



US Army Corps of Engineers  
BUILDING STRONG.

**Inland Waterways Users Board Meeting No. 95**  
**Virtual Webinar**  
**Institute for Water Resources, Fort Belvoir, VA**

**October 30, 2020**

Minutes  
Inland Waterways Users Board  
Meeting No. 95  
Held Virtually by Webinar  
Fort Belvoir, Virginia

October 30, 2020

The following proceedings are of the virtual 95<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board held on the 30<sup>th</sup> of October 2020, commencing at 9:05 a.m. This is the second virtual meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board, held by webinar, at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Humphreys Engineer Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Mr. Robert J. Innis, Chairman of the Inland Waterways Users Board presiding. Inland Waterways Users Board (Board) members present at the meeting included the following:

MR. DAVID A. EARL, Board Member, Marathon Petroleum Company LP (MPC).

MR. ROBERT J. INNIS, Board Chairman, LaFargeHolcim, Inc.

MR. THOMAS HORGAN, for Board Member Mr. Timothy Power, SCF Marine, Inc.

MR. DAMON S. JUDD, Board Member, Marquette Transportation Company LLC.

MR. MICHAEL J. MONAHAN, Board Vice Chairman, Campbell Transportation Company, Inc. (CTC).

MR. W. SPENCER MURPHY, Board Member, Canal Barge Company, Inc. (CBC).

MR. DENNIS OAKLEY, Board Member, Bruce Oakley, Inc.

MR. ROBERT D. RICH, Board Member, Shaver Transportation Company.

MR. C. MATTHEW RICKETTS, Board Member, Crouse Corporation.

MR. GREG TURNER, Board Member, Dow Chemical Company.

MR. JEFF WEBB, Board Member, Cargill, Inc., Cargo Carriers, Cargill Marine & Terminal.

Board Chairman Emeritus MR. MARTIN T. HETTEL, of American Commercial Barge Line LLC (ACBL), and former Board member MR. W. MATTHEW WOODRUFF of Kirby Corporation also participated in the meeting.

Also present at the virtual meeting were the following individuals serving as observers of the activities of the Inland Waterways Users Board, designated by their respective Federal agencies as representatives:

The Honorable MR. R.D. JAMES, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

MR. DAVID LEACH, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Project Planning and Review, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

MR. VANCE STEWART, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Budget and Management, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

REAR ADMIRAL SHEPARD M. SMITH, Director, Office of Coast Survey, National Hydrographer, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce, Silver Spring, MD.

MS. HEATHER GILBERT, Policy Advisor, Office of Coast Survey, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce, Silver Spring, MD.

MR. WILLIAM K. PAAPE, Associate Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD).

MS. BERNADETTE WINSTON, Transportation Services Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Official representatives of the Federal government responsible for the conduct of the meeting and providing administrative support to the Inland Waterways Users Board from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers were as follows:

MAJOR GENERAL (MG) WILLIAM H. GRAHAM, Users Board Executive Director and Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

MR. MARK R. POINTON, Executive Secretary and Designated Federal Officer (DFO), Inland Waterways Users Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Alexandria, Virginia.

MR. THOMAS P. SMITH, Chief of Operations and Regulatory Division, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

MR. STEVEN D. RILEY and DR. FORREST B. VANDERBILT, Alternate Designated Federal Officers (ADFO), Inland Waterways Users Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, Alexandria, Virginia.

MS. TIFFANY S. BURROUGHS, Acting Chief, Navigation Operations Section, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

MR. PAUL D. CLOUSE, Deputy, Navigation Operations Section, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

MR. DAVID A. FRANTZ, Inland Navigation Program Manager, Navigation Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

COLONEL STEVEN M. SATTINGER, Commander, Rock Island District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

COLONEL ANDREW “COBY” SHORT, Commander, Pittsburgh District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Program speakers in scheduled order of appearance were as follows:

Mr. Mark R. Pointon, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Inland Waterways Users Board Designated Federal Officer (DFO) and Executive Secretary, Institute for Water Resources.

MG William H. Graham, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Users Board Executive Director and Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations.

Mr. Robert J. Innis, Chairman, Inland Waterways Users Board, Director, Transportation Operations, LaFargeHolcim, Inc.

Mr. Paul D. Clouse, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Navigation Operations Branch, Deputy Chief of Navigation.

Mr. David A. Frantz, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Navigation Operations Branch, Inland Navigation Program Manager.

Mr. Stephen G. Durrett, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters, Great Lakes & Ohio River Division, Regional Business Director.

Mr. Thomas D. Heinold, Jr., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District, Chief of Operations.

Mr. Mark R. Wingate, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, Deputy District for PM (DPM).

