

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan Collaboration Team Meeting #1

1. The subject meeting was held via conference call on 28 August 2002. Following is a list of participants:

Mike Klingner	Upper Mississippi, Illinois & Missouri Rivers Association
Heather Hampton-Knodle	Upper Mississippi, Illinois & Missouri Rivers Association
Bob Clevenstine	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mark Beorkrem	Mississippi River Basin Alliance
Holly Stoerker	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association
Bob Goodwin	Maritime Administration
Bill Cappuccio	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Suzanne Jiwani	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Charlie DuCharme	Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Bill Franz	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Rich Worthington	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)
John Barko	Corps Engineer Research and Development Center
Greg Ruff	Corps Mississippi Valley Division
Dave Raasch	Corps St. Paul District
Teresa Kincaid	Corps Rock Island District
Ken Barr	Corps Rock Island District
Laura Abney	Corps Rock Island District
Jerry Skalak	Corps Rock Island District
Jack Carr	Corps Rock Island District
Rich Astrack	Corps St. Louis District
Dave Leake	Corps St. Louis District
Dave Gates	Corps St. Louis District
Dennis Stephens	Corps St. Louis District

2. J. Skalak opened the meeting with a request for participant introductions and input regarding team membership. H. Stoerker suggested that it would be useful to first discuss the Corps' expectations as to team roles and responsibilities. M. Klingner noted that the team needs to think at the system level and should be considering the big picture. J. Skalak and D. Leake stated that they expect the team to be actively engaged in all aspects of the plan formulation process, providing intensive, high-level input, review, and reaction to study products throughout their development and that the team is expected to be the primary vehicle for external study coordination. J. Skalak added that the team should be composed of a balanced mix of technical and policy expertise. The following additional comments were offered:

CEMVR-PM-M

SUBJECT: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan Collaboration Team Meeting Via Conference Call

a. M. Beorkrem recommended that Mr. Paul Osmond, Illinois Department of Natural Resource, and a representative (TBD) from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center (UMESC) be added to the team.

b. J. Skalak acknowledged that he had discussed with B. Clevenstine the potential for engaging General G. Galloway. B. Clevenstine will explore this further with him.

c. K. Barr suggested that Department of Agriculture representation be pursued.

d. J. Barko also promoted the addition of representation from the UMESC but was uncertain as to who might be available/appropriate in light of recent staff departures, etc.

e. J. Skalak noted that Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (K. Hinterlong) asked that the Corps formally request FEMA to designate team representation. J. Skalak acknowledged that such a request had not yet been processed. K. Hinterlong had agreed during a phone conversation to participate until such time.

3. M. Beorkrem noted that the study/plan will need to build upon previously completed work such as the Delft and Galloway reports and the Floodplain Management Assessment. J. Skalak and others concurred.

4. M. Klingner emphasized that thorough quantification of flooding impacts on the transportation network will be very important. J. Carr responded that certain economic evaluation work is already underway, using existing data, and that the study's economic analysis will include quantification of flood impacts on transportation, public utilities, and critical infrastructure. The evaluation of the economic impacts of sedimentation induced flooding will also be given consideration.

5. B. Franz acknowledged that Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) comments on the draft Project Management Plan (PMP) are forthcoming. The EPA wants water quality, local and downstream, and habitat benefits to be considered as part of the economic evaluation of alternatives. This is needed to assure a balanced look at all potential benefits.

6. B. Clevenstine raised a question regarding how the Corps' system of accounts will be used and trade-off analysis processes will be applied during alternative evaluation.

7. D. Gates stated that an array of plans, to include one that maximizes flood damage reduction using environmental measures, will be evaluated. The environmental plan should be useful in ultimately configuring a recommended project plan that might well incorporate both the National Economic Development (NED) and National Environmental Restoration (NER) components.

