and they are great to do it.
8 They are not a viable option to take us to
9 the distant markets. And half the corn in
10 Minnesota is shipped out of the state of
11 Minnesota. And in spite of the fact we now
12 have 12 operating ethanol plants in Minnesota
13 to try to keep the corn at home and process
14 it there, that percentage is staying roughly
15 the same, because we're producing more corn.
16 And it's still got to go somewhere where the
17 markets are and we are working hard in
18 Minnesota to provide markets there.

19 Small town Minnesota is having a
20 difficult time and will get more difficult.

21 I support option H. Let's keep the
22 river going. I'm an environmentalist also. I
23 want to keep the river usable in lots of
24 different ways and I just thank you for your
25 time. Let's get on with it.

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Jim.

2 SOL SIMON: Good evening. My name
3 is Sol Simon. I'm the director at the
4 Mississippi River Environmental
5 Organization. Our group is concerned with
6 the environmental effects in preserving the
7 Mississippi and I think everyone has heard
8 here tonight that the Army Corps is
9 destroying the Mississippi. That's not a
10 controversial issue. The Corps admits it.
11 In their report to Congress they stated
12 that. And nobody here -- I haven't heard
13 anybody deny that fact.

14 It's a plain fact that the
15 Mississippi is going, is becoming a very
16 simple -- coming from a very productive
17 ecosystem to a very simple ecosystem, largely
18 in part to the way the Army Corps manages the
19 navigation system. We're not here to discuss
20 this. The Army Corps doesn't want to do
21 anything about it. I think you've all heard
22 some day we might look at that issue, we've
23 got some processes, we're going to meetings.
24 Well, did you see anything come out of this
25 meeting? They don't even have any studies on

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 it. They are holding some meetings right now
2 on that issue. They don't have any plans to
3 deal with the issue, so the issues of the
4 environmental issues are not controversial.
5 They are destroying the river. They have no
6 plans to stop destroying the river.

7 I think what is controversial is the
8 economic issues of this navigation
9 expansion. Basically the question is, do we,
10 does the existing system benefit us and who
11 does it benefit, and who pays the cost, and
12 would expanding the system benefit, and who
13 pays the cost? Well, the existing system is
14 being paid for almost all by the taxpayer.

15 The, I can't remember the man up
16 there in the blue suit from the Corps, I'm
17 sorry, I forgot your name. He kept saying,
18 well, the nav industry is going to pay 50
19 percent. No, they are only paying 5 to 2
20 percent of the cost of the whole cost of
21 running the system. That's what he's not
22 focusing on. The taxpayers are paying the
23 rest of cost of the system.

24 But let's look at just the nav
25 expansion issue. That's what he wanted to

1 focus on, just the nav expansion. Okay, so
2 the, he's claiming that the navigation
3 industry is going to pay 50 percent. Here
4 you see Chris here MARC 2000. I hear him
5 saying they can't afford to pay 50 percent.
6 Maybe he's adjusted his figures. They didn't
7 have the money, but maybe they're going to
8 come up with that money.

9 What is the benefit of expanding the
10 locks over the existing system? The benefit
11 is to reduce those delays. There is delays
12 at the lower locks. Now, the industry claims
13 that they cost between 20 and 35 million
14 dollars a year, those delays, so that's the
15 benefit that the industry, the barge industry
16 will gain 20 to 35 million, to save 20 to 35
17 million dollars. And who, and who pays the
18 cost? The tax payers. The tax payers are
19 going to pay 600 million dollars so that ADM,
20 Cargill, Con-Agra, City Bank, Citicorp, those
21 are the companies that own almost all the
22 barges, so that they will save that money.

23 Okay, now you don't see anybody here
24 today -- you see some farmers that MARC 2000
25 has brought out and you see MARC 2000.

1 You're not going to see anybody here from
2 Citicorp. You're not going to see anybody
3 here from ADM or Cargill saying, ADM and
4 Cargill really needs that money, and we need
5 the taxpayers to help us, because that would
6 be absurd, so they're not going to do that.
7 They are going to get the farmers here to say
8 that. A lot of you are farmers. How many of
9 you think ADM and Cargill are your
10 friends? You know that they're not. They
11 are there to use you and that's what they are
12 doing tonight.

