

MINUTES OF RRAT/RRCT JOINT MEETING

24 June 2008

Hannibal, Missouri

1. The joint meeting of the RRAT and RRCT began at 10:00 a.m. and was opened by RRAT Co-chair, Joyce Collins. A list of the attendees is attached to these minutes. Joyce began with stating that the intent of this meeting is to discuss interaction between all groups, the Illinois River team, the RRAT, and the RRCT. Introductions were made by everyone in the room.

2. The first presentation was given by Ken Barr. His presentation can be found at the end of these minutes. Between the years 1993 to 2004 the Navigation Study was done. From this study the Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP) was developed. The program has a dual purpose authorization. This program has a large study area and includes 37 lock sites, 1,200 miles of river, 226,000 refuge acres, and 2.5 million acres of significant ecosystem area. The program area is from toe of bluff to toe of bluff and all navigable tributaries. The Corps is presently in the design and implementation stage of the program. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was completed in September 2004. The program has a recommended \$5.3 billion for ecosystem restoration and \$2.4 billion for navigation efficiency. The First Increment Plan (15 years) has a recommended amount of \$1.88 billion (2004 dollars) for navigation efficiency and \$1.46 billion for ecosystem restoration. The navigation efficiency implementation includes moorings; switchboats, which will save 5 minutes of each lockage making them cost effective; seven new 1,200-foot locks; mitigation; and continued study and monitoring. The 1930 construction of the locks have auxiliary sites for new locks intended for future construction. The ecosystem implementation for the First Increment Plan has \$1.7 billion which is the authorized amount in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). This program will include fish passage at 4 sites; water level control at two dams; forest and cultural resources management plans; adaptive management; 35,000 acres of floodplain restoration (this will be 100% Federal funding); and continued study and monitoring. We have authorization to cost share with Non-government Organizations (NGOs). Ken showed a slide of the list of projects to be accomplished within the First Increment Plan for ecosystem restoration. The monitoring will show how the projects are performing. In regard to the floodplain restoration, if it is below the high water mark and the Corps can demonstrate "goodness" of the project, than this will be considered using all federal funds. We estimate 220 projects in 15 years and the adaptive management will help us to learn. We are assuming the Environmental Management Program (EMP) will continue. If EMP is not continued, then \$10.4 million per year could be used for these projects through NESP. A question was asked by Joyce and Dick as to what if less than \$10 million is appropriated and does this mean that all of that funding will go to the EMP project. Ken answered that the Corps would have to decide on the split for the projects, but that the \$10.4 million does not come right off the top for EMP. We can work in good faith. There is a Comparative Clause and we would have to demonstrate comparative progress to Congress. A comment was made that maybe the Corps should state a "floor" of what should be spent for projects funded through NESP. Joyce made a comment that the Long Term Resource Monitoring (LTRM) program should be looked at to see that it fits the NESP needs. This was agreed up and the Corps has a commitment to do that. Further discussion of this topic was tabled in order to continue with the day's agenda. Ken continued his presentation and spoke of the geomorphic and floodplain reaches. The Corps thought that we would look at the physical

aspects of the study area and we are now focused on four reaches which include: 1) the quad cities north to St. Paul where there are not many levees; 2) the quad cities south to Melvin Price Locks and Dam because these are lake-like environments and have levees; 3) the open river from Melvin Price Locks and Dam to the confluence of the Ohio River; and 4) the Illinois River that is included in the NESP area. We have identified twelve geomorphic reaches and looked at major physical drivers like major tributaries. These geomorphic reaches are about 100 miles long and sometimes have three pools or less. Ken showed a slide of the First Increment Plan for the Illinois River ecosystem measures which has about 47 projects. This reach has a different focus. One project that is different is that the Mississippi River will have fish passage while the Illinois River does not. A question was asked about the water level management backwater and Ken thought that it was rolled into the backwater restoration because of the focus on backwater and side channels. The Feasibility Study was completed in 2004 with the Chief's Report and Congress gave us design money. Ken showed a slide of projects that have been started including Emiquon East, Emiquon West, Middle Peoria backwaters, Twin Island protection, water level fluctuations, LaGrange lock, and mooring cells. Ken reminded us that this is a unique opportunity to operate the system with navigation and the ecosystem. The Corps Districts have been trying to accomplish working with both navigation and ecosystem with the stewardship responsibilities for years but it has been difficult crossing that line.