Mr. Stephen R. Fritz, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh District, Program Manager for Mega Projects.

Mr. Adam C. Walker, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District, Project Manager.

Mr. Don B. Getty, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District, Project Manager.

There were two public comments made during the public comment period of the meeting; there were no written public comments submitted for the record prior to or during the meeting.

## PROCEEDINGS

**Mr. Mark R. Pointon:** Good morning ladies and gentlemen, General Graham, Chairman Innis. Appreciate you all getting on this morning. This is our second virtual Users Board meeting. We had the one in July, Meeting No. 94. Now this one, as a result of our enduring COVID-19 pandemic.

My name is Mark Pointon. I am the designated Federal officer of the DFO of the Inland Waterways Users Board. Welcome to the 95<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board.

Before we begin with the meeting program, I'm obligated to read for the record that the Users Board being was created pursuant to Section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. It provides the Secretary of the Army and the Congress with recommendations on funding levels and priorities for modernizing in the waterways of the United States.

The Board is subject to the rules and regulations of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, as amended. This is a Sunshine in the Government Act meeting, and as such it's open to the public. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the sponsor of the Board and provides the Executive Director, which is Major General Graham and the DFO and for all the normal activities.

We currently have one party that's requested to make a public comment at the end of the meeting during the public comment period. We have no written reports that were submitted for the record. Anyone else wishes to make a public comment at the end of the meeting during the comment period go ahead and shoot me a message on the chat or send me an email so we can hopefully accommodate you.

The proceedings are being recorded and will have a record of the meeting shortly after it's concluded.

Since it's a virtual meeting again, I'm going to kind of go through some virtual meeting rules so that we hopefully we avoid any SNAFUs or challenges or any a lot of feedback from open mics. I'm also going to conduct a roll call of the members that need to be participating and the senior staff and the Federal observers. As I go through, please state your name and your affiliation as you are making comments. That is directed mostly at the Board members as we go through the dialogue, back and forth and also the presenters. I urge everyone to please stay muted so that we absolutely limit and reduce as much of the background noise as we can. Sometimes that's a whole lot worse than it needs to be. We are essentially control all the presentations again so Steve and Steve and Don and Adam and all the other presenters, go ahead just indicate to us that you are ready to move onto the next slide if we don't anticipate that as we go through your presentations. If we had to move votes which we will, any motions that are going to be pass I will actually call on each Board member to go ahead and indicate aye actually I think what we did last time it was a lot better to indicate anybody that was voting nay to track that for the record so that we have a record of the vote count for any motions that are passed.

We do have a list of the participants. Not going to scroll through it at the moment right

now so Board members I'm actually going to do a little bit of a roll call here so please indicate that you're here as I go through that you're present on the meeting.

I know I saw Chairman Rob Innis, so I believe you're on the line. I take that static that that's you trying to say yes.

Mr. Monahan, I believe you're on the line. We've already had a little dialogue going before the meeting was convened.

David Earl. Alright I saw you on the web.

Damon Judd. We saw you previously. Are you on the line, Damon?

**Mr. Damon Judd:** Yes, I am, thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Great. Thank you.

Spencer Murphy. We saw you. You present, Spencer? Alright. I hope everyone's here in the year.

Dennis Oakley? Is that Dennis? So, Dennis, that's a question mark.

From SCF Marine do we have Tom Horgan?

**Mr. Thomas Horgan:** Yes.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. Great. Thank you, Sir.

Rob Rich from Shaver. I think I saw you on the line previously. So Good Morning for you. I think you are the early bird out of all of us. Hope you got a good cup of coffee with you.

Matt Ricketts. I see you on the webinar Matt. So, checking you off as being here buddy.

Greg Turner from Dow. Alright I'm not sure if you're on Greg. We do have a Greg. So, I think that's you.

And lastly, Jeff Webb. Jeff Webb? Jeff Webb? Going once. Going twice. Alright.

Looking at the Federal observers, I do see that we have the Honorable Mr. James on. I also see that we have Mr. Vance Stewart and Mr. David Leach from the Assistant Secretary's Office.

From NOAA I see Heather Gilbert on the line. Heather is Admiral Smith with you?

**Ms. Heather Gilbert:** Yes, I saw him on...he should be...he might be muted.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Ok. Alright. Thank you. Thanks for that confirmation. Welcome Admiral. Appreciate you for taking the time to join us this morning.

From the Department of Agriculture. Do we have Ms. Bernadette Winston?

**Ms. Bernadette Winston:** Yes. Right here. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you, ma'am. And from the Maritime Administration, do we have Mr. William Paape? Bill are you with us this morning?