13 Now, if you look at the issue of
14 barge versus rail, a lot of farmers here,
15 I've heard a lot of farmers say, trains won't
16 haul our grain, you know, so we need the
17 barges to haul our grain out. Well, and
18 there's rail car shortages. Well, if you
19 think about it, why are there rail car
20 shortages? Because the trains -- I've heard
21 the vice-president for Burlington Northern
22 talk about this issue. They make the least
23 amount of return on, on grain cars, because
24 they are only used for a one way and they
25 have a very subsidized system. The train is

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 paying all the cost of their system and the
2 barges are paying 2 to 5 percent of their
3 system, so the trains have a subsidized
4 competitor, so they are not going to -- they
5 are going to put a very marginal amount of
6 money into moving their grain, so the
7 farmers, so the farmers are saying, you know,
8 the trains won't help us. Of course the
9 trains aren't going to help. The tax payers
10 are making ADM and Cargill rich by moving
11 their grain, you know, for them. It's
12 absurd.

13 And I think the, you know, the
14 farmers have a hard time. You know,
15 basically they get paid very little for the
16 amount they do. I realize that. But the
17 barges are not going to help them.

18 Thanks.

19 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Sol.

20 JOHN STEELE: Yes, I'm John Steele
21 from Sargeant, Minnesota. I'm a family
22 farmer, raise corn and soybeans. I view my
23 biggest challenge in the future is competing
24 with South America, and I feel that I need a
25 really good river system to be competitive.

1 So I want whatever has to be done to make
2 that as good a system as what they are
3 building in South America.

4 Thank you.

5 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, John.

6 JEFF ROBERG: Thank you. My name is
7 Jeff Roberg. I'm the president of Minnesota
8 Trout Association and a licensed professional
9 geologist. Own an environmental consulting
10 firm.

11 I want to make three points. And
12 the first is I want to applaud the Corps Of
13 Engineers and all you guys that have been
14 working on this, and in my professional
15 experience and in this meeting tonight it
16 gives me a great deal of confidence in the
17 professional level of valuation that you guys
18 have put together. In almost every aspect of
19 my business as an environmental consultant
20 dealing with private natural resource
21 managing, we can rely on the expertise of the
22 Corps Of Engineers for things like river
23 restoration, best management practices for
24 all types of things, and I'm continually
25 impressed at the level of planning that goes

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 into the systems that you manage and have
2 control over. It should give the public a
3 great deal of confidence in studies like
4 this.

5 I also want to say how disappointed
6 I am of you at the US Fish & Wildlife
7 Service. It's no surprise to me that the
8 environmental study drags on perpetually.
9 This is what we've come to expect from the
10 environmental managers in this agency. They
11 won't meet a deadline, they won't ever stop
12 asking questions, and they won't do the
13 practical planning that's necessary to make
14 our systems work. It's a real
15 disappointment.

16 The last item I would like to make
17 is I think that the biggest threat we have on
18 the river system is recreational overuse.
19 This is the thing on the horizon that
20 threatens to shut down the important
21 navigation system, threatens to overload our
22 fish and wildlife resources and we're paying
23 little attention to the environmental impacts
24 that recreationalists are causing, and in my
25 role in the Trout Association, we see

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 pressures that may be irreversible with
2 recreational overuse, and we're struggling
3 with trying to manage that, and we're not
4 getting the answers from the resource
5 agencies that we think we deserve.

6 Thank you.

7 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Jeff.

8 CHRIS BRESCIA: My name is Chris
9 Brescia. I'm with MARC 2000, and despite
10 what Sol says about me, I really am a nice
11 guy. I, however, disagree with him. I don't
12 believe that the Corps is destroying the
13 river. I believe that what the Corps is
14 doing is what Congress told it to do, and
15 what Congress told them to do is pay
16 assistance and allow the Midwest to grow and
17 to do it in a responsible way, and every year
18 that the system has been in place, Congress
19 looks at this, DNR agencies look at it, and
20 try to add their contributions to how the
21 system ought to be managed and it changes
22 over time, and I think that's a reality.

23 I would also like the record to show
24 that we agree with some of the points that
25 the Sierra Club made. This may come as a

1 shock to some people, but the statement I
2 thought that was articulated had some good
3 points to it. It is a multiple use river.
4 We agree with that. Our organization, which
5 is made up of agricultural interests,
6 industrial interests, development interests,
7 labor unions, all believe that it's a
8 multiple use river, known to be managed like
9 that.

10 The reason that we do have people
11 coming to visit to this area is that they
12 have good jobs, they have the income to
13 recreate, they have the income for tourism.
14 That comes from somewhere. It comes from the
15 job creation that is often stimulated by the
16 river system and other means of production.