CEMVR-PM-M

SUBJECT: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan Collaboration Team Meeting Via Conference Call

8. J. Skalak reemphasized that flood damage reduction is the study driver.
9. G. Ruff acknowledged that the Corps has struggled with how best to meet the intent of the legislation. He went on to say that clearly the primary study product is to be a systemic flood damage reduction plan. However, that plan should reflect consideration of both structural and nonstructural alternative measures and that ecosystem restoration opportunities consistent with system sustainability goals and having flood damage reduction benefits will need to be identified and evaluated.
10. J. Skalak suggested that the plan could potentially be neutral with respect to environmental restoration outputs.
11. D. Gates added that the outputs of the Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan (UMRCP) alternative plans will be compared against a predetermined quantitative backdrop for systemic environmental sustainability needs. The Upper Mississippi River - Illinois Waterway (UMR-IWW) System Navigation Study will have the lead on quantifying the sustainability needs reference points for the UMR System. The UMRCP will determine the net quantitative outputs for each of the alternative UMRCP project plans. Any recommended plan will, at a minimum, neutralize any adverse project impacts (i.e., mitigate the impacts). Flood damage reduction compatible environmental restoration opportunities might also be identified during the conduct of the planning effort..
12. M. Klingner stated that systemic hydraulic modeling-driven opportunities for flood damage reduction need to be explored first and that regional economic benefits need to be calculated.
13. J. Skalak confirmed that the Flow Frequency Study is progressing well and that the new profiles should be available for use by this fall. He noted that the results of the economic evaluation work currently being done using '79 profiles will be used to focus evaluation work using the new profiles.
14. M. Klingner emphasized the need to identify and evaluate flood conveyance alternatives.
15. D. Leake noted that a thorough list of flood damage reduction-related problems, needs, and opportunities and potential measures must first be developed. That list will be refined and prioritized as the study process progresses.
16. In response to H, Hampton-Knodle's inquiry regarding PMP completion, J. Skalak acknowledged the previous day's Corps conference call, the purpose of which was to discuss the Upper Mississippi, Illinois & Missouri Rivers Association's (UMIMRA) concerns with the draft PMP. He provided the following summary of the results of that call:

CEMVR-PM-M

SUBJECT: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan Collaboration Team Meeting Via Conference Call

a. The Corps will coordinate a meeting with UMIMRA representatives and appropriate others to review economic evaluation work described in the draft PMP and discuss possible additional work that may be desired/beneficial.

b. The Corps will further investigate potential for defining the 1,000-year flood event for alternative evaluation use.

c. The Corps will add task items to the PMP that focus upon the policy aspects of flood damage reduction comprehensive planning.

d. The “enhanced reconnaissance” descriptor will be dropped.

17. D. Leake reminded the call participants that the PMP is a dynamic document and suggested that it may not be finalized until early next year. J. Skalak and G. Ruff thought that an approvable document would need to be completed as soon as possible. J. Skalak stated that the draft document will be revised, taking into consideration all comments received, prior to routing for final approval.

18. H. Hampton-Knodle reiterated that development of a flood routing plan is a primary study product. In response to this D. Leake asked for clearer definition of “routing” and does this concept apply to both the existing system or a significantly revised system. J. Skalak suggested that all of the alternatives to be considered essentially represent “flood routing” plans.

19. S. Jiwani inquired about the differences between the proposed geographic extents of the regional focus groups and the locations of the proposed public meetings. In response J. Skalak stated that although there were some relationships between the two, the selection of locations for the first round of public open houses was not directly driven by this relationship.

20. H. Hampton-Knodle expressed her concerns with the questionnaire that was distributed with the initial study newsletter. She considered it to be biased toward environmental concerns and nonstructural flood damage reduction alternatives. She also stated that it failed to solicit public input regarding economic expectations and that the Corps should consider employing professional market research assistance in the development of such questions. M. Klingner supported this comment. H. Stoerker provided the following additional comments:

a. Should consider developing new “questionnaire” for 2nd series of public meetings.

b. Use public meetings to refine future outreach tools.

c. The questionnaire is not a scientific survey.