3. Next, Chuck Spitzack presented information on the formation of the River Advisory Panel which is called out for in the authorization of the navigation sustainability program. His presentation can be found at the end of these minutes. NESP calls for a river advisory panel for ecosystem restoration portion of the program. It has two purposes, the first being the consultation guidance on implementation report due every four years, the first of which is due June 2009; and the second is guidance for the prioritization and sequencing of projects and the process. Chuck showed a diagram of the arrangements for advice, guidance, partnership, collaboration and coordination of this River Advisory Panel (RAP). He spoke about the Mississippi River Commission (MRC) and who is on the commission. On the right on the diagram is the River Resources Teams and the work groups associated with them. Their roles are being better defined for the implementation. In the middle of the diagram are the system level groups one of them being the NECC-ECC. On the left of the diagram, during the Feasibility Study, these groups were set up to assist and be aware of the progress of the Feasibility Study and we hope to continue these National and Regional groups during the implementation. Chuck brought copies of this and explanations of these groups. He then showed a diagram of what the proposed arrangement is. He also talked about institutional arrangements in the study and they had workshops in 2005. There was no work in the Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007 on Institutional Arrangements (IA). In 2008 we had focus groups because of a renewed interest. The next step will be a preliminary draft document that will go out to a broader section of groups. Major conclusions of the focus were that the IA is functioning well; we need a new structure to meet legislative requirements; NGOs need to be fully engaged; we need exemption from the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The focus group recommended that the RAP should be established; the RAP should serve as Advisory Panel mandated in the authorization; the RAP membership should be consistent with WRDA 2007; the RAP scope should not be expanded at this time; and no changes are recommended to the operations of the EMP-CC. Chuck then showed a slide with the Purpose Statement, "...to provide the partnership, consultation, and guidance necessary to successfully implement the

ecosystem restoration component of NESP.” The scope of consultation and guidance of the RAP is to provide implementation reports to congress; to have an adaptive management approach to implementation; to address cumulative impacts and improve ecological integrity; to have system mitigation for environmental and cultural resource impacts; the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act activities; integration and coordination with other restoration-related river programs; coordination with RAP working groups; and outreach with the public, stakeholders, and decision-makers. Chuck then showed a slide of the membership of the RAP. The question was asked as to how we see the representation of the RAP. Chuck answered that he thinks it needs discussion. Ken Barr and Janet Sternberg added examples of certain groups that could part of the representation. In regard to Implementation Guidance, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA(CW)) will give us guidance on communicating things such as recommendations on establishment, roles, and responsibilities. Rich Worthington, from the Corps’ Headquarters (HQUSACE) is a team member and has issued a draft guidance which is close to approval. The Corps is to give recommendations for this guidance. The focus group gave their perspective on the RAP membership which can be found on the presentation slide and with the representative characteristics. A membership issue would be that the Coast Guard, National Park Service, and Forest Service would not directly be represented. Another membership issue is how will individual members be selected and which NGOs will be asked to participate on the RAP. Chuck showed a slide of a timeline. In June the product will go out for review; July/August comments will be received; September/October will be a decision; October/November the decision will be shared with partners; November/December will be the last meeting and requests will go out; February will be the first RAP meeting. Joyce asked if the draft will be sent out by the NECC-ECC distribution list. Chuck answered yes and a few others, also. The next steps are that the focus groups are to be ad hoc; the focus groups are to develop draft recommendations on the RAP and other topics; the partners and the Corps are to develop a proposal concerning the RAP for ASA consideration and then is the transition to the RAP. The River Teams are the RRF, RRCT, RRAT and Work Groups. Chuck showed a slide of the expectations of the teams and work groups. Joyce asked about how the assignments are to be given and how will the process develop. Chuck answered that recommendations will be given and then we’ll get feedback.

