

1 U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
2 PUBLIC MEETING  
3 GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER  
4 INTERBASIN STUDY  
5 FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 2014  
6 7400 LEAKE AVENUE  
7 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, 70118  
8  
9  
10 MODERATOR: LAUREN FLEER, U.S. Army Corps of  
11 Engineers, Chicago District  
12  
13 PANELISTS: JOHN GOSS, White House Counsel on  
14 Environmental Quality  
15 COLONEL FREDERIC DRUMMOND, U.S. Army  
16 Corps of Engineers, Commander of the  
17 Chicago District  
18 DAVID WETHINGTON, Project Manager  
19  
20 REPORTED BY:  
21 SANDRA P. DIFEBBO,  
22 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER  
23  
24

1 MS. FLEER:

2 I would like to welcome everyone to the  
3 Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin  
4 Study public meeting. Thanks everyone for  
5 joining us this afternoon. Thank you to those  
6 of you who have joined us via webinar. Today's  
7 meeting is about the Great Lakes and Mississippi  
8 River Interbasin, also known a GLMRIS, Study.  
9 My name is Lauren Fleer. I'm with the U.S. Army  
10 Corps of Engineers, Chicago District. I'm going  
11 to be this afternoon's moderator.

12 When you arrived earlier today, you  
13 were likely offered a few sheets of material.  
14 The first was an agenda on a green sheet of  
15 paper which talks about our schedule that we  
16 have planned for this afternoon. Secondly,  
17 there are some frequently asked questions about  
18 the GLMRIS report and other ANS efforts, on a  
19 blue sheet of paper, and then, thirdly, there is  
20 a comment registration form. If you did not  
21 have the opportunity to register to speak online  
22 for today's meeting and would like to submit a  
23 comment or make a comment orally, we do  
24 encourage you to fill out a yellow form. That  
25 way we can incorporate it into the formal

1 comment series that will be ongoing on the  
2 GLMRIS study until March 31st of this year.

3           Lastly, you were also offered a copy of  
4 the summary booklet of the GLMRIS report. This  
5 is basically an abbreviated version of the full  
6 GLMRIS report that was released on January 6th  
7 of this year.

8           Now, I'd like to introduce you to this  
9 afternoon's panel. On your far right is  
10 Mr. John Goss, White House Counsel on  
11 Environmental Quality. We also have Colonel  
12 Frederic Drummond, Commander of the Chicago  
13 District, Army Corps of Engineers, and then Dave  
14 Wethington, who is the project manager for the  
15 GLMRIS study.

16           The Corps of Engineers has organized  
17 several, almost a dozen, public meetings just  
18 like this one across the Great Lakes and  
19 Mississippi River Basin to accomplish two  
20 things. First is to present the contents of the  
21 GLMRIS report to all of our stakeholders, but,  
22 secondly, and more importantly, is to receive  
23 your comments and answer some of your questions  
24 about the material included in the report. As I  
25 mentioned, we'll have a formal comment period

1 until March 31st of this year. You can enter a  
2 comment to be included in the formal record  
3 either by speaking at a meeting, like this one  
4 held today, online at our website, there is a  
5 comment form, or via USPS. There is an address  
6 on the back of the sheet if you do prefer to  
7 submit, you go home, and you decide that you  
8 have something to say, and you want to submit a  
9 comment later. They all count the same. We  
10 encourage you to participate in any way that you  
11 want to.

12           Without further adieu, I will hand the  
13 mic over to Mr. John Goss.

14       MR. GOSS:

15           Thank you all for joining us today.  
16 This is a real milestone in the discussion of a  
17 unique project to creating an invasive species  
18 barrier between the Great Lakes and all of our  
19 rivers in the central part of the U.S. I think  
20 as you're aware, the Mississippi Basin has been  
21 the recipient of a number of unwanted guests  
22 over the years, zebra mussels and others that  
23 were originally brought from around the globe  
24 into the Great Lakes, and then they most likely  
25 passed through Chicago, through the Chicago

1 Waterway System and into our rivers. Presently,  
2 you're living with a fish that everyone in the  
3 Great Lakes absolutely does not want to make  
4 their way to Lake Erie or any of the other  
5 fishing communities up there. So we are in a  
6 unique situation where we have the political  
7 will, the media attention, and the science  
8 people all working on coming up with a barrier  
9 project. So we really do need some feedback now  
10 on this report.

11 I think you'll see that we have  
12 advanced this discussion from kind of a war by  
13 press release and lawsuits and so forth about  
14 what should happen in the Chicago Waterway to a  
15 very high level of science, engineering,  
16 accurate cost projections. We can have a much  
17 more serious discussion about the choices here  
18 tonight. So I want to thank the whole GLMRIS  
19 team, Colonel Drummond. Everyone that's been  
20 involved has really done their job to present  
21 the options. We need your help in analyzing  
22 those and from the federal agencies that I work  
23 with, primarily, we absolutely don't want to try  
24 to make this decision in Washington. It needs  
25 to come from the region, including the entire

1 Mississippi Basin that's affected. So we  
2 genuinely need your help on evaluating the  
3 choices, and then we'll try to come to some  
4 consensus on one or two of these and move  
5 forward.

6           We have an ongoing effort in the  
7 Chicago Waterway to keep Asian carp out. Don't  
8 think we have a slide. It's called the Asian  
9 Carp Regional Coordinating Committee, and those  
10 efforts are going to continue. We recently got  
11 confirmation in the 2014 budget that we can  
12 continue with those control efforts of building  
13 a new electric barrier that's going to be  
14 completed in the next couple of years. Colonel  
15 Drummond's team has done a great job on that. I  
16 think we have a lot of confidence that the  
17 electric barrier is still an effective control  
18 mechanism at this time.

19           For those of you in the transportation  
20 industry, I think in the next year we're going  
21 to have some discussions about fish being pulled  
22 into the barrier, possibly, and we're going to  
23 have to work with the industry on that challenge  
24 but certainly look forward to including any of  
25 your thoughts on that over the course of the

1 next few months. I want to turn it over to  
2 Colonel Drummond to get his report, but thank  
3 you for your participation and your  
4 contributions. I'm very optimistic that we're  
5 going to move this forward. Thanks.

6 COLONEL DRUMMOND:

7 Well, it's certainly my pleasure to be  
8 here on what I would consider a very sunshiny  
9 day in New Orleans, given that we came from  
10 Chicago. As you can imagine, there is about a  
11 40-degree difference. When we got off the plane  
12 today, everybody was staring at us because we  
13 had our 650 goose down jackets on.

14 It is my pleasure to be here. First of  
15 all, I'd like to thank the representatives from  
16 Senator Vitter's office here in attendance  
17 tonight as well as Toby Barrett from the Ontario  
18 Parliament, sir. Thank you for taking time out  
19 of your meeting to come here and listen to us  
20 today, as well as Colonel Richard Hanson. The  
21 commander of the New Orleans District is here  
22 with us tonight. Rich, thank you for allowing  
23 us to use your building. It doesn't take my  
24 team, as well as me, very long, and I've been  
25 down here on a couple of occasions, to see the

1 nation's resolve when there is an issue to  
2 tackle. New Orleans and everything that's  
3 happened here over the last eight to ten years  
4 is a good -- gives you a good snapshot of the  
5 magnitude of potentially what will be undertaken  
6 with the eight different options that we have  
7 over here to the right.

8           So GLMRIS, I think you know the  
9 acronym, is a very complex study that examines  
10 and prevents aquatic transfer, interbasin  
11 transfer, between the Great Lakes and the  
12 Mississippi River Basin. Our report outlines  
13 potential prevention methods and presents  
14 evaluation criteria to help readers distinguish  
15 among the alternatives. I'd like to tell folks  
16 the purpose of our report is to paint a very  
17 objective picture of several alternatives and  
18 offer decision makers, stakeholders, and the  
19 public, like yourself, the range and information  
20 about the options.

21           This report does not make a  
22 recommendation nor does it put any priority into  
23 the plans. This report is also unique from many  
24 other Corps of Engineers' reports in that it  
25 identifies a range of options, and is adaptable

1 for incorporation of future technologies as they  
2 come online through the ACRCC or other  
3 stakeholders. Apart from the GLMRIS study, the  
4 Corps of Engineers is intimately involved in the  
5 Asian Carp Regional Coordinating Committee. I  
6 often tell folks in a public forum it is  
7 probably the flattest organization. There is  
8 well over 18 agencies involved in this.  
9 Probably the flattest I've seen in 32 years of  
10 service. IPM has got a direct line straight to  
11 the ASA, Miss Darcy and her folks. John Goss  
12 has got his direct line to the CEQ, so it  
13 doesn't get much better than that for a district  
14 commander to see things happen relatively  
15 quickly.

16           The prevention of the spread of aquatic  
17 nuisance species -- today you're going to hear  
18 primarily about 13 of them, ten coming down from  
19 the Great Lakes and three coming up from the  
20 Mississippi River. That's what we call a shared  
21 responsibility among federal, state, and local  
22 agencies, as well as you, the public. The Corps  
23 remains dedicated in working alongside our  
24 partners and moving forward as our authority  
25 allows on this particular topic. Some quick

1 numbers. Since it began on the 6th of January,  
2 we visited -- we had a briefing in D.C. Fifty-  
3 three representatives and various staffs were at  
4 that meeting. This information has been pushed  
5 out to a little over 7,000 media outlets. It's  
6 growing every day. You're going to hear some  
7 terms. Eight potential alternatives. You  
8 should have in your hand a book when you came  
9 in, 25 pages long. It's a very good snapshot.  
10 It is what I call a primer. It gets you going.  
11 You are going to read this, and you're going to  
12 say, okay, I need more. Online, we have a 232-  
13 page report.

14           And then if that's not enough, we have  
15 the Tom Clancy version of the 10,000 pages worth  
16 of appendices. Everything from aquatic nuisance  
17 species, why they're medium and high risk, all  
18 the way to the economic data that will help you  
19 out. I would be remiss if I didn't mention  
20 that, you know, it's not just the Chicago Corps  
21 of Engineers. Of course the PM and many of the  
22 members are from Chicago, but we have well over  
23 100 different members from 19 different  
24 districts across the Corps that have had their  
25 fingers in one way or another into this report.