CEMVR-PM-M

SUBJECT: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan Collaboration Team Meeting Via Conference Call

21. D. Leake stated that the Corps will take the Collaboration Team (CT) comments into consideration. A revised comment sheet will be developed and coordinated with the CT.

22. M. Beorkrem supported the need to gather economic data. Although large urban areas may have good economic data that meets their specific needs, smaller urban areas and un-urbanized areas may not. He also supported the need to develop regional economic data.

23. J. Skalak noted that the proposed regional focus groups will be valuable to our efforts to mine (identify, assess, and utilize) local/regional data.

24. H. Hampton-Knodle commended the Corps on the website that has been set up for the study.

25. In response to an inquiry by J. Skalak regarding other agency and non-government organization participation in the upcoming study open houses, H. Stoerker responded that the Corps should lead the study open houses.

26. J. Skalak acknowledged that there is a study budget disconnect that will need to be addressed. He went on to clarify that this problem has to do with the fact that the currently expected FY 03 appropriation reflects a request that was based upon a study cost estimate of approximately \$3 million. Now that the proposed study cost estimate is near \$5 million, a higher level of funding in FY 03 will be needed to complete proposed work within the authorized study time frame. He acknowledged that the draft PMP lays out a budget based upon study duration and current cost estimate. G. Ruff stated that the Corps is working this issue internally.

27. J. Skalak asked D. Leake to lead a discussion of the proposed regional focus groups. D. Leake proposed that these groups should plan on meeting 2-3 times during the duration of the study and that the participants need to be representative of a cross section of flood plain interests (economic and commercial, ecosystem/environmental, agricultural, etc.). D. Leake went on to list proposed members for one of the RFGs.

- 2 levee and drainage district reps
- 1 urban levee and drainage district rep
- metro St. Louis
- mayors
- regional planning
- railroad interests

CEMVR-PM-M

SUBJECT: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan Collaboration Team Meeting Via Conference Call

- Natural Resources Conservation Service (Department of Agriculture)
- Refuge manager
- MO and IL Department of Natural Resources (Department of Conservation)
- The Nature Conservancy (TNC)/American Land Conservancy (ALC)
- Audubon

28. Comments on this proposed list included the following:

- a. B. Goodwin noted that the ports and marinas need to be represented.
- b. J. Skalak commented that the recreation interests need to be properly represented.
- c. B. Clevestine suggested that someone from the Riverlands project office or Mike Wally (sp?) might be good additions.
- d. M. Klingner proposed Sam Baner or perhaps someone else from the Mid America Port Authority.
- e. B. Clevestine asked about possible representation from TNC or ALC.
- f. B. Franz noted that TNC now has an IL/Mississippi River Campaign.
- g. J. Barko noted that there will be lower river considerations and perhaps someone from one of the lower river Corps Districts should be involved.
- h. B. Clevestine suggested that someone from TNC might ultimately be the more appropriate member. M. Beorkrem concurred.
- i. B. Franz added that the water utilities and sanitary districts should be engaged.
- j. M. Klingner proposed that the geographic limits for the Regional Focus Groups (RFGs) should be as follows:
  - (1) 1. St. Louis – Quad Cities
  - (2) Thebes, IL to St. Louis
  - (3) Quad Cities – Anoka
  - (4) IL

CEMVR-PM-M

SUBJECT: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan Collaboration Team Meeting Via Conference Call

29. There was general consensus that the number of RFGs should neither be increased nor reduced. The Corps will continue to pursue identification of RFG members. The CT members were asked to provide suggestions for RFG participants.

30. D. Leake recommended that the next meeting of the CT be a face-to-face one and that that meeting will need to be held as soon as possible after the public open houses. There was general agreement that this meeting should be scheduled for the day after the upcoming Flow Frequency Study Task Force meeting (October 11, St. Louis, MO).

JERRY A. SKALAK  
UMRCP Regional Project Manager

CF:  
Collaboration Team Members  
Corps Product Development Team members

Dist File (PM-M)  
PM-M (Carattini)