17 There are a couple of questions that
18 were raised. Who pays and who gains? Well,
19 there's a real good reason why the waterway
20 system is managed by the federal government
21 and the operation is paid by the federal
22 government, because the beneficiaries are
23 all, everyone who is in this room. Everyone
24 benefits from the river system. There are
25 widespread benefits and Congress at one time

1 in the history thought, let's try to
2 compartmentalize the benefits and get every
3 user to pay, but they found that the benefits
4 were so diverse that that didn't make
5 economic sense to try to do that.

6 In our own analysis we asked an
7 independent accounting firm to commission, we
8 found that over 61 percent of the benefits
9 are for people in everyday walks of life who
10 have absolutely nothing to do with the river
11 system, with the production, or with the
12 movements of products. That's why it's a
13 system that serves everyone. It's a federal
14 investment and it's an investment that
15 returns to the people.

16 In terms of -- I would like to make
17 a comment about the gentleman who was
18 concerned about waiting a half hour for a
19 barge to go through a bridge. We very much
20 would like to be able to transit locks in a
21 half hour. That's what this is all about.
22 If you have a 1,200 foot lock, and an 1,100
23 foot tow, you can transit in 40 minutes as
24 opposed to a hour and a half or two hours.
25 That's what this is all about.

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 You've got to go to the Coast Guard
2 though because they have responsibility for
3 some areas, and I would like to address that
4 issue.

5 Spills. Spills are a threat. And
6 spills are a threat that are taken
7 seriously. And the reason that you can't
8 find a lot of data on spill impact is because
9 there are so few spills, it's unbelievable.
10 Okay, we would like to keep it that way,
11 because we don't want the quality of the
12 water ruined and every barge company has a
13 response plan if there is a spill, and it
14 takes responsibility for that. Now that's
15 under OPA 90 and that, that will continue.

16 The barge industry is the one
17 through which the taxes are collected to pay
18 for half the cost of construction. It's not
19 the barge industry that's paying. It's not
20 the barge industry that's getting the
21 benefits. It's the producers, the shippers,
22 the consumer. Okay, that cost is reflected
23 in the price of the product. It's just
24 passed on. I think Russ Eichman described it
25 as the barge industry being stuck between the

1 producer and the consumer. The barge
2 industry is placed at a minimum, at a
3 minimum, in terms of profitability. That's
4 how it succeeds and that will continue to
5 happen even as costs decline.

6 Uhm, the reason why it takes longer
7 to load a barge than it does to empty a truck
8 is that it takes 59 trucks to fill a barge.
9 So consider that when you're looking at a
10 terminal and what's going on at a terminal
11 and it takes 879 trucks of grain to fill a
12 tow, a 15 barge tow. That's why it takes
13 long to do that, but those are the
14 efficiencies that you gain when it moves down
15 the river system.

16 An issue of drawdown was brought
17 up. Very important concept that we worked
18 with the environmental community in
19 addressing through the Upper Mississippi
20 Summit. It was through the judicious
21 attention that the biologists were able to
22 proceed in this fashion and do those types of
23 responsible activities on the river to
24 address the environmental needs of the river
25 and we will continue to participate in those

1 activities. Fifteen barge tows maximum that
2 will move on the Upper Mississippi. We're
3 not in the business of straightening the
4 river. That's a 1960s, 1970s axiom that you
5 ought to put out of your lexicon right now.
6 It's just a no-good.

7 BILL WIEDMAN: One minute.

8 CHRIS BRESCIA: I'll take as much
9 time as Sol took. The archaic system, this
10 is an archaic system. It's an old system,
11 but you know what? It's a system that
12 works. And we've looked at the ma blood
13 trains, which was suggested by the Isaac
14 Walton League ten years ago. It's not -- the
15 technology is not there yet, but this is a
16 system that still produces results and that's
17 why we're looking for the federal government
18 to make an additional investment.

19 In terms of the fish and wildlife
20 service, I would have really hoped that the
21 Fish & Wildlife Service would have put
22 someone's name at the bottom of that letter.
23 I think it's important for a federal agency
24 to take responsibility and for the author to
25 take responsibility, but I'm presuming that

1 since they are a responsible agency that they
2 work that through the entire system and
3 that's the type of response that they chose
4 to make at this time.