1 Dave will talk a little bit about -- our  
2 language has changed over the last couple of  
3 years, and he'll highlight what authorization  
4 that we're working under.

5           What you're going to see tonight is  
6 approximately about 18 slides. Dave will go  
7 through it. My hope is that we just give you  
8 more information, and then certainly what I'm  
9 encouraging you to do tonight is listen. This  
10 is the night of the various meetings that we've  
11 been doing here in the last three weeks. We  
12 have listened, and as you'll hear, there is also  
13 an option. If you don't want to get up tonight,  
14 there is plenty of forms for you and/or the  
15 members of your organization to come online and  
16 put your thoughts about what you think about  
17 this very -- what I say is a very, very complex  
18 topic.

19           So with that said, I'm going to turn it  
20 over to Dave Wethington, and we'll go through  
21 the brief, and I look forward to your questions.

22           MR. WETHINGTON:

23           Good evening, everyone. My name is  
24 Dave Wethington. I'm the Project Manager with  
25 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Chicago.

1 Thank you all for taking the opportunity to come  
2 out tonight. A little bit about myself. I am  
3 an engineer by training, chemical engineer,  
4 undergrad, master degree in environmental  
5 engineering. Over the past four years, four and  
6 a half years, I've had the privilege and honor  
7 of working with these great engineers,  
8 scientists, planners, biologists. I've learned  
9 a whole lot about biology, about aquatic  
10 nuisance species, and I am hoping I can share a  
11 little bit of that knowledge with you today.

12                   The Great Lakes and Mississippi  
13 River Interbasin Study, as we call it, or  
14 GLMRIS, was authorized in the Water Resources  
15 Act of 2007. What this language told us to do  
16 is evaluate a range of options or technologies  
17 that are available to prevent the transfer  
18 between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River  
19 basins through aquatic pathways. On the map you  
20 see in front of you, that's kind of ground zero  
21 for our study, is that brown kind of squiggly  
22 line that extends from the upper part of  
23 Minnesota all the way through Pennsylvania and  
24 New York. That is the interbasin boundary, the  
25 watershed divide between these two very vast

1 basins. Before I get to speaking about the  
2 Chicago Area Waterway System, which is the focus  
3 of all these activities, I want to spend a  
4 moment talking about other potential pathways  
5 that may exist between these two basins.

6           You see that divide. It's about  
7 nearly 1,500 miles. The Corps of Engineers  
8 actually worked with other state agencies to  
9 identify potential pathways that may form  
10 between those basins. Now, the Chicago Area  
11 Waterway System represents the continuous,  
12 highly-utilized, and the primary method for  
13 species to potentially transfer through an  
14 aquatic pathway, but there are 18 other sites  
15 that were identified that are significantly  
16 lower risk than the Chicago Waterway System.

17           The reason for that is that the  
18 majority of them are what we call episodic  
19 pathways, which means that they form during  
20 significant precipitation events, significant  
21 rainfall events, where you have the headwaters  
22 of a couple of streams flow together and form a  
23 temporary aquatic conflict or a temporary  
24 aquatic connection that may allow species to  
25 transfer between the basins. There are several

1 of those 18 sites that are what we call  
2 perennial or what exists at all points during  
3 the year, however, sometimes they are frozen,  
4 and oftentimes they are much more on the order  
5 of a farmer's ditch as opposed to a complex,  
6 multi-purpose, multi-use waterway like you see  
7 in the Chicago Area Waterway System. So the  
8 potential solution, the solution set, for these  
9 other 18 aquatic pathways are, in fact, likely a  
10 lot simpler than what we're going to be  
11 discussing today within the Chicago Area  
12 Waterway System.

13           The goals of GLMRIS were twofold.  
14 Number one, look at potential ways to try and  
15 prevent the transfer of aquatic nuisance  
16 species. When you implement these controls or  
17 these technologies, what kind of impacts will  
18 you have on the existing uses and users of the  
19 Chicago Area Waterway System. If they're, in  
20 fact, adverse impacts, how do you appropriately  
21 mitigate or offset those adverse impacts?

22           Stakeholder engagements, as Colonel  
23 Drummond mentioned, has been a very important  
24 piece of GLMRIS since its inception. We formed  
25 an executive steering committee that had members

1 of state, federal, local governmental and  
2 regulatory agencies to help provide input  
3 throughout the study process. We had a number  
4 of different public engagement opportunities  
5 where we took input from members of the public,  
6 just as yourselves.

7           In July 2012, we received an  
8 intervening legislation that kind of reshaped  
9 kind of the direction of our study. This  
10 legislation asked us to do three things. First,  
11 it asked us to complete the study in 18 months.  
12 We received this legislation on July 6th of  
13 2012. Eighteen months later, on January 6th,  
14 2014, we turned in a completed report. It also  
15 asked us to focus on the Chicago Area Waterway  
16 System. I mentioned those other 18 aquatic  
17 pathways.

18           There is an appendix in the GLMRIS  
19 report that kind of summarizes the most recent  
20 happenings and the most current details about  
21 each of those sites and refers the reader to the  
22 vast resources that are available on our  
23 website, which, again, is the top link on the  
24 back of this book, which has detailed pathway  
25 characterization reports for each of those 18

1 sites. It talks about what species may  
2 transfer, how often those potential pathways may  
3 exist, but none of them are as significant as an  
4 aquatic pathway, a significant risk of an  
5 aquatic pathway, as you find in the Chicago Area  
6 Waterway System.

7           Finally, the legislation we received  
8 asked us to look at hydrologic separation among  
9 the other alternatives we are examining within  
10 the GLMRIS report. Chicago Area Waterway  
11 System, as you can see, there is also a similar  
12 map within your book. It is a very complex and  
13 multi-use waterway system. Some of the main  
14 uses are listed on this slide. They include  
15 navigation, things like commercial cargo  
16 navigation, noncargo navigation, like emergency  
17 vessels, and other boats as well as pleasure  
18 craft. It's also a significant tool for water  
19 conveyance within the Chicago Area Waterway  
20 System.

21           Something that I didn't know that I  
22 learned over the past several years is that on  
23 average, about 65 to 85 percent of the total  
24 volume of the Chicago Area Waterway System, the  
25 Chicago River, is treated municipal wastewater.

1 That represents a very important use of water  
2 conveyance within the Chicago area.  
3 Finally, flood risk management is a critically  
4 important use of this complex system. During  
5 significant precipitation events, Chicago has  
6 the ability to backflow or change and actually  
7 have two directions of flow within this system.

8           Ordinarily, water flows from Lake  
9 Michigan into any one of those five points you  
10 see up on the slide, downstream and exits the  
11 Chicago Area Waterway System through those  
12 series of points, 7 through 10. Those end up  
13 emptying into the Illinois River and into the  
14 Mississippi River, obviously, making its way  
15 down here. The Chicago Area Waterway System, as  
16 I mentioned, is a very complex system. It  
17 really does represent that primary aquatic  
18 connection between the two basins, which is the  
19 focus of our efforts in GLMRIS.

20           The report itself represents a range  
21 of alternatives very similar to what the  
22 authority asked us to do. They present a range  
23 of alternatives as a conceptual level of design.  
24 We also do include what type of mitigation would  
25 be necessary for those adverse impacts, impacts

1 to things like navigation, things like water  
2 conveyance and water quality, as well as flood  
3 risk management. It also contains a conceptual  
4 level cost estimate for each one of the  
5 alternatives. While we use traditional Corps of  
6 Engineers' cost-estimating methodologies,  
7 because we are at a more conceptual level, these  
8 costs are best used for comparing among  
9 different alternatives within the report as  
10 opposed to strict comparison to what you might  
11 consider as an authorized cost. There would  
12 certainly need to be additional analysis  
13 completed prior to implementing or prior to  
14 constructing any one of these potential  
15 scenarios.

16           The GLMRIS report itself really is  
17 best used as a tool for decision makers. I'll  
18 speak to it a little bit at the end after I've  
19 had the opportunity to discuss each one of the  
20 alternatives, but what this report does is  
21 provides evaluation criteria for each one of  
22 these alternatives. Evaluation criteria would  
23 include things like the costs, total time to  
24 implement, the amount of risk reduction that's  
25 achieved by a certain alternative as well as

1 other ancillary economic or environmental  
2 impacts and helps users of the report, such as  
3 yourself, or other decision makers, members of  
4 the state, federal resource agencies, members of  
5 Congress, to help use this report as that  
6 decision-making tool. Help conduct a trade-off  
7 analysis among the various alternatives.

8           Very simply, if you are to break  
9 down the process of GLMRIS into three easy  
10 steps, they are listed on the slide. Number 1,  
11 try to identify the connections. Here we  
12 focused on the Chicago Area Waterway System. We  
13 identified what species were a potential  
14 concern. We start out with a list of over 200  
15 different species and refine that down to a list  
16 of about 35 which were of particular concern for  
17 transfer and potential establishment on the  
18 other side of the basins.

19           Of those 35, we identified the 13  
20 that presented a high or medium risk of  
21 potential transfer and having that transfer  
22 result in some kind of establishment with some  
23 kind of adverse consequences in that  
24 establishment.

25           Now, I want to talk a little bit

1 about the risk assessment process that was used  
2 in GLMRIS. A lot of this analysis is risk  
3 based. While I would love to be able to stand  
4 here and tell you there is an 85-percent chance  
5 this species will cause 50-percent damage to  
6 this ecosystem, even with the most well-  
7 understood species, it's very difficult to try  
8 and quantify those kinds of numbers. Instead,  
9 we used a very qualitative risk assessment  
10 process, rating these species as high, medium,  
11 or low, looking at the uncertainties associated  
12 with those rankings.

13           We also looked at a whole range of  
14 possible controls that could be implemented,  
15 things like aquatic herbicides, things like  
16 poisons for fish, physical barriers, and  
17 channels. We even got ideas from the public  
18 like heating the canals, such as it was  
19 uncomfortable for the species, or even trying to  
20 freeze the canals to prevent things from moving.