4. Janet Sternberg then spoke in regard to the Institutional Arrangements for NESP and handed out a Draft for Discussion at the meeting. She and Gretchen Benjamin participated in the RRF for her state and also the RRCT for MVR and they drafted something about how the river teams could help implement the NESP programs. The teams have been going along pretty good and they don’t see much reason for change. She is not proposing that every group look alike but to please give her comments in the next month; she had 2 slides that showed what the expectations are of the teams and groups. It would be great and if these teams could meet every once in a while and share information and learn from each other. We should look for opportunities for these teams to get together. A question was asked by Joyce if Janet envisions that the participation of the RRAT or RRCT would filter down to district teams and that NGOs are invited to attend but their participation is limited. Chuck stated that they “may” participate for purposes of NESP management, that this can be an open discussion, and that there is already a good NGO participation. Janet asked about the Illinois River team and if there is much communication between the representatives and others. Marc stated that they do include a few more people to make sure that there is communication and we need to bring in IDNR, Water

Resources. We need opportunities for cross-pollination. A question was that that we are looking at a draft and we see a lot of communication but where are the decisions being made, at the RRAT level? Chuck answered that with the system and reach planning we will have a geotechnical core from the Corps that aligns the reaches and they will formulate a plan to identify reach objectives. That team also includes the Illinois River work group. The river team actually will come to an agreement and understanding for that reach. The panel will give guidance and the process used and we will have a planning handbook for specific projects. The RAP will understand and stamp their acceptance of the product. The RAP will rely on the river teams for a quality document. The Reach 4 projects will be a consolidated list from a higher level. There is a lot of advice given but the Corps will end up making the decisions. Joyce added that it is a coordinating body and each agency makes decisions for themselves but we try to understand how actions affect others. Recommendations are made and the Corps makes the decisions. Joyce added that we need to move on so if you have more questions, talk about them at lunch break.



5. Next, Brad Thompson of the Rock Island District spoke about the Illinois River Basin. There was a draft plan completed in the year 2000 and was given to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (ASA) in May and it was just approved. It next goes to Congress and is officially to them now. This was in WRDA 2000 and includes long term monitoring and ecosystem restoration; a computerized inventory and analysis system; a program for sediment removal and use. Two awards were given to this plan which highlighted the collaboration. The program's future is that funding will be \$7.4 billion through the year 2055 for all agencies. The Tier 1 amount is \$131.2 million and has sixteen projects. Brad showed a slide of the groups that worked together. The Illinois River work group has several efforts: the Illinois River Coordinating Council; the Illinois River Basin Restoration Comprehensive Plan, and the Navigation Study/NESP. The RRCT and RRAT have moved along through the years. The NESP Institutional Arrangements began with a state letter from the Governor. Discussions were facilitated by Congressman LaHood in 2005 and 2006 and there are ongoing informal discussions with RRCT and RRAT. The right people were there for the discussions and we are glad to have both groups together today at this meeting. Brad showed an organization chart for their comprehensive plan and there had been cost sharing with the agencies involved. The working level folks were the engineers and biologists. It is such a big water shed they set up regional teams. Brad then showed a potential revised organizational structure including the Illinois working group which is the existing Illinois River Basin Restoration system team). The RRAT has the lower 89 miles in the

St. Louis District. FWIC is a more biological focus. A question was asked by Dick Steinbach if Brad was suggesting that the body of the structure just become a new label. Brad answered that it is somewhat representative but could have a different label. Dick made a comment that the Illinois River is target-rich for environmental work and it warrants a focus group but as we move forward, there are technical teams, programmatic teams, and a political focus which we are trying to keep out of the technical focus. Joyce agreed and Ken said that in the NESP program Illinois has about 60% of the area. Brad commented thought he that we could find a "home" for both political and technical. Chuck Spitzack commented that we need to come up with a recommendation that is acceptable to both. Even though you may be a technical person, you have to engage with river teams. Chuck Theiling talked about other issues that came into play. Chuck Spitzack and he discussed these and Joyce added that the RRAT Tech will come up with recommendations and then will give them to the RRAT Exec and then they make recommendations that will go up the chain. Marc Miller stated we are all making valid points but he will later talk about how he sees things. What they would like to do is take an advisory committee composed of many of the same people, and then expand the group and add more federal partners in order to provide input on technical information. We would meet as needed and would be flexible on bringing in expertise to the group. One step above that is to move it up to an Illinois working group and have a strong community stakeholder. Most of the discussions would be at this level. The question was asked as to how does he see the Coordinating Council working with the RRCT. Marc answered that it would happen at the working group level. Ken asked about the other 2/3 of the projects that are not in Illinois. Marc said that we do not have a Coordinating Council for Missouri yet but we can revisit this and maybe get a group together. Joyce commented that her agency (USFWS) does not have the staff and they are trying to work within existing groups and streamline. She is hearing that maybe there would be a separate entity outside of the RRAT and Coordinating Council that would then make the recommendations to give to the RRAT Exec which would probably mean more meetings that they are not capable of attending. Dick asked if there is a FACA on this. Chuck Spitzack answered that we would have to look into this. Mike Griffin commented that he sits on several of these team meetings and he is concerned about the thought that Illinois is trying to get more influence and more of the money. Joyce commented that river groups are dealing with more than just NESP and also have channel maintenance so whatever decision is made it has influence on other things. Debbie Bruce commented that the Illinois River Group is based on law and they are the governing body and that they work with these groups for planning. Their intent is not to have triple votes but assurance that the best projects are selected and we take advantage of getting cost sharing and be conscious of coordinating with partners with agriculture and NGOs. For the short term we still plan to have technical people at committee levels as they relate to particular reaches. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources and Water Resources integrated in 1995 and sometimes they still feel like they don't communicate. Marc added that we have a lot of efforts that are not rising up to levels of discussions and he gave an example of dredging at East Peoria. We want to make sure all efforts on river have local stakeholders involved. It's not just state agencies and we need to work on how best to do this. Joyce added that this should be easy to address. Getting the right people involved would mean RRAT and RRCT.