5 And.

6 BILL WIEDMAN: I would ask you to
7 wrap it up.

8 CHRIS BRESCIA: I'm almost done,
9 Bill.

10 BILL WIEDMAN: You have 30 seconds.

11 CHRIS BRESCIA: Finally, I think
12 it's, I found this public meeting to be very
13 helpful, very instructive, and I'm hoping
14 that those who came to participate, first of
15 all, ought to be applauded, because we do
16 live in a participatory democracy, and if you
17 don't participate, you don't make your voice
18 heard, and then I think it's a shame on you
19 and you shouldn't, you should just, you know,
20 not complain about what we have. But the
21 people here who came this evening are
22 exceptional on both sides, and I think that's
23 a credit to all of us and I think it
24 demonstrates that we're very serious about
25 this resource and we want to make sure that

1 the future is well taken care of.

2 Thank you.

3 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Chris.

4 Yes, sir.

5 PAUL BURTELS: My name is Paul
6 Burtels. I'm representing the National
7 Corn Growers Association here this evening.
8 We are an association 31,000 members
9 throughout the US. I am also a part-time
10 farmer in southern Illinois and let me start
11 with that.

12 Several gentlemen this evening
13 talked about their family farm operation.
14 I've recently returned to my family farm. I
15 have four small sons and I would like to see
16 a farm that's been in my family for over 130
17 years continue with my children and their
18 children. In the area where I live we are
19 completely reliant upon the export market.
20 That's what keeps us going. But we can't do
21 it ourselves. From my area, we haul grain to
22 the open river, but I know that we need the
23 corn produced in Minnesota and Iowa and
24 Wisconsin, those volumes are what keep my
25 prices up. That's what keep me profitable

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 and that what will bring my sons into
2 farming.

3 Now, Sol, I appreciate your
4 heartfelt, you know, I appreciate that for
5 the farmers, but let me tell you, I think
6 you're --

7 SOL:

8 PAUL BURTELS: -- good, I don't think
9 you're representing your best interest, quite
10 frankly. The export market is beneficial to
11 farmers. This year we have record high
12 processing, we have record high feed levels,
13 but grain prices are low, and the reason why
14 is because this year exports are down,
15 marginally, less than 5 percent they are
16 down. That's why grain prices are low right
17 now. Exports are important to farmers. I
18 will say that for the third time. Exports
19 are important to farmers.

20 Now, I hear a lot about
21 corporations, corporate welfare. Well, let
22 me see. As I recall, one of the largest
23 grain exporting companies is Harvest States.
24 Let's see, that's a co-op owned by farmers,
25 so their profits get returned to farmers in

1 the form of dividends.

2 Now you say railroads, okay, well,
3 let's see, we're helping Citicorp, we're
4 helping Cargill, those are corporations.
5 Last time I checked, ah, Burlington Northern,
6 Santa Fe and the Union Pacific, Southern
7 Pacific were corporations.

8 SOL: They pay their rate.

9 BILL WIEDMAN: We'll not get into a
10 dialogue here.

11 SOL: He's asking me.

12 PAUL BURTELS: I'm not here to
13 belittle the railroads, but let's be
14 realistic. I just sat down and looked at
15 this. In the time period that this study was
16 going on in the west, west of the
17 Mississippi, they went from seven railroads
18 to three railroads.

19 Now, common economic thought will
20 tell you as someone is faced with less
21 competition, their costs go up. The rates
22 they charge go up. Now, if you get rid of
23 the river, what makes you think that the
24 railroads will not raise their rates? It's
25 not because they are bad people, it's because

1 they are businessmen. They charge what the
2 market will bear. I think I'll just go ahead
3 and stop with that, but I want to say that
4 all 31,000 members of the National Corn
5 Growers Association support Alternative H.

6 Thank you.

7 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Paul.

8 TONY BINSFELD: Good evening, my
9 name is Tony Binsfeld. I live here in
10 La Crosse. My family has been living on the
11 river since 1919.

12 One of the questions earlier tonight
13 is, what's important to you. To me it's very
14 important that we continue to maintain our
15 economy in the Midwest. I think the greatest
16 thing we can do for our children is to pass
17 on a strong economy and a strong
18 infrastructure that maintains that economy.
19 Like it or not, Midwestern economy has been
20 built, founded on agriculture, for
21 generations. And I think it's going to
22 continue to be that way.