21           We looked at the range of possible  
22 controls, over 90 different controls, and tried  
23 to identify which were the most realistically  
24 implementable and feasible. So we take this  
25 information about the connections, about the

1 species, about the controls, combine it with  
2 background information about economies that move  
3 through the Chicago Area Waterway System, about  
4 fisheries, about other information that's  
5 pertinent to the study and incorporate all of  
6 this into this range of alternatives that are  
7 described in the GLMRIS report and summarize in  
8 those thousands of pages of appendices that  
9 Colonel Drummond mentioned.

10                   Before I get into the alternatives  
11 themselves, I want to spend just a moment  
12 talking to you a little bit about some of the  
13 technology that we used within this report.  
14 First of all, go over to the far right-hand side  
15 of the slide and look at something that's  
16 probably very easy for us to conceptualize, a  
17 physical barrier in the channel. It would  
18 provide a block such that untreated surface  
19 waters from either basin could not mix.  
20 Pretty simple concept.

21                   This type of aquatic nuisance  
22 species control would likely address each of  
23 those modes of movement you see in the upper  
24 right-hand corner. If you break it down very  
25 simply to how the species move through the water

1 column, look at different technologies that  
2 apply to those methods of movement, that's how  
3 we came up with this range of potential  
4 technology that we describe in the GLMRIS  
5 report.

6                   Very simply, aquatic nuisance  
7 species can either swim, float, or they can  
8 hitchhike or move across with a barge tow or  
9 with a recreational boat on the hull of those  
10 vessels. Something like a physical barrier,  
11 because it would stop the swimming, stop the  
12 floating, and stop the movement of vessels,  
13 would likely address each one of those modes of  
14 aquatic nuisance species movement within that  
15 pathway.

16                   Let's look at something else that we  
17 are probably a little bit more familiar with.  
18 In GLMRIS, we took the concept of electrical  
19 barriers in the lower left-hand corner there and  
20 modified it based on lessons learned from the  
21 existing implementation of electric barrier  
22 systems just outside of Chicago. As it's  
23 currently implemented, the electric barrier that  
24 is set to control for Asian carp species is  
25 implemented in an unimproved channel.

1 Electrodes are placed at the bottom of a canal  
2 that's over 100 years old. The sheetpile wall  
3 sides really may help or may hurt the actual  
4 goal of trying to prevent the transfer of the  
5 species. We have to work with what we're given.  
6 Tune the frequency, the voltage, of that  
7 specific electric barrier to accommodate those  
8 existing conditions.

9                 In GLMRIS, we take that electric  
10 barrier concept and instead construct an  
11 engineered channel for it where we can determine  
12 from the outset what is the final depth going to  
13 be, where can we put electric barrier or the  
14 electrodes, on the bottom, on the sides, at  
15 angles. What else can we do to help engineer  
16 this channel to really gain benefit from lessons  
17 learned with regard to the existing  
18 implementation of the electric barrier system  
19 outside of Chicago.

20                 We also have some more novel  
21 concepts. They are based on applications of  
22 existing technologies. Take, for example, in  
23 the upper left-hand corner the GLMRIS lock  
24 concept. This is a flushing lock. It takes a  
25 traditional navigation lock and applies a series

1 of pumps to it that help move the water through  
2 the lock targeting specifically floating aquatic  
3 nuisance species. You can see how one or more  
4 of these individual aquatic nuisance species  
5 controls could be used to address the various  
6 modes of movement, so when used either singly or  
7 in combination with each other, could attempt to  
8 prevent transfer of aquatic nuisance species.

9           I'm going to start, and I'll go one  
10 by one. I have a slide for each one of the  
11 alternatives. If you have your book, flip to  
12 Page 10 to kind of follow along. Baseline  
13 Alternative 1 in the lower left-hand corner.  
14 You can keep track with me, where we are at.

15           The Baseline Alternative is what is  
16 traditionally known as the no new federal  
17 action. As opposed to calling it a no action  
18 plan, I prefer to call it a sustained activities  
19 alternative. The reason for that is that there  
20 is, in fact, a lot of action that is currently  
21 ongoing toward the control and prevention of  
22 aquatic nuisance species.

23           State agencies, natural -- you know,  
24 Department of Natural Resources, Fish and  
25 Wildlife Service, Corps of Engineers, among

1 others, are currently implementing a range of  
2 activities that have been identified that are  
3 going to -- that exist currently and are going  
4 to continue in the future. This establishes our  
5 baseline conditions that we use as a measuring  
6 post for evaluation of the additional risk  
7 reduction brought by each of the subsequent  
8 alternatives. We needed to get a snapshot of  
9 what goes on today and what's potentially going  
10 on in the future so we can identify how much  
11 additional risk reduction, how much additional  
12 prevention, if you will, will be gained by each  
13 one of these subsequent alternatives.

14                   Alternative Plan Number 2 is our  
15 nonstructural control technology alternative.  
16 Nonstructural controls are very simply those  
17 types of aquatic nuisance species controls that  
18 could be implemented without building a physical  
19 structure. We use things like active  
20 management. What's active management? It's the  
21 addressing of Asian carp population by fishing  
22 them down with the commercial fisherman or the  
23 identification of perhaps a lonely stand of  
24 aquatic nuisance plants where you can attack  
25 those plants where they exist currently with

1 aquatic herbicides like we see in that picture  
2 at the top, and, thereby, if you control where  
3 those aquatic nuisance species are, you can  
4 prevent the transfer.

5                   Nonstructural controls can also  
6 include things like education and outreach. Why  
7 is it a good idea to clean my boat after I pull  
8 out of the waterway and put it into a different  
9 waterway? Why is it a bad idea to dump my bait  
10 bucket straight into the water that has live  
11 bait swimming around in it at the end of the day  
12 after fishing. What kind of laws or regulations  
13 could be promulgated? Things like the Lacey  
14 Act, things like enhanced bilge or ballast water  
15 management.

16                   All of these activities could be  
17 implemented fairly quickly, and that's why we  
18 have included them in indicating an estimated  
19 time of completion, under this alternative, of  
20 nearly zero years. This unique part of the  
21 nonstructural control methods is that they are,  
22 in fact, best management practices.

23                   Now, I'm not going to stand here  
24 today and tell you that implementing new laws  
25 and regulations or education outreach is going

1 to certainly prevent the transfer of species.  
2 They are, in fact, best management practices, so  
3 we include them for each one of these subsequent  
4 alternatives within the report.

5           Successful implementation of these  
6 is certainly a shared responsibility. I'll use  
7 those terms, that term, "shared responsibility,"  
8 a number of times throughout this discussion,  
9 because, in fact, whether it's nonstructural  
10 controls or full physical separation of basins  
11 will be a shared responsibility among various  
12 federal, state, and members of the public in  
13 order to have successful implementation as we  
14 look forward to a strategic kind of control  
15 strategy for aquatic nuisance species.

16           Alternative Plan 3 is the first of  
17 our two technology alternatives. What  
18 Alternative Plan 3 does is attempt to establish  
19 two control points that control for the two-way  
20 transfer of aquatic nuisance species. We use a  
21 technology called an aquatic nuisance species  
22 treatment plant which was mentioned earlier in  
23 controls. Very simply it has a treatment train  
24 using screens, filters, and UV light to  
25 inactivate or to stop aquatic nuisance species

1 from transferring between the basins. As you  
2 can see, on the map on the left-hand side, there  
3 are two points that are established that  
4 effectively serve as control points for the  
5 entire system.

6           At those two points, the flow of  
7 those channels, the Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal  
8 or the Cal-Sag Channel is rerouted through those  
9 aquatic nuisance species treatment plants  
10 thereby treating the entire volume of water that  
11 comes through during dry ebbs and flows. We  
12 also, in addition, established the GLMRIS Lock,  
13 bookended by a pair of electric barriers in that  
14 constructed navigation channel to allow  
15 navigation to continue at these points.

16           Now, when you look at potential  
17 faults of this particular alternative, the first  
18 thing that comes to my mind is what happens when  
19 you have increased flows. I mentioned that  
20 these aquatic nuisance species treatment plants  
21 are built for dry weather flow, the standard  
22 flow. It would be impractical to construct, and  
23 it would be much larger, because you only get  
24 really significant flows maybe a couple of times  
25 a year, once every five years, et cetera, but

1 when you get those large flows, and what we  
2 designed for were significantly large flows,  
3 something that is called a 500-year storm, there  
4 would be significant infrastructure which would  
5 be necessary to capture and contain that so that  
6 this particular control structure isn't  
7 overwhelmed or you don't cause significant  
8 flooding to the residents of the Chicago land  
9 area. Because of significant mitigation of the  
10 structure, there is a significant time to  
11 completion, about 25 years, with an estimated  
12 cost of about 15-and-a-half billion dollars.

13           Alternative Plan 4 is the second of  
14 our two technology-based alternatives. This  
15 takes the concept of ANS control point, and  
16 instead of having two-way control points, we  
17 stretch the expanse of the Chicago Area Waterway  
18 System and place one-way control point, as you  
19 can see, at or along the shore of Lake Michigan  
20 as well as a single control point at the bottom  
21 of the system, what we call Brandon Road Lock  
22 and Dam. That's in the lower left-hand corner.  
23 So with that lower control point, you're able to  
24 address the one-way transfer of the species  
25 coming up the system, and the series of other

1 red dots at or near Lake Michigan would address  
2 the one-way transfer of species coming in,  
3 thereby, you create a control zone, which is  
4 what we call a buffer zone. The buffer zone  
5 allows us to do a couple of things.

6           Number 1, at this point in time,  
7 there is not any indication that there are  
8 aquatic nuisance species concern within that  
9 buffer zone. So if you maintain that buffer  
10 zone in the future, as you go forward, you can  
11 control that zone and do things like early  
12 monitoring, trying to see if there is a transfer  
13 of species between the basins that may have  
14 passed by those one-way control points.