6. The meeting was stopped for lunch at noon and we reconvened at 1:30 p.m. Next, was to be a perspective given by Marc Miller, a representative of the state of Illinois. Marc wanted to know that the states thinks it makes good sense to continue along the lines of which have been presented and that we should look at specific needs of reaches. The Illinois effort would plug into the RRAT group and they would be able to prioritize things at that reach. Their rationale for their involvement should be clear. They don't expect others to be looking at this reach at the same level of their expertise and interest. The state of Illinois will be able to help. The Corps has any final decision but the state of Illinois will help and advise. This makes sense in terms of biology. Joyce asked the question that in terms of infrastructure, IDNR has members on the RRAT and the technical team does the prioritization so she wanted to know if the state is saying that all that effort will be pulled out and we will go through a separate pipeline. Debbie Bruce of IDNR says, yes, that's the way they see it working. The Illinois working group would work with RRAT. As a clarification, Joyce asked if the Illinois group would go though the Governor's office. Debbie answered, yes. Janet Sternberg asked if they are not seeing things get through for Illinois or if there is a problem with anything that has happened. Debbie answered, no, they just feel that the people that have worked on that river will be able to follow the plan to the satisfaction of the EMP process and it's because of all the science and study that has happened in the area. Janet then added that she could see that what's being done for the 519 Process would happen that way. Debbie answered, yes. Janet they asked for a clarification that there will now be two people on the RRAT, one for the Illinois River and one for the Mississippi River. Debbie answered, no, that the RRAT would have only one person. In addition, they see each reach

having its own science and its own plan and they would be working on that level. Janet stated that the EMP program will be going on for a while and then asked will the state of Illinois help pull that program together along with NESP. NESP and EMP have worked well as a partnership. Janet also commented that for the 519 program she can understand why the state of Illinois would be so involved and that it is a support to NESP. Debbie stated that they see things in the Illinois River that would be above and beyond those programs. Janet and Joyce both commented that there are goals and objectives and that some fit into NESP nicely and some fit into 519.



Debbie asked how the RRAT is doing it now. Joyce answered that the RRAT already has representation from Illinois. Debbie then asked how are the groups setting goals and objectives for those 4 reaches and she thinks we are all saying the same thing. Chuck Spitzack stated that the RRAT and RRCT are aligned with Corps of Engineers district boundaries but for NESP we don't have those kinds of boundaries. Once we get the plan done, we will go to the operative structure and work with the district and then work on those projects. A question was asked as to how these two proposals are different or are they the same. Joyce answered that at St. Louis District we have the RRAT which includes people from the Middle Mississippi and they do ranking and prioritization which then feeds up to RRAT Exec. Then this is sent up to the Corps for decision. Joyce further stated that she believes the hearing is that there would be a separate group for the Illinois River only. Dick Steinbach stated that there would be planning only by reach but then the prioritization would have to go to separate districts. The prioritization decision will happen at the districts. Chuck Spitzack answered that it gets into different programs and staffing of each district and that setting priorities would probably cross boundaries. Marc Miller then asked if there is a concern that the state of Illinois would be circumventing the Corps, because he thinks we can work around that. Chuck added that activities can be dealt with differently. Ken Barr asked how will the new Illinois team work with channel integration needs. Chuck Theiling answered that we want to capture administrative details of the project and we want regional teams to work but it all needs to combine into a central database. We are trying to work with a program that goes across four reaches. Marc said that they want the Corps at the budgeting process and maybe Brad is already attending those and sometimes maybe the district commanders are, too. Marc clarified that the state of Illinois won't be going off alone without the Corps and that we have had great participation with the Corps. While discussions were