23 Agriculture is based on
24 transportation, especially when you're as far
25 from the market as we are. There's a lot of

1 countries out there right now that are trying
2 to duplicate our transportation system, and
3 with some success, in Argentina. I feel that
4 we should continue to invest in our
5 transportation system, but we're going to be
6 relegated to a second tier supplier of grain
7 to the world markets. And when we, when that
8 happens to us, our economy is going to
9 deteriorate. We will not have the luxury to
10 support good government, and to support
11 funding from environmental issues. We won't
12 have the luxury of being able to debate and
13 study issues out 50 years. We'll be looking
14 at problems next week, next month, next
15 year.

16 Good economy supports good
17 government and a good environment, and I
18 believe that the transportation system in the
19 Midwest is vital for us to, to continue in
20 this mode.

21 Accordingly, I support expansion of
22 the locks, and I guess if you would sum it up
23 in the words of our beloved president, it's
24 the economy, stupid.

25 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Tony.

1 DAN LARSON: I'm Dan Larson. I'm
2 the executive director of River Resource
3 Alliance. We're an organization representing
4 a broad cross section of agriculture,
5 transportation, commerce, and public interest
6 in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas. We
7 support a multimodal transportation system
8 that provides shippers with the most viable
9 shipping options. We also support a
10 management plan for the river that includes
11 managing it, the river system, for the
12 benefits, for its multiple benefits of major
13 navigation and recreation.

14 I want to make a couple of points
15 tonight now, and I'll be fairly brief, but
16 it's important to note that Minnesota,
17 Wisconsin and the Dakotas are the furthest
18 growing regions from the Gulf ports on the
19 Upper Mississippi River System, and, as such,
20 it can be argued that this system is most
21 important to these northern states, because
22 we are an agriculture, are and continue to be
23 an agricultural-based economy.

24 Overall the system provides
25 thousands of jobs, promotes the safest, most

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 efficient and environmentally sound mode of
2 transporting bulk commodities to sea ports
3 and also helps to preserve a way of life. To
4 reach -- in this region, the system is vital
5 to providing or preserving that way of life.

6 The results of not modernizing the
7 system would be disastrous. In making the
8 decision not to improve the system, we will
9 voluntarily turn over our leadership
10 positions in the world grain markets to our
11 competitors. We will voluntarily turn over
12 our market positions to our competitors.
13 That will be a decision that we make and that
14 we'll be able to either keep the markets or
15 give them away by the decisions that we make
16 here with this group and in other forums.

17 In addition, we'll shift capacity
18 from waterways to roads and rail. And
19 create, and thereby create significant
20 additional fuel use, air emissions, crossing
21 accidents, and road congestion.

22 The system was built to allow
23 landlocked farmers in upper Midwest states to
24 compete in world markets. Our strong economy
25 and generations of success are testaments to

1 the success of that system. We need to
2 support our farmers, by providing them with
3 more tools, not less.

4 We should implement Alternative H.

5 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Dan.

6 DAVID ANSBURY: Good evening. My
7 name is David Ansbury. I'm the manager of
8 Agri Business Analysis for C F Industries,
9 which is a large regional fertilizer co-op
10 producer. We distribute about one and a half
11 billion dollars worth of fertilizer each
12 year. The entire fertilizer industry uses
13 the river system in the US to ship about 11
14 to 12 million tons of fertilizer a year.
15 Eight to nine million tons of that comes up
16 usually from the Louisiana region and the
17 barge system is extremely important to us in
18 that respect.

19 The way that a cooperative works,
20 and most of you may know, of course, is that
21 even though we are a large, typically
22 profitable entity, that money that we make we
23 do not keep. We send it back to our
24 members. We have approximately 1.2 million
25 farmers who buy some of our fertilizer each

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 year. When we make a profit, our profit gets
2 sent back to them, so it goes back to the
3 people that are actually using our service,
4 so, as an entity, as far as Sol was talking
5 about, we don't get rich ourselves. We're
6 owned by the farmer producers.

7 Just to summarize here though,
8 there's a lot of good things that have been
9 said already. I would like to say that as an
10 industry we would like to support Option H to
11 provide 1,200 foot capacity at locks 20 to 25
12 and extend the guidewalls to 1,200 feet at
13 locks 14 through 18.

14 Thank you.

15 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, David.