15           It also allows the City of Chicago  
16 the flexibility to continue to backflow and to  
17 continue to let water flow as it currently does  
18 during significant precipitation events. You'll  
19 note that there are, at the bottom, there are  
20 two barriers that are physical barriers. The  
21 reason we've included those is because those two  
22 streams that they block are primarily  
23 nonnavigable. You can get through them in a  
24 canoe, for example, or perhaps a Jon boat, but,  
25 for the most part, there is not a significant

1 recreational or certainly any cargo navigation  
2 that occurs through those waterways.

3           As you create physical barriers in a  
4 waterway, you stop the way water moves. You  
5 stop the way it normally drains, so you have to  
6 create this mitigation, because you'll create  
7 additional flood risks by the implementation of  
8 those physical barriers.

9           Now, in this particular scenario,  
10 that mitigation necessarily is much less, so you  
11 have smaller reservoirs and smaller total  
12 conveyance networks which give you a little bit  
13 quicker time to implement as well as a  
14 significantly smaller, about half, the cost of  
15 the previous technology alternative, about 7.8  
16 billion dollars.

17           Alternative Plan 5 is the first of  
18 our two hydrologic or physical separation  
19 scenarios. As the name suggests, this one  
20 places barriers at or near the lakefront, Lake  
21 Michigan. As you can imagine, as I discussed  
22 before, if you have an impact on the way water  
23 moves within Chicago, especially during  
24 significant precipitation, significant rainfall  
25 events, the placement of these barriers will

1 induce additional flood risks, so to compensate,  
2 to mitigate for that, additional tunnels and  
3 reservoirs would need to be constructed to  
4 ensure that the nearly 9.2 million residents of  
5 Chicago and surrounding suburbs are not  
6 adversely impacted by the introduction of these  
7 physical barriers. Again, this leads to a  
8 significant time for construction as well as a  
9 fairly significant cost of about 18.4 billion  
10 dollars.

11                   So the team looked at the way these  
12 kind of previous alternatives were working out  
13 and saw that there is a common thread that  
14 really a significant cost associated with each  
15 one of these scenarios went to that mitigation  
16 for flood risk, went to what happens when you  
17 place technology, place barriers in the waterway  
18 and affect the way the water moves. You need to  
19 mitigate for that.

20                   We looked at ways you can place  
21 physical barriers in the system without causing  
22 that additional flood risk. In fact, the team  
23 was fairly successful at doing that. In this  
24 particular scenario, there is only a small  
25 amount of mitigation, those tunnels and

1 reservoirs that are necessary to specifically  
2 address the way water moves. However -- there  
3 is always a however. We open up the stretch of  
4 the Chicago River east of those two points. In  
5 that stretch of Chicago River, there are two  
6 significant water reclamation plants. You can  
7 see them in the map on the right-hand side.  
8 Those brown squares. If you are also following  
9 along in your book, they are probably pretty  
10 easily evident to you on that map.

11           Those brown squares, water  
12 reclamation plants, are located on the north  
13 part as well as the south part of the system.  
14 These plants currently discharge a significant  
15 amount of wastewater to the Chicago River which  
16 then flows downstream. If you open up the river  
17 to Lake Michigan, you all of a sudden have the  
18 introduction of a significant pollution load to  
19 Lake Michigan, to the Great Lakes.

20           Now, while Chicago certainly has a  
21 storied history with regard to dirty water, I  
22 would say that they're actually working to try  
23 and mitigate for that, try to compensate and  
24 really bring up those water quality standards.  
25 The Metropolitan Water Reclamation District has

1 recently announced it will begin to disinfect  
2 those water streams that are coming out as well  
3 as add additional nutrient removal. So while  
4 there is certainly a history -- let's imagine  
5 for a moment that the water that is being  
6 discharged by the City of Chicago is the same  
7 kind of water as is being discharged by the City  
8 of Milwaukee which goes into Lake Michigan or  
9 the City of Detroit.

10                 No matter what, with the addition of  
11 even that cleaner stream of wastewater, you  
12 still have the significant contribution of  
13 nutrients, persistent organic blooms, like PCBs,  
14 like mercury, things that wastewater treatment  
15 plants don't even treat for today, like  
16 pharmaceuticals. That will be new additional  
17 inputs of contaminants into a natural resource.

18                 While the spirit of the Clean Water  
19 Act is trying to clean up the streams as fast as  
20 possible, given the way they flow currently  
21 today, the introduction of new pollutants into a  
22 significant natural resource would, per our  
23 conversations with the U.S. EPA and the state  
24 EPA, would be significantly difficult to try and  
25 permit. Instead of introducing these

1 contaminates into Lake Michigan, we continued  
2 the abatement of these contaminates and the  
3 introduction of them continued downstream. We  
4 rerouted these points for another actually very  
5 good reason, which is significant to the  
6 navigation community that uses the Illinois  
7 Waterway.

8           I mentioned at the outset that a  
9 significant amount of water that comes down-  
10 stream is that municipal wastewater discharge.  
11 So if you are to reroute those two points into  
12 Lake Michigan, you lose a significant volume of  
13 water that comes down during the Illinois  
14 waterway, which then feeds into the Mississippi  
15 River. So that's another reason why we chose to  
16 keep that important flow, because of the  
17 navigation issue of the Corps of Engineers.

18           There would be additional mitigation  
19 which would be necessary, assuming this kind of  
20 zero deduction of pollution, which is a  
21 certainly conservative estimate, including  
22 capture of combined outfalls as well as  
23 mediation of contaminated settlements. Because  
24 of these other mitigation factors trying to  
25 limit the amount of environmental degradation to

1 a natural resource, we look again at significant  
2 total time for the project and total cost  
3 estimated at about 25 years or about 15.5  
4 million dollars.

5                   Alternative Plan 7 and 8 are what we  
6 call hybrids. They include elements of both  
7 physical separation and technological  
8 alternatives. You can split the Chicago  
9 Waterway System into an upper part and lower  
10 part. Really, very simply, these two hybrid  
11 scenarios put a physical barrier on one part of  
12 the system while leaving the other part open.  
13 This one, as it suggests, leaves the Cal-Sag  
14 Channel, the lower part of the system, open  
15 while placing that physical barrier on the other  
16 part of the system, the Chicago Sanitary Ship  
17 Canal.

18                   The second hybrid switches them  
19 around, leaving the Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal  
20 open for navigation and placing a physical  
21 barrier on the lower part of the system. Look  
22 at estimated time of completion for both of  
23 these. I'll scroll back up for the first one.  
24 Same, about 25 years, because of the associated  
25 mitigation necessary for each of these, but the

1 costs are significantly different. It is  
2 something I'd like to highlight because of the  
3 level of mitigation necessary for one versus the  
4 other. This one at about 15.1 billion dollars  
5 is nearly twice the second hybrid at 8.3 billion  
6 dollars.

7                   As I mentioned at the outset, the  
8 goal of the GLMRIS report is to provide  
9 information for decision makers and to that  
10 effect we utilize evaluation criteria and  
11 discuss these criteria for each one of the  
12 alternatives that are presented within the  
13 report.

14                   Now, this summary document is not  
15 going to have a whole lot of discussion about  
16 evaluation criteria, but, hopefully, between  
17 reading this and the discussion we have today,  
18 there will be an interest to kind of open up  
19 that longer document. Chapter 3 has a lot of  
20 great information about these evaluation  
21 criteria. They are all summarized in a table in  
22 the executive summary as well as in Chapter 4.  
23 Some of these criteria, as I mentioned at the  
24 outset, include the kind of effectiveness of  
25 a particular alternative and examine that

1 with the cost, time to implement, and other  
2 economic or environmental impacts.

3           Before I conclude today, there is a  
4 couple of things I'd like to ensure that we kind  
5 of have a mutual understanding of. I think it  
6 was very clear in my explanation, that, if not,  
7 I apologize, the mitigation really does serve as  
8 the driving factor for the time to implement and  
9 the total cost for a wide variety of these  
10 alternatives. No matter what, there will be  
11 residual risks that will be applied or will be  
12 evident for any one of these particular  
13 scenarios.

14           There are ways for aquatic nuisance  
15 species to transfer that are outside of the  
16 aquatic pathway. Human mediated transport,  
17 avian transport, et cetera, are all important  
18 things to acknowledge that there can be a  
19 significant investment in infrastructure that  
20 could be easily undone by the unintended or  
21 perhaps intended carelessness of things that we  
22 might do on a daily basis.

23           There are certainly risks associated  
24 with the duration to implement a number of these  
25 different scenarios. That's why it is important

1 for us to have this conversation today and have  
2 this conversation among other parts of the  
3 region to understand what are the biggest  
4 concerns, and if there is a need to bring down,  
5 have some incremental risk reduction, what kind  
6 of activities could occur as we try and build  
7 toward that long-term goal of aquatic nuisance  
8 species prevention.

9                   Adaptive management is a very  
10 important part of each one of these scenarios,  
11 because there is a different level that each  
12 potential alternative could be adapted to as new  
13 technologies come on line and new research is  
14 achieved. If I leave you with nothing else  
15 today, it's the concept that aquatic nuisance  
16 species control is certainly a shared  
17 responsibility, whether it's someone's  
18 responsibility when they're participating as a  
19 weekend angler or whether you look at long-term  
20 infrastructure solutions that require federal,  
21 state, public input. Aquatic nuisance species  
22 control is something that needs to be a  
23 conversation that we all certainly need to have  
24 as a collaborative group and come to some kind  
25 of consensus based path forward.

1                   For that reason, we are traveling  
2 among a number of different parts of the region  
3 and have hosted meetings like this where we have  
4 had anywhere from about 25 to over 120 attendees  
5 come and voice their opinions and listen to what  
6 we have to say and, hopefully, carry this  
7 message of shared responsibility back to their  
8 friends, family, constituents.

9                   We do have a comment period that has  
10 been recently extended to close on March 31st of  
11 this year, allowing actually four additional  
12 weeks from the original duration of the comment  
13 period, because we heard a call from some  
14 stakeholders that the early March date was not  
15 long enough. We hope that this will provide  
16 additional time to provide comments.

17                   What we'll do is we will take these  
18 comments, assemble part of a summary report, and  
19 like the GLMRIS report itself, provide them as a  
20 tool for decision makers so that everyone can  
21 understand what we've heard at these different  
22 sites and these different regions throughout  
23 this GLMRIS roadshow.