ongoing, Brad was developing new organization diagrams on a slide showing three options. Doug Blodgett asked the question of how would their vote be a bad thing where they have more knowledge about the Illinois River and that he thinks it makes more sense and why should people who know more about the Mississippi River prioritize projects on the Illinois River. Joyce and Chuck stated there is a difference administratively because there could be more meetings for staff and that it is now pretty efficient and the RRAT is dealing with both rivers at the same time. Janet commented that she is settled with NESP and EMP and that the state of Missouri had folks that favored projects in the open river and others with favorites in the side channels so we had to come together with a unified outlook. With NESP, it becomes harder to prioritize projects for the state because we also had projects in the RRCT which are just in the pools and you have to decide where you want the NESP dollars to go. Debbie answered that the state of Illinois is in the same process and that they are inundated with requests from five districts and ninety projects and that they are struggling with this, too. The Office of Water Resources and IDNR were separate and now they report to the same deputy. Janet asked if they are looking at things with a biological perspective or at administrative dollars. Debbie answered that they look at many issues and not just technical (e.g. public support, public health and safety). They will have a unified direction when attending meetings. Dick commented that the Corps has the Illinois River identified as a separate reach so the next ten years of work will match nicely so the group has to see that all the work matches up with the goals and objectives and this is the same with the Middle Mississippi. The partnership plan will have to be married into the NESP Middle Mississippi plan. The 10% missing in the danger zone is how does it all feed back because the perception could be leapfrogging and this has the potential for being confrontational. The Illinois River is going to be its own plan. But again, this is all advisory and it's really the Corps that makes the decisions. Chuck Theiling said that there are four or five things that bother all of us because of the "paradigm shift". First, the appointment of the technical group would be from the governor's group and so far we have all been able to appoint our own representatives. Second, the role of the RRCT and RRAT are going to change and it's an adjustment we will have to make. To the Iowa group that Chuck talked about earlier, this would represent a change to the role of the RAP and the level of detail will be slightly different. Third, the role of the Science Panel, which functions and supports NESP, may also change. Fourth is the notion of goals and objectives and how do we integrate them. Fifth is the possibility of one state pitting against another. These are possible issues and we should resolve them before going forward. A comment was made that we need a clarification of the reaches, the RRAT, and the RRCT. Ken stated that we have a Regional support team and also that the RRAT and RRCT will have a joint meeting once a year in Peoria. A comment was made by Terry Kohlbus that his commission feels that they have had to compete with the states and that they have more congressional support. Mike Griffin stated that this is exactly why he is concerned because one state says they have more congressional pull. Marc stated that he sits on different regional perspectives and that the state of Illinois is competing on a national scale with different efforts and we should try to get as much excitement as we can for the Upper Mississippi. We need to get the majority of the senate excited about this and that Illinois has a lot to offer and they will try to get a lot of the constituents on board. His office is trying to get more momentum built for the Upper Mississippi. Chuck Spitzack stated that UMRBA would have to go before them and show the plans and we need their support and we recognize that we have to go through those channels. As far as the plan it will be the experts and supporters. The RRAT and the RRCT will be a check on