16 MARK BURKRUM: I'm Mark Burkrum.

17 I'm the regional representative for the
18 Sierra Club, Midwest Region, and representing
19 its half million members across the country.
20 I also work with the Mississippi River Basin
21 Alliance which is composed of 130 different
22 organizations that range from Minnesota to
23 New Orleans. Our organizational members are
24 involved in a variety of issues ranging from
25 human health issues within the inner city to

1 issues that we're discussing here tonight.
2 That seems to be a little bit unrelated to
3 that, but they are related, as has been
4 pointed out.

5 I'm amused by how industry
6 representatives try to out environmental the
7 Sierra Club, because that's pretty hard to
8 do, and I've -- our organization has often
9 been accused of being on the fringe of the
10 environmental movement, but in actuality
11 we're leaders in understanding energy
12 efficiencies, human health issues, and water
13 quality, and I think that with this issue
14 that we're trying to deal with here, all of
15 those are involved and all need to be on the
16 table, and that's one of the problems we have
17 with the Corps Of Engineers' study is that
18 it's trying to limit itself to deal with just
19 the very small portion of what our problems
20 are in managing the river. We need to have
21 on the table the cumulative effects that have
22 been caused by 60 years of managing and
23 changing the natural processes of the river.

24 We have great concerns over how the
25 Midwest survives. Our members live in the

1 Midwest. They live -- they're farmers.
2 They're city folks. They're business
3 people. So we have to take those things into
4 consideration, but I think that since we have
5 not taken the natural resources into
6 consideration in the last 60 years of
7 managing the Mississippi River from the Gulf
8 to the headwaters, that this is the proper
9 time, the proper place for us to have all the
10 those cards on the table. Industry needs to
11 have all those cards on the table as well.

12 We've tried to discuss with them
13 some modernizations. We want to modernize
14 the physical structures that we have on the
15 river. Well, the industry, the barge
16 industry needs to modernize some of its
17 facilities and be willing to modernize its
18 operations.

19 We cannot get the industry to
20 discuss scheduling. We need to look at
21 moving some product down the river when there
22 is no movement. There is many times when we
23 have locks that aren't being utilized fully.
24 That's some of the things that need to be put
25 on the table.

1 Maybe we need to be looking at
2 different ways of storing our grain. Maybe
3 not as much of it stored on the farm and move
4 it more towards areas close to the export
5 market, so when those owners come in from
6 foreign countries, ConAgra and Citicorp, and
7 those others can move the product quickly,
8 but those things aren't on the table.
9 Industry refuses to discuss those things.
10 They want the taxpayer to cover that kind of
11 cost and we think these need to be on the
12 table.

13 Just to sum up, the Sierra Club and
14 the other environmental groups, including the
15 Isaac Walton League and the National Wildlife
16 Federation and others are not taking a
17 position we are going to shut down this river
18 system to commercial operation. I think all
19 the members recognize it's an important
20 commercial entity and it needs to remain so.
21 But how we manage it for that use and try to
22 rectify some of the damages that have been
23 done over the years, damages that down my way
24 down in Illinois include 13 million tons of
25 silt entering the Lower Illinois River System

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 choking off the life forces in the river, and
2 destroying its capability to function, for
3 other than just running a boat down the
4 river, those things need to be on the table
5 and industry sometimes doesn't want to
6 discuss that.

7 We need, we may need to be looking
8 at some section of the river where we're
9 talking about trying to increase capacity,
10 even to cut down traffic at certain times of
11 the year, but industry and the Corps don't
12 want to discuss that. We think those things
13 need to be table and we need to manage this
14 river in a balanced manner.

15 We are only spending about 16 to 20
16 million dollars a year in either studying or
17 doing some kind of rectification for the
18 environmental damage that's been done and yet
19 the taxpayer is spending 130 million to
20 manage the river system on the Upper Miss and
21 the Illinois River for industry use, so we're
22 not at balance yet, and that's what the
23 debate is going to be about.

24 Thank you.

25 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you. Mark.

1 MARK SCHULTZ: I'm Mark Schultz.
2 I'm secretary of the La Crosse County
3 Conservation Alliance, and this is, the
4 Alliance is the forum for discussion of
5 natural resources issues. In La Crosse
6 County there's 27 member organizations, about
7 6,000 members. And our biggest concern is
8 this is a public resource that's being
9 utilized and we don't see public support for
10 any alternative here, unless there's
11 consensus of the resource management agencies
12 that are responsible for the river. That
13 includes the Corps, the Fish & Wildlife
14 Service, the states, and the users.