24                   Again, your voice is important, so  
25 with that, I encourage you to stay in touch with

1 the study. If you think of questions that you  
2 have, you can either make a comment on the  
3 website or even after the comment period is  
4 closed, send us an e-mail. Be sure to friend us  
5 on Facebook, follow us on Twitter, and with  
6 that, I appreciate your time and look forward to  
7 hearing your comments and thoughts with regard  
8 to the GLMRIS study. I'll turn it back over to  
9 Lauren.

10 MS. FLEER:

11 Thanks very much to all our speakers  
12 tonight and all of you for being here. I would  
13 like to now turn the floor over to you and hear  
14 your questions and comments. The way we'll  
15 conduct the discussion is I have a list here of  
16 all of you who have registered to speak. I will  
17 recognize you, and when I do, please come to the  
18 microphone. We have a stenographer here tonight  
19 taking all of the comments and keeping a record  
20 of this meeting verbatim, so it is very  
21 important that everyone speak clearly.

22 If you would, identify your name and  
23 your organization that you're here to represent  
24 and your five-digit zip code. That will help us  
25 make sense of all the testimony that we have

1 been gathering both tonight and in all of the  
2 meetings across the region.

3           I apologize if I mispronounce  
4 anybody's name. And if you are joining us via  
5 webinar, and you would like to make a comment,  
6 please dial Star 1 on your phone or you can use  
7 the send note button at the top of your computer  
8 screen. The moderator will unmute you, and you  
9 can share your comment with the room here as  
10 well, which is also being recorded. To get  
11 started, I would first like to invite David Doss  
12 to the microphone, and Toby Barrett will be on  
13 deck.

14           MR. DOSS:

15           Thank you. I'm David Doss with  
16 Senator David Vitter's office. What other  
17 information did you need?

18           MS. FLEER:

19           Zip code, please.

20           MR. DOSS:

21           70002. I just have a brief  
22 statement from Senator Vitter that I'd like to  
23 read. I'd like to thank the Corps for their  
24 efforts in putting together this very  
25 comprehensive study. The study covers a range

1 of options and technologies that are currently  
2 available to help abate the movement of aquatic  
3 nuisance species between the Mississippi River  
4 and Great Lakes Basins. What this report  
5 highlights is something that many, including  
6 Senator Vitter, already knew, that the complete  
7 separation of the two basins would not only be  
8 costly in terms of construction and  
9 implementation, but, also, economically  
10 detrimental to the industries who depend on  
11 continuity and stability between the Great Lakes  
12 ports and New Orleans.

13           Moving cargo along our waterways is  
14 the most cost-effective means of transportation,  
15 and, in fact, the Mississippi River moves about  
16 500 million tons of cargo each year. This cargo  
17 includes chemicals, coal, timber, iron, steel,  
18 and more than half of the nation's grain  
19 exports. Cutting off traffic between the Great  
20 Lakes and the Mississippi River Basin would  
21 force businesses to use more expensive means of  
22 transportation, and those businesses would  
23 ultimately pass those costs on to the consumer,  
24 which is not a positive consequence anyone is  
25 hoping for. Stifling our economy by limiting

1 access to our nation's most vital waterway is  
2 not the answer. While Senator Vitter believes  
3 it is important for the Corps to prevent the  
4 spread of aquatic nuisance species in the Great  
5 Lakes Basin, we should also encourage continued  
6 use of current preventative measures and also  
7 consider more practical alternatives presented  
8 in the report. Thank you again.

9 MS. FLEER:

10 Thank you very much. Toby Barrett to  
11 be followed by Mark Wright.

12 MR. BARRETT:

13 Toby Barrett. Good afternoon  
14 everyone and panel members. Toby Barrett. I'm  
15 a provincial member of Parliament from Ontario.  
16 I guess I have my -- my zip code is N0A1N2, a  
17 little different. I'm elected to represent  
18 110,000 people on the north shore of Lake Erie  
19 on the Ontario side roughly halfway between  
20 Buffalo and Detroit across from Erie,  
21 Pennsylvania. I represent towns like Port Dover,  
22 Port Rowan, Port Maitland, Big Creek, and the  
23 Grand River. It's the largest river on the  
24 north shore of Lake Erie. And bit of a wakeup  
25 call. We discovered two Asian carp, grass carp,

1 in the Grand River. Sterile, but it really  
2 caused quite a stir. I really appreciate the  
3 opportunity today. I left a copy of my paper at  
4 the front desk. Actually, my wife and I are on  
5 holidays in this beautiful state. We really  
6 feel quite at home. We've been driving on ice  
7 for two days.

8                   I don't have all the answers. I  
9 realize nobody does. I do want to listen this  
10 afternoon. We live in Port Dover. It is on  
11 Lake Erie, the most productive freshwater lake  
12 in the world, one of the five Great Lakes, as we  
13 all know, the largest body of fresh water in the  
14 world, of very important relevance in commercial  
15 fishing, Lake Freed and commerce. The  
16 administrative headquarters for Lower Lakes  
17 Towing is in Port Dover. Sports fishing, of  
18 course, recreational boating, duck hunting,  
19 ecotourism. The people I've been talking to for  
20 the last year, year and a half, and  
21 organizations, we do favor the ecological  
22 separation of the Mississippi and the Great  
23 Lakes Basin. We do wish to see the restoration  
24 of a natural divide at Chicago. I know many,  
25 many years and lots of dollars, probably will go

1 over budget and over time, but we favor that  
2 direction. We favor creating a divide that  
3 Indiana's ecomarsh worried about fish coming  
4 down the Maumee River in Ohio into Lake Erie,  
5 and I know there is a fence there. I don't know  
6 how effective that is. The province of Ontario  
7 has banned the transport of live Asian carp for  
8 bait or for food or other reasons.

9           In Ontario, it's illegal to possess  
10 live Asian carp. In the province of Ontario, it  
11 is illegal to import live Asian carp, and,  
12 again, the fear of an accidental release or even  
13 an intentional release. The concern of this  
14 interjurisdictional transport of live fish, the  
15 concern -- I'm not down here to give any advice  
16 to people down in the United States, but the  
17 concern of transporting fish for food between a  
18 state that has Asian carp and one that does not  
19 have Asian carp, if the truck goes in the ditch  
20 or into a stream, I couldn't count the number of  
21 bridges I've crossed over down here in this  
22 beautiful state in the last few days.

23           A year ago our Ontario Ministry of  
24 Natural Resources in Ontario proposed the  
25 gutting or the evisceration of all imports of

1 Asian carp just to make sure they're dead. The  
2 trucks say live fish on the sides. You drain  
3 them before the border, but the fish can live  
4 for perhaps up to a day or two. There is an  
5 environmental assessment consultation going on  
6 right now on that one.

7                   So just to wrap up, regardless of  
8 the options that are being considered, I  
9 certainly urge everybody to continue to be  
10 proactive, continue to research, continue the  
11 hearings, for example. I invite you to Ontario.  
12 I invite -- the City of Toronto was talked  
13 about. I invite you to Port Dover, my hometown,  
14 down on Lake Erie. Continue to do the economic  
15 studies, the cost benefit studies. Obviously,  
16 the risk benefit studies around the ecological,  
17 even the social impact, particularly look at the  
18 impacts on commerce and on the economy of some  
19 of the measures that are being considered.

20                   So thank you very much for your  
21 work. Thank you very much for your time. I am  
22 looking to the other representatives today.  
23 Thank you.

24                   MS. LAUREN:

25                   Thank you very much. Mark Wright

1 next followed by Patrick Brennan.

2 MR. WRIGHT:

3 Mark Wright with the American  
4 Waterways Operators, 70433. First, I want to  
5 thank the Corps for your work on this. We  
6 appreciate the extension of time to work on  
7 comments. Many of our members are interested in  
8 this subject for obvious reasons. We especially  
9 appreciate you coming to New Orleans. Part of  
10 the discussion among our membership over the  
11 years has been why is this important to members  
12 in New Orleans. We have a lot of people who  
13 have shown up today. I think over time people  
14 started to realize why this is such a big deal.

15 I think one of our data points that  
16 we notice is almost a fourth of the commodity  
17 shipments via CAWS originate in the New Orleans  
18 area. So you can imagine that it would have a  
19 significant impact on us, on our membership. We  
20 appreciate the work you've done. We think it's  
21 a great analysis, a great analysis of the  
22 alternatives, especially being done in such a  
23 shortened time frame. Kudos to you on that. We  
24 appreciate that. As many of you know, AWO has  
25 been working on this subject for over a decade.

1 We see this as really a next step, a new  
2 beginning on this. Certainly, we intend to go  
3 with it every step of the way and be a  
4 contributing stakeholder. We think the best  
5 part of the report is that it's assessing the  
6 impacts.

7                   It's really clear in our mind that  
8 physical separation is not an alternative. We  
9 think the report sort of suggests that as well.  
10 We certainly want to emphasize that. I think  
11 one of the things that we want to highlight as  
12 well is that separation -- we have two complete  
13 separations, physical separations, and two  
14 really devastating impacts.

15                   First, you would see the effect it  
16 would have on individuals, companies, members of  
17 our association from Illinois down to Louisiana.  
18 It would have a dramatic impact on jobs. Just  
19 as importantly, it would have an impact that  
20 perhaps would produce a solution that's worse  
21 than the problem.

22                   In other words, the cargo that goes  
23 through these areas would find other ways.  
24 Those alternatives are not necessarily better  
25 environmentally. Everything from traffic to

1 environmental effects of trucks and things like  
2 that. In the Chicago area, Illinois. We like  
3 to promote ourselves, the barge industry, as the  
4 most environmentally friendly mode of  
5 transportation. We think it's an important  
6 aspect of this, as we move along here.

7           Having said all of that, I'll leave  
8 it alone. I know you probably heard from Lynn  
9 Munch. I know you've heard from Lynn Munch for  
10 many years. She said as much as there needs to  
11 be said about it from my perspective, but we  
12 appreciate it again. Thanks for coming to New  
13 Orleans. Certainly we plan to be with you in  
14 the years to come to continue this study. Thank  
15 you.