the process and will legitimize the process and not prioritize. Kathy Kowall asked if the Illinois participants on the RRCT and RRAT would they be putting more emphasis on the Illinois River. Marc answered, yes. Brian Johnson interjected that it doesn't have to be that way and like Janet says, from a Missouri perspective, it is difficult for a state to get on the same page. Debbie stated that is what they are working towards. Chuck Theiling stated that there are different paradigms that work better and more efficiently. This may be part of the question of how we coordinate for the whole river. Debbie asked the question if EMP is a separate program. Marvin Hubbel stated that EMP is separately funded and authorized but that there is a huge overlap between the two groups and the groups will probably have combined meetings. Mike Jawson mentioned the "no new starts" constraint. Mike Griffin commented that RRCT has a project in Illinois and is an EMP project and stated that he will research the areas and plan the project because IDNR could not take the project. Mike Cox stated that no matter what we do, it will be a paradigm shift and it will be difficult for all of us to deal with but we as a system need to increase visibility on both the ecological and navigation sides. On both rivers there is a lot of expertise and we could miss a sharing of information. There appears to be some discussion on the reorganization and there will be some overlap and some people going to multiple meetings and he thinks that for the initial phase of the shift, it might be better for all organizations to start with a lower level working group like a task group instead of something like the RRCT or RRAT level. Maybe we will do shifts at smaller levels. Terry Kohlbus stated that the paradigm shift is from a WRDA authorization to a WRDA appropriation. Marvin Hubbel agrees but its not just that there are a lot of things like coordination, the question is how do the Illinois River needs integrate themselves to the Mississippi River needs. Debbie then asked why would you not have a joint meeting with all three groups and how do these groups communicate, and we need to take advantage of the knowledge base and do the planning and keep the integrity. It is stated by several that this is the first joint meeting of RRCT and RRAT. Chuck Theiling said that sometimes the separate meetings discuss the same thing so Option 3 of a organization chart on Brad's slide works pretty well for that. Doug Blodgett commented that they all learn from each other and there is some joint participation so why shouldn't the state of Illinois have their own group. Debbie stated that the state doesn't have the resources to have separate participants so we would probably have the same person attending. Marc said that when it comes to making the appointments of who will be attending, we will try to be fair and will ask who wants to be involved. Chris Urban said that she would like to talk about the appointment. Marc stated that his concern is that the right agency would attend. Joyce made the concern that the situation could be made more complicated by them. Chris asked the questions of why the selection would be made by the governor's office and what is the benefit. Debbie stated that historically it is up to the agency to make that choice and sometimes there are more people attending that one. Marc wanted all to know that the appointment choice will probably be made from suggestions given to the Lieutenant Governor's office and will not be a political selection and that they have been successful in this so far. Debbie stated the names mentioned are scientific experts and there is a conscious effort to keep that expertise on the river. The state wants an opportunity for the private stakeholders to get involved and they want more leverage for the funds. Mike Griffin said that we are all doing the same types of things that the state is proposing. Marc commented that they realize that all of you are dedicated to the river in terms of working through the processes in your states, it just that we have for ten years worked on a watershed group and we feel this is how you can move forward. This is a watershed opportunity we are trying to champion. Marvin asked if this is something you can write up so that all agencies can fully

understand. Joyce made the suggestion that if Illinois could draw a diagram and address each paradigm shift this would be very helpful. We will not have a complete consensus at the end of the day but it will move us forward. Joyce asked the question if they see the Illinois River Water Group deciding that the watershed projects will be dealt with differently while some are brought up to the RRAT and what about navigation projects like dredging, how does the state see these. Marc answered that dredging activities will probably be dealt with at the district level and this would probably be OK except for placement of materials. We are looking at 519 and main stem as being the same. Debbie stated that they are looking at erosion and sedimentation and effects from our tributaries. It took a long time for people to look at ecosystem issues and we don't want to give that up. Joyce agreed with that statement. Ken commented that we are trying to get our channel maintenance issues to work with the ecosystem issues. Doug said that there is a focus on a lot of things but finding resources is an issue and the tributary work is a critical program and is using Section 519 dollars. Joyce said that he should address your proposal and concerns and get this out to all for further discussion. There was no opposition to what Joyce suggested. Joyce said that the RRAT Exec will get together and talk about it and will get recommendation to the Corps. The RRAT and the Corps has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Mike Griffin said that the RRCT and the Corps have a charter and we need to review if any changes would need to be made. Joyce said that we will send a copy of both to everyone. Brian reminded all that if no e-mail has been seen then give us your e-mail address to assure you get the information.

7. Joyce asked if there were other topics needing discussion since this was the first joint RRCT/RRAT meeting. There were no additions brought up for discussion.
8. Debbie Bruce of IDNR and Marc Miller of the State of Illinois thanked all and expressed that they greatly appreciated being invited to the meeting. They will draft a letter.
9. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

JANET C. ULIVI, P.E.
Civil Engineer, Engineering and
Construction Division