15 And one aspect that hasn't been
16 represented here tonight that's an important
17 part of, at least La Crosse County's economy,
18 is those businesses that are based on the
19 natural resources that are out there on the
20 river. Whether it's the guy fixing some
21 motors for the commercial fisherman, or bait
22 shops, or whatever, but I did a survey back
23 in the early '80s and there's a significant
24 -- thousands of jobs in La Crosse County
25 that are dependent on that water base out

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 there and that water base needs to be high
2 quality for that to be important.

3 And so I would hope that that
4 economic aspect of the navigation and the
5 environment is taken into consideration when
6 we look at that, and I really haven't seen
7 any part of that study that takes that into
8 consideration so far. Maybe I missed it.
9 There's a lot to the study, but -- and I
10 think that the potential for these kinds of
11 businesses in the middle Mississippi River is
12 there, assuming we do the right things with
13 management and floodplain, so that potential
14 for economic development down there exists,
15 provided that the floodplain area is managed
16 adequately. So that's all I've got.

17 Thank you.

18 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you.

19 MARY ANN HADLICK: My name is Mary
20 Ann Hadlick from Logical Consultants here in
21 La Crosse, Wisconsin. I've been quite
22 actively involved in studying fresh water
23 muscles on the Mississippi River for the past
24 30 years, 22 of the years which have been as
25 a business. I guess I have a number of

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 comments that I would like to make.

2 That, first of all, I was wondering
3 how the Corps managed to get, and I didn't
4 really hear it explained, suddenly get a
5 positive cost benefit ratio for this
6 particular, various aspects of this project
7 that have been suggested. And I guess I
8 would have liked to have seen that explained
9 a little bit better.

10 Generally I concur with the Fish &
11 Wildlife and UMRCC statements on this
12 matter. I've seen a lot of changes in the
13 river over the past 30 years. For instance,
14 in 1996 I spent ten weeks on the Mississippi
15 River working. In 1997 I spent 13 weeks on
16 the river working from Cottage Grove,
17 Minnesota to Fort Madison, Iowa, and I can
18 assure you that I've seen the good, the bad,
19 and the ugly over all these years.

20 For instance, right now they are
21 talking about drawing down Pool 8, to sort of
22 mitigate for some of the problems that we
23 have there. And over the years I have asked
24 about the water levels and everybody always
25 denies that they were being kept elevated,

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 but finally in the Pool 8 EIS, it comes out
2 and shows that there were three different
3 water level management regimes that have
4 occurred over the years. So, in other words,
5 the Corps Of Engineers is really responsible
6 for a lot of this erosion and the loss of
7 islands that has gone on over the past few
8 years.

9 In general, I realize commercial
10 navigation isn't going to go away. I have
11 friends that are farmers too. The one farmer
12 mentioned that his exports were down, and I
13 guess nobody ever explained why they were
14 down, and if they are down, if that's going
15 to continue, then are the Corps' projections
16 actually correct and honest?

17 Thank you.

18 BILL WIEDMAN: Thank you, Mary Ann.
19 Well, I would say we've run out of steam
20 right now.

21 I appreciate all the information
22 that we've received and encourage you one
23 more time, for those of you who have not
24 taken advantage of the opportunity to comment
25 or to work in the small groups, to please

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386

1 turn in those sheets. There's an opportunity
2 to put comments down or questions that you
3 may have. The Corps reps are still here and
4 will be here for a while longer. I'll
5 officially close the meeting, but if you want
6 to take advantage of their expertise and get
7 some more questions, please do.

8 Thank you for participating all
9 evening. I appreciate it.

10 (Meeting adjourned at 10:56 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN)
2) ss
3 COUNTY OF LA CROSSE)
4
5

6 I, Nancy J. Johnson, a Notary Public duly
7 commissioned and qualified in and for the State of
8 Wisconsin do hereby certify that there came before
9 me on the 4th day of August, 1999, commencing at
8:30 o'clock P.M., the above-mentioned matter; that
the transcript is true and complete, to the best of
my ability, of the testimony given by witnesses.

10 I further certify that I am neither attorney
11 or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of
12 the parties to the action in which this meeting is
13 taken, and further that I am not a relative or
employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
parties hereto or financially interested in the
action.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my
15 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 19th day of
16 August, 1999.

17 REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTER
18 NANCY JOHNSON
19 P.O. Box 21
La Crosse, Wisconsin, 54602-0021

20 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
21 December 16, 2001
22
23
24
25

NANCY JOHNSON
(608) 784-9386