16           MS. FLEER:

17           Next we will have Patrick Brennan  
18 followed by Matthew Lagarde.

19           MR. BRENNAN:

20           Good evening. My name is Patrick  
21 Brennan. I'm the sustainability manager with  
22 Ingram Barge Company. My zip code is 37205.  
23 Ingram is the leading inland marine  
24 transportation company with a fleet of 150  
25 towboats and nearly 5,000 barges. Ingram is an

1 active member of the AWO. We'd like to make  
2 some additional comments with regards to AWO's  
3 work for GLMRIS. We believe the GLMRIS report  
4 is a solid foundation on which a comprehensive  
5 solution to prevent interbasin transfer of basin  
6 species and also preserves the free flow of  
7 waterborne commerce can be built.

8           The Chicago Area Water System is the  
9 sole marine transportation link between the  
10 Great Lakes and the Mississippi River System,  
11 which plays an important role in the national  
12 economy. For example, nearly 10 percent of the  
13 goods transported through the Chicago Water  
14 System end up in the lower Mississippi and along  
15 the Gulf area.

16           It's abundantly clear from the  
17 Corps' report that the physical separation is  
18 too expensive, too lengthy, and too uncertain to  
19 be a viable solution. Additionally, the closure  
20 of the water system would be devastating to  
21 thousands of people and businesses from Illinois  
22 all the way down to Louisiana that rely on the  
23 water system for their livelihood. We strongly  
24 believe that an alternative that preserves  
25 navigation between the Great Lakes and the

1 Mississippi River Basin must be found. There  
2 is, of course, a lot of work to be done, such as  
3 a study of alternatives be realized, including  
4 performing necessary environmental assessments  
5 relying on robust public input.

6 Ingram Barge will work in  
7 conjunction with the AWO which plans to play a  
8 key role in conversations and engagement going  
9 forward. Again, thank you for this opportunity  
10 to speak today.

11 MS. FLEER:

12 Matthew Lagarde followed by Angie  
13 Fay.

14 MR. LAGARDE:

15 Matthew Lagarde. I'm just with the  
16 industry. Boat captain by trade. 39426 would be  
17 the zip code. I want to commend the Corps for  
18 the thoroughness of the study. It's lengthy, at  
19 best. We appreciate the extra time to digest  
20 the contents of it. Being from Louisiana and  
21 the area, we're sensitive to invasive species,  
22 nutria, Formosan termites, water hyacinth. We  
23 know what kind of damage it can wreak on the  
24 environment. We don't want to see it spread  
25 anywhere else. Not in favor of complete

1 separation between the Great Lakes and the  
2 inland river system. I think it would have  
3 devastating ecological and economical effects.  
4 Ecological, you know, you put this over the  
5 road, it's going through neighborhoods. There's  
6 additional construction that has to be done.  
7 The highways, maintain those thoroughfares.  
8 Rail, the exhaust fumes and everything that goes  
9 along with trucks. Barge is the way to go.

10 Chicago is a port city. New Orleans  
11 is a port city. The city thrives and is built  
12 around aquatic trade. As a taxpayer, regardless  
13 of which option you go with, I hope you spend  
14 the dollars wisely to achieve the results that  
15 you set out to achieve. I hate to see a  
16 25-year, \$18 million project that does not  
17 prevent the spread of the aquatic nuisance  
18 species.

19 We hope that you take a science-  
20 based approach and use real data and not scare  
21 tactics, not falsifications, not rumors. As far  
22 as the far-reaching economic effects of it, my  
23 first trip ever on the river was on a yacht  
24 moving from Waukegan, Illinois, down to Florida  
25 for the wintertime. There are rural areas in

1 Mississippi and Alabama that survive on this  
2 trade. It's not just Louisiana and the Gulf  
3 Coast. It's not just the barge industry. It's  
4 not just environmentalists that win if we come  
5 up with a viable solution. It's throughout the  
6 entire lower half of the American states.  
7 Everything that touches the river system is  
8 affected by this. Thank you.

9 MS. FLEER:

10 Thank you. Angie Fay followed by  
11 Jeff Kindl.

12 MS. FAY:

13 I'm Angie Fay with Blessey Marine  
14 Services. Zip code is 70123. Like I said, I'm  
15 Angie Fay. I'm the Vice President of Quality  
16 Assurance and Corporate Compliance with Blessey  
17 Marine Services. We own and operate 74 towboats  
18 and 152 tank barges. We employ approximately  
19 800 employees. We're headquartered here in  
20 Harahan, Louisiana, and have a fleet facility  
21 in Houston, Texas. Our towboats and barges  
22 safely move petroleum products and pressurized  
23 cargoes on our inland waterway system and on  
24 sections of the Great Lakes. Thank you for the  
25 opportunity to provide comments today on the

1 GLMRIS Study. Thank you for having it here in  
2 New Orleans as well. First, the towing industry  
3 alongside AWO has worked very closely with the  
4 Corps and other federal agencies since 2004 to  
5 ensure aquatic nuisance species do not migrate  
6 past the electronic barriers and that water-  
7 borne commerce continues to move smoothly.

8           The GLMRIS report provides a solid  
9 foundation by which a comprehensive and viable  
10 solution can be developed, a solution that  
11 preserves the integrity of waterborne  
12 transportation while protecting the waterway  
13 itself.

14           Second, we're pleased that even  
15 though the Corps' timeline for completing the  
16 study was cut short by Congress, the Corps has  
17 done a very good job assessing the impacts of  
18 the variable alternatives to prevent invasive  
19 species transfer. Clearly, physical separation  
20 is too expensive, too lengthy, and contains too  
21 much uncertainty to be a viable solution.

22           After all, here we are some 1,400  
23 miles away from the CAWS talking about the  
24 viability of the waterways that link the  
25 Mississippi River to the Great Lakes. The

1 importance of maintaining commerce through this  
2 vital artery is abundantly clear.

3           Third, the Chicago Area Waterway  
4 System is the only marine transportation link  
5 between these two watersheds. The commerce that  
6 buys these waterways is not only important to  
7 the regional economy but the national economy as  
8 well. Almost 10 percent of the goods transported  
9 through the CAWS end up here in the lower  
10 Mississippi and along the Gulf Coast, including  
11 U.S. export grain bound for the worldwide  
12 market.

13           Closure of the CAWS would be  
14 devastating for the thousands of people and  
15 businesses from Illinois to here in Louisiana  
16 that rely on the waterway for their livelihood.  
17 In addition, separation would result in a  
18 diversion of critical cargoes that we transport  
19 and put that cargo on the roadways and other  
20 modes of transportation, none of which are as  
21 environmentally friendly and as safe as the  
22 towboat and barge industry.

23           Lastly, we New Orleanians are no  
24 strangers to flooding. The closure of the CAWS  
25 would also result in the redirection and

1 introduction of wastewater, stormwater, and  
2 contaminated sediments into Lake Michigan as  
3 well as disrupt the current flood control  
4 measures that rely on the lock system. We  
5 realize that a great deal of work still lies  
6 ahead before a viable alternative can be  
7 determined.

8                   We, the towboat and barge industry,  
9 along with AWO, will remain steadfast in  
10 ensuring our livelihoods don't get washed away.  
11 We will continue the effort to support and  
12 provide feedback to the Corps in its enormous  
13 endeavor. Thank you.

14           MS. FLEER:

15                   Thank you. Jeff Kindl followed by  
16 Spencer Murphy.

17           MR. KINDL:

18                   Good afternoon. Jeff Kindl, vice  
19 president of Gulf Operations with American  
20 Commercial Lines, with our headquarters in  
21 Jeffersonville, Indiana. Like the other  
22 speakers, I'm against --

23           MS. FLEER:

24                   Could you provide your zip code?

25           MR. KINDL:

1                   I'm sorry. 70123. Like the other  
2 speakers, I'm against separation of the two  
3 basins. We move hundreds of thousands of tons  
4 of cargo in the Chicago area. One thing that's  
5 unclear in the study or in this pamphlet I think  
6 is where navigation ends under the proposed  
7 alternatives.

8                   If we were to end up with a lock  
9 situation, put new locks in, perhaps we should  
10 look at the situation like they've got in Europe  
11 where they reuse the lock water. They pump it  
12 out, store it on the shore, and pump it back in.  
13 At least the ones in the Danube that I've been  
14 on.

15                   Industry wise, there is -- I'm also  
16 a native Chicagoan, so I have a lot of friends  
17 and family still up there. We've got three  
18 major steel mills and a major refinery in  
19 northwestern Indiana on Lake Michigan and  
20 probably a couple of other dozen terminals that  
21 are barge served.

22                   As the others have said, throwing  
23 all of that truck traffic onto the highways, I  
24 don't think you've taken into account the  
25 additional accidents, commute times, loss of

1 productivity from sitting in traffic, even loss  
2 of life from accidents. I think those of you  
3 that watch the news, from there you saw the  
4 wreck in Michigan City, Indiana on I-94 last  
5 week. I can see further scenarios of that type  
6 with the thousands of extra trucks that will be  
7 on the road. The roads are packed, as it is, as  
8 you well know. So I think, as the others have  
9 said, more air pollution as well, which is going  
10 to affect the health of many of the individuals.  
11 Thank you.

12 MS. FLEER:

13 Spencer Murphy followed by David  
14 Deloach.

15 MR. MURPHY:

16 Good afternoon. My name is Spencer  
17 Murphy. Zip code 70118. I am with Canal Barge  
18 Company headquartered here in New Orleans. We  
19 are a family-owned marine transportation  
20 company. We've been in business for 80 years.  
21 We carry liquid and dry bulk cargo throughout  
22 the entire inland waterway system from Texas to  
23 Pittsburgh and to Chicago and back. I want to  
24 thank you for the opportunity to comment on the  
25 GLMRIS study. I thank you for coming to New

1 Orleans for this public meeting. As you can  
2 see, this is not just a Great Lakes issue but a  
3 national issue. Any recommendations that are  
4 taken as a result of this report will be felt  
5 throughout the inland waterway system and  
6 throughout the American economy.