**Mr. William Paape:** Yeah, good morning Mark.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Hey, good morning Bill.

And from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps or USACE) we have Major General Butch Graham is on the line. I believe Mr. Thomas Smith Chief of Operations is also on the line. Do we have Ms. Tiffany Burroughs as the Acting Navigation Branch Chief? Alright. I don't see if she's on the line or not.

Hey, is that you Tiffany?

**Ms. Tiffany Burroughs:** Yes.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. Great. Thank you, ma'am. And Paul Clouse who's the Deputy Navigation Branch Chief. I know we talked earlier Paul. So just confirm you're on the line.

**Mr. Paul Clouse:** Yes sir, Mr. Pointon. I'm online.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. Thank you, sir.

Alright at this point, General Graham I'm going to turn the microphone over to you as the Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations to provide your welcoming and opening remarks sir.

**Major General William "Butch" Graham:** Thank you. I come to you right now with the St. Louis District Team from Mel Price Lock. Just watching maintain the auxiliary chamber. We've got people on it right now. Teams working at that. Next project is on track. Under budget. Like that. Alright.

And we were able to go with Mr. Robert Innis who's with us. Yesterday we toured the project, then we went up to LaGrange Lock and Dam where they just recently opened up the entire Illinois River, Rock Island District did. So, it's great to see that network connection. Still got to finish up a lot of work, but the facility is open and ready as was promised. So just delighted to see that wonderful progress.



I know time was an issue and it took about two years to put that all together with the industry and so everybody on the net here today I think this is a great example of what collaboration and partnering looks like. The Industry partnership with the Corps of Engineers to ensure that what is necessary to provide you all with what you all require which is a reliable system.

And so, we have a great presentation here today. Mark appreciate you putting all this together. And as you said this is our second virtual Users Board meeting and it doesn't make it any easier the second time. As we have seen in the past we noticed a lot of goodness that came out of these Board meetings with some of the networking that went on at them, so I just wanted to point out one concern is that as we continue into this time with COVID is that we don't lose that personal connection that works through the small contact points before they become big issues.

So, with that, I will just end with that. If anybody has got a concern out there that you believe that we're not addressing haven't addressed it in this room, as soon as we can meet face to face, please give me a call. Anybody who's out there listening, if you have some issue you're not satisfied with, the answers you're getting or not getting any answers, since I can't meet you face to face just please give me a call. Okay, Mark. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you sir. Chairman Innis. You're next up to provide some opening remarks as the Chairman of the Users Board. Rob?

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Thank you Mark. Can you hear me?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes sir.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Alright. I just wanted to welcome everyone to the 95<sup>th</sup> Users Board Meeting. I wanted to thank the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works Mr. James and Major General Graham for being with us here today. Your involvement in the Users Board is vital to this success. I wish we could have all been together in person yesterday when we did the tours. I really enjoyed getting to see what work has been done and the time and effort that the team has put together. Just at LaGrange and what they were able to accomplish in the time frame and with the struggle that they had with high water it was really a fantastic opportunity to see what the Army Corps could do and this whole Illinois River closure and shutdown has been so successful. We've seen real benefits from this and we're not seeing this shut down five years in a row, so I really wanted to take the time to thank all of the members that worked on this together, industry and the Corps, to put this together to be able to do it this way. I just think that shows our collaboration. And as we go forward, we have the Capital Investment Strategy which I understand is currently being reviewed by the Administration. That collaboration is more important now than ever with the lengthy construction projects winding down. If Congress decides to provide inland waterways a new construction start for Fiscal Year 2021, it will be critical for the Users Board to specifically identify the next set of new projects to bring online with the start of a new process. For the past two Board meetings, we the Board received reports for each project is in the process. There was reporting on a Capital Investment Strategy for review, for the Mississippi River Lock 25, the Three Rivers project, and Montgomery Lock on

the Upper Ohio, as all proceed ahead in the process. It is a lengthy process. It's important that we are preparing for the next wave of projects for construction. I look forward to receiving said updates on these projects. With that are there any other comments from Board members?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any comments from any of the Board members?

**Mr. Robert Rich:** This is Robert from Shaver Transportation out in the West coast and gentlemen I'm really glad to hear that this extended closure of the Illinois River is successful. We have had two extended closures out here on the Columbia-Snake System. Of course, an incredible job of managing them and we were really hoping that we would be able to export this to our part of the country so we were watching them pretty closely and see how a similar river project was built and encouraged by it. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thanks Rob. Any other Board members?

**Ms. Bernadette Winston:** Hello. This is Bernadette with the USDA. So, I would like to say thank you to Mark and the Corps of Engineers for putting together the meeting. USDA continues