7           As noted in several points by  
8 earlier speakers and also in the report,  
9 Louisiana is, by far, the largest port of origin  
10 for goods coming into Chicago and the Chicago  
11 Area Waterway System. That is simply because  
12 it's the result of the efficiency provided by  
13 our inland waterway system. It's the same  
14 efficiency that allows our Midwestern farmers to  
15 compete with our counterparts in Brazil and  
16 other countries by sending their products by  
17 barge to New Orleans.

18           That efficiency is being put at risk  
19 in many of the alternatives suggested in the  
20 GLMRIS report. The report, as we all know, is  
21 too voluminous for us to make any credible  
22 comments in less than five minutes, so I will  
23 stick to the high points as to why any further  
24 efforts should focus on nonstructural solutions.  
25 Hydrological separation is unnecessary. It's

1 impractical, if not impossible, and will cause  
2 more harm than good. It will result in  
3 absolutely predictable negative consequences for  
4 a very uncertain benefit. I say it's  
5 unnecessary, because current efforts are  
6 working. The breeding carp population has not  
7 moved in several years. There are no carp  
8 moving through electric barriers.

9           I say it is impractical because of  
10 the cost and the timeline associated with many  
11 of these structural solutions. We're talking  
12 about price tags of 10, 15, 18 billion dollars.  
13 For 18 billion dollars, you can build six locks  
14 and dams, even at the current inflated price tag  
15 of today's dollars. The entire civil works  
16 budget for the Corps on an annual basis is less  
17 than six billion dollars.

18           I say it is impractical, because it  
19 would require replumbing the entire City of  
20 Chicago and their regional sewerage system and  
21 their flood control structures. I say it is  
22 unnecessary, because the faster, more effective  
23 nonstructural solutions are available to address  
24 the problem. This week alone there have been  
25 numerous articles in the Wall Street Journal and

1 other publications about the commercial fishing  
2 industry capitalizing on this easy opportunity.  
3 Imagine if we took one tenth of the money  
4 required to achieve hydrological separation and  
5 put those resources into commercial fishing and  
6 other efforts. Paul Prudhomme nearly killed off  
7 the red fish with one recipe. We can do the  
8 same with Asian carp.

9           As I've often said, when I talk with  
10 people in the Great Lakes, in Louisiana too many  
11 fish in the water is not considered a problem.  
12 That is considered an opportunity. Hydrological  
13 separation will do more harm than good. Missing  
14 from the report due to time constraints is any  
15 sort of NEPA analysis. As you well know, the  
16 Corps can't start turning dirt on any project  
17 until a full environmental impact study is done,  
18 which, in this case, would, as others have  
19 noted, involve an analysis of increased air  
20 pollution, increased CO2 emissions, increased  
21 spills. On a nonenvironmental front, increase  
22 traffic, increase personal injuries, all of  
23 which are well-documented when you move goods  
24 from the waterways into other modes. I would  
25 suggest to you that an economic impact analysis

1 is somewhat incomplete, although I do appreciate  
2 that an economic analysis can be inexact. I'll  
3 give you some very direct information, very  
4 direct evidence from our company. We have a  
5 subsidiary company, Illinois Marine Towing. It  
6 is the largest independent barge fleet  
7 operation in the Chicago Area Waterway. I  
8 suspect that it is the number one user of the  
9 O'Brien Lock. IMT employs 130 people paying  
10 family wages at a time when Illinois' employment  
11 rate is nine percent.

12                   With hydrological separation, IMT's  
13 entire business is put at risk, as are all of  
14 those jobs. The assets, they float. We can  
15 move those to another location on the river, but  
16 the jobs will get left behind. This not a  
17 hypothetical situation. It's a simple fact. If  
18 you close down the Chicago Area Waterway System,  
19 it will make it too inefficient to be useful for  
20 our customers. Those jobs will be lost. I ask  
21 you to compare the cost to the proposed benefits  
22 of separation, proposed benefit being stopping  
23 carp entering the lake. Separation offers no  
24 guaranty of success. Human transfer through  
25 bait buckets and boats are not controlled by

1 separation. Transfer by birds or other animals  
2 are not controlled by separation. We will be  
3 wasting billions of dollars, putting many people  
4 out of work in order to stop an invasion that is  
5 not certain to happen and not certain to cause  
6 ecological harm, even if it did.

7                   In short, to undertake further  
8 measures to stop the carp from moving into the  
9 lake, we need to focus on nonstructural  
10 solutions. Like doctors with the Hippocratic  
11 Oath, our collective goal should be to first do  
12 no harm. As I said, there is much more to  
13 comment on, but I will save my further comments  
14 for our written remarks. Again, I thank you for  
15 coming to New Orleans. Thank you for your  
16 consideration.

17                   MS. FLEER:

18                   Next up is David Deloach.

19                   MR. DELOACH:

20                   Z. David Deloach. My zip code is  
21 70767. I'm Z. David Deloach, owner of DeLoach  
22 Marine Services. I operate 11 vessels, a towing  
23 operation based in Port Allen, Louisiana. My  
24 company employs approximately 145 persons aboard  
25 vessels on shore and at our repair facility in

1 Port Allen. I'm also the chairman of the  
2 Louisiana Association of Waterway Operators and  
3 Shipyards, LAWS for short, and the chairman of  
4 the Southern Region of the American Waterways  
5 Operators. So you can see I'm deeply concerned  
6 about things which affect the maritime community  
7 and economy of the State of Louisiana and the  
8 Gulf Coast area.

9                   The issue of the Chicago Area  
10 Waterway System or CAWS and its connection to  
11 the Great Lakes and further the connection  
12 between these systems and Louisiana and the Gulf  
13 Coast are significant. Any change to the  
14 present transportation structure, which has an  
15 effect on this link, is of paramount importance  
16 to the people and employers in the State of  
17 Louisiana and the Gulf Coast region.

18                   Repeatedly throughout the assessment  
19 and as part of the GLMRIS report, it's  
20 acknowledged that's there is an economic link  
21 between the areas by way of barge transportation  
22 in the amount of millions of tons of cargo moved  
23 between the CAWS area and the Louisiana area.  
24 Specifically, on Page 19 of the report, it's  
25 acknowledged that 14 percent of the shipments

1 received and seven percent of the shipments out  
2 of the Chicago Area Waterway System are related  
3 to the New Orleans area. My math would tell me  
4 that's 21 percent of the barge movements in and  
5 out of CAWS that has a relationship to the New  
6 Orleans area. When you add in the Baton Rouge  
7 and Lafayette areas, that number jumps to 25  
8 percent of those barge shipments.

9                   In 2008, there were roughly 15  
10 million tons of cargo which went through the  
11 lock system between the inland waterways of CAWS  
12 and the Great Lakes. That information was mined  
13 from the report. If you extrapolate that 25  
14 percent of those have a shipping relationship  
15 with Louisiana, it amounts to approximately  
16 1,900 barge movements per year.

17                   That's a significant impact on the  
18 economy of Louisiana, and if there were to be a  
19 complete separation between the systems, these  
20 1,900 barge movements would disappear. Keep in  
21 mind that for the entire Gulf Coast Region, that  
22 number would only increase. So I am not sure  
23 about the exact nature of all of the  
24 alternatives, but it looks like all of them but  
25 Number 1, 2, and 3 require some sort of

1 separation. I only state that I and my  
2 organizations would be opposed to any scheme  
3 which proposes a complete separation of the  
4 systems, as it would create a significant  
5 negative impact on the State of Louisiana, the  
6 Gulf Coast, and the maritime communities within  
7 area.

8           Further, in listening to some of the  
9 presentations, I was thinking about the  
10 additional truck traffic. If you take those  
11 1,900 barge movements that relate to Louisiana,  
12 that's worth about 150,000 truck movements. The  
13 total amount of cargo moved from the CAWS area  
14 through the lock system into the Great Lakes  
15 would relate to about 560,000 truck movements  
16 per year.

17           Then further, the gentleman from  
18 Ontario, I want to remind him that if you go  
19 back far enough in history, you'll find that the  
20 Mississippi Valley actually flowed north into  
21 the Great Lakes, so we did at one time have  
22 complete flow back and forth between the Great  
23 Lakes Region and the Mississippi Valley. It was  
24 actually that connection that provided the  
25 opportunities for the folks up in Ontario, when

1 this country was first being settled, to be able  
2 to paddle their canoes down into the Mississippi  
3 River and take their beaver pelts back to  
4 Ontario. But, also, we have a chef up in the  
5 Baton Rouge area named Chef Parola who has  
6 contacted our congressman to see if there is  
7 some money available, possibly, that we could  
8 promote this campaign that Spencer was talking  
9 about on promoting the silverfin or Asian carp.  
10 But while you're in the area, I invite you up to  
11 Baton Rouge. I can get you with Chef Parola,  
12 and you can take some lessons on cooking and  
13 preparing the Asian carp and take them back up  
14 to Ontario and start a restaurant. Thank you.

15 MS. FLEER:

16 Thank you very much. At this point,  
17 we have heard from everyone who has registered  
18 to speak, but we have plenty of time. If you  
19 have not had the opportunity speak, I'd like to  
20 invite you to do so now or if you have spoken  
21 already and would like to do so again. I see  
22 two hands. Give us your name and zip code.

23 MR. DUFFY:

24 I'm Sean Duffy of Big River  
25 Coalition, 70006. I'd like to say this is not a

1 regulation that I followed for very long. I've  
2 been engaged by some of my partners in the room,  
3 and I would just like to explain that as David  
4 Doss of Senator Vitter's office discussed, the  
5 Mississippi River System, we're seeing over 500  
6 -- right around 500 million tons of cargo  
7 movement. That's 500 million tons of cargo  
8 being imported or exported. That doesn't count  
9 for the tonnage that goes domestically from  
10 state to state.

11                   A couple of things that I can draw  
12 back the information from the Corps is the  
13 presentation recently MVD addressed that the  
14 Mississippi River has a \$200 billion impact on  
15 the national economy every year, and, also, the  
16 Mississippi River Commission released a call to  
17 action in the fall of last year that talked  
18 about the importance of maintaining the river.  
19 Some other things that may not have been  
20 considered in this report are things like the  
21 lower Mississippi River being -- efforts to  
22 deepen the river to 50 feet, efforts to deepen  
23 some of the feeder channels, Baptiste Collette  
24 to 26 feet. So as we're looking at increasing  
25 tonnages as related to the deepening of the

1 Panama Canal, as related to world needs for  
2 additional agricultural products, the figures in  
3 today's market are not really what we're looking  
4 at. What we're looking at are projects that  
5 will take ten or more years to complete. I  
6 won't even go into commenting on something  
7 that's going to cost over ten billion dollars.  
8 With what I know about the national budget, I  
9 say that's a farfetched idea, at best, but I  
10 think it's important to look at -- one of the  
11 things we always practice is we're looking at  
12 unimpeded navigation, keep channels moving.

13         We've heard a lot of excellent testimony  
14 on the threats to the environment, additional  
15 truck traffic, additional rail traffic, but we  
16 have to remember to look at the future. We're  
17 looking at increasing tonnages. I'll tell you  
18 it's hard to get accurate numbers, including the  
19 fact that the five V-trap Port Authorities on  
20 the Mississippi River I am engaged with on a  
21 daily basis. Trying to get accurate tonnage  
22 figures is very hard. 500 million could become  
23 600 million, could be more, but if you look at  
24 world ports, when we add those tonnages, we're  
25 in the top five, if not the top three on world

1 ports by tonnages. Because the ports on the  
2 lower river are broken down into five V-trap  
3 Port Authorities, most people only look at those  
4 individual ports and their tonnages, but we have  
5 to remember the importance of the river.

6           The Big River Coalition will also  
7 file comments as we have a chance to look at and  
8 appreciate the extension of time and the efforts  
9 to come to New Orleans. I mean, we always do  
10 look at food as a remedy for something, so I'll  
11 end on that. I appreciate the chance to  
12 comment. Thank you.

13           MS. FLEER:

14           Gentleman in the blue jacket.

15           MR. STARK:

16           Good evening. I'm Jim Stark. I'm  
17 the executive director of the Gulf Intracoastal  
18 Canal Association. My zip code is 70174, New  
19 Orleans. The Gulf Intercoastal Canal  
20 Association is a trade association representing  
21 some 400 members, stakeholders, and partners who  
22 do business on or support businesses on the Gulf  
23 Intracoastal Waterway or the GIWW. The majority  
24 of our members are towboat and barge companies  
25 and their customers. As you've already heard,

1 several of them are here today. Our mission is  
2 to ensure that the GIWW and its tributaries are  
3 maintained, operated, and improved to provide  
4 safe, efficient, economical, and environmentally  
5 sound water transportation serving the interest  
6 of petrochemical facilities, refineries, farms,  
7 mines, ports, commercial fisheries, recreation  
8 and more. The GIWW is at the southern end of  
9 our nation's inland waterway system links the  
10 ports of the Gulf states, and through its  
11 tributaries links those ports to the heartland  
12 of the nation.

13                 It's the third busiest U.S. waterway  
14 in terms of tons shipped. 116 million tons a  
15 year, worth about \$80 billion a year, behind  
16 only the Mississippi River and the Ohio system.  
17 Our association, therefore, is please and  
18 encouraged that you've added a public meeting on  
19 GLMRIS here in New Orleans. Thank you.

20                 This is an indicator of your  
21 understanding that this report and the aquatic  
22 nuisance species problem that it is addressing  
23 are truly of national importance and not just  
24 regional interests. In the past year, the GIWW  
25 has been subjected to two critical locks and

1 waterway closures right here in the New Orleans  
2 area which greatly affected not only Gulf Coast  
3 shipping but customers northward into the  
4 heartland as well. Similarly, any waterway  
5 closures on the rivers and in the Chicago Area  
6 Waterway System will negatively affect shipping  
7 here along the Gulf. Heard much of that today.

8           Clearly, our inland waterways are a  
9 nationwide interdependent system and must be  
10 viewed as such. Decision makers should  
11 carefully consider impacts to the national  
12 system we have as they evaluate the eight  
13 alternatives developed by the study, and, in our  
14 view, avoid the closures contemplated in the  
15 report.

16           The Gulf Intracoastal Canal  
17 Association hopes this dialogue continues as the  
18 next steps are formulated for this important  
19 issue. We plan to provide our members' input  
20 and be a part of the effort to assure the  
21 ultimate solution remains nationally focused and  
22 informative. Thank you.

23           MS. FLEER:

24           Any other questions or comments at  
25 this time? Colonel Drummond? Anybody on the

1 panel? Would you like to say anything at this  
2 point?

3 COLONEL DRUMMOND:

4 Thank you very much for coming out  
5 tonight. I think it was Spencer that sort of  
6 hit on it earlier. Many, many of you in here  
7 also touched upon the national importance as  
8 well as the national system that we're talking  
9 about here. I can't reiterate enough. I know  
10 most of you in this room understand as well  
11 there is a reason we're doing these public  
12 sessions. There is a reason that we overly  
13 reiterate that your voice counts. You must go  
14 to the website or you should go to the website  
15 and voice your opinion like many of you did here  
16 tonight.

17 I often close by saying it's also  
18 important the reason we come here is to open up  
19 this book, this GLMRIS book, from the PM so you  
20 can hear it firsthand from us on what we're  
21 seeing and what we're viewing and then go back  
22 and dive into the 232 pages, and in your  
23 specific area, whether it's economics, barge  
24 traffic, or whatever it is, I'm certain you can  
25 find something that will help you understand the

1 magnitude of this very complex system within our  
2 report. So as you start to unfold this very  
3 complex study, which many of us have been  
4 involved in for years, John and Dave as well as  
5 myself, then I think you can start seeing  
6 perhaps maybe a little bit different perspective  
7 or it will help you as you write your comments  
8 and get them out to those who need them.

9                   So your state DNR's are very  
10 important, Department of Natural Resources. The  
11 ACRCC works very closely with many of them.  
12 Your state representatives. We have one with us  
13 tonight. They are very, very important. Make  
14 sure they hear your voice as well as any other  
15 state, local, your mayors and elected officials.

16                   I would like to close by saying just  
17 a couple of things. Because of the area I'm in,  
18 first of all, if you are a barge operator or a  
19 towboat operator, and many of you own companies,  
20 thank you. Thank you very much, because you  
21 have been safe going through the Sanitary Ship  
22 Canal and CAWS waterway with us with the  
23 production of the barrier in 2002. We couldn't  
24 do it without your support. We understand that.  
25 You have been very good to the Corps of

1 Engineers working with us, whether it's us or  
2 the Coast Guard, slowing your barges down to go  
3 through the barrier and making sure that your  
4 folks that are on the barges, as well as the  
5 towboats, are safe. So for me and the Corps of  
6 Engineers, we appreciate that as you go up and  
7 down the Mississippi doing what you do best, and  
8 that is moving commerce for the country.

9                   We will be around for a little bit.  
10 Perhaps maybe you didn't want to get up here and  
11 ask a question. We'll be here. Anybody in a  
12 red lanyard are part of this report. They can  
13 certainly talk to you as well as I can talk to  
14 you and Dave and John.

15                   Dave, do you have anything else?

16                   MR. WETHINGTON:

17                   One quick thing to add is that we  
18 appreciate you coming out tonight. We enjoy  
19 coming to New Orleans for a couple of reasons.  
20 Obviously, the weather is much better than minus  
21 20 we saw in Minneapolis earlier this week.  
22 But, honestly, your opinion and the kind of  
23 collaborative voice we hear down here from this  
24 industry, which is very strong representative,  
25 is a unique aspect to the input to the GLMRIS

1 report. I just want to note, as you are looking  
2 at the GLMRIS report in a little bit more  
3 detail, as you are going through some of these  
4 alternatives in this book or in the more  
5 detailed report, that of the eight alternatives,  
6 actually six of them still provide for some type  
7 of navigation to continue while impacting --  
8 while having some sort of positive effect on  
9 reducing the risk for aquatic nuisance species  
10 transfer.

11                 So trying to find a way to reduce  
12 risk or to prevent or try to achieve a level of  
13 prevention with regard to aquatic nuisance  
14 species transfer, we believe can still be done  
15 in kind of in combination in partnership with  
16 other existing uses such as strong navigational  
17 use for the Chicago Area Waterway System.

18                 Thank you all for your time tonight.  
19 I'll turn it back over to Lauren for any  
20 concluding statements.

21                 COLONEL DRUMMOND:

22                 Do we have any people on the  
23 website?

24                 MS. FLEER:

25                 No one wants to speak. Thanks again

1 to everyone for joining us here tonight. Also  
2 on the webinar. We will be around for as long  
3 as you guys want to talk, so please hang out and  
4 come talk with us. I want to remind everyone,  
5 again, that the comment period, the formal  
6 comment period, will be open through March 31st  
7 of this year. If you would like some more  
8 instructions about how to submit a formal  
9 comment, please pick up a yellow comment  
10 registration form on your way out and also help  
11 yourself to extra copies of the materials that  
12 have available tonight for others of your  
13 constituent and friends and family.

14                   Thanks very much.

15                   COLONEL DRUMMOND:

16                   Just mention the two other locations  
17 that we're going to be at so they are aware.

18                   MS. FLEER:

19                   We have a meeting coming up the  
20 second week of February in Northwest Indiana and  
21 again in Buffalo, I think, February 13th.

22                   Thanks very much again. That will  
23 conclude our meeting.

24                   [End of meeting.]

25

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

This certification is valid only for a transcript accompanied by my original signature and original required seal on this page.

I, SANDRA P. DIFEBBO, Certified Court Reporter, in and for the State of Louisiana, as the officer before whom this meeting was held, do hereby certify that the foregoing 78 pages was reported by me in stenotype, was prepared and transcribed by me or under my personal direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding;

That the transcript has been prepared in compliance with transcript format guidelines required by statute or by rules of the board, that I have acted in compliance with the prohibition on contractual relationships as defined by Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure Article 1434 and in rules and advisory opinions of the board.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra P. DiFebbo,  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

Date: \_\_\_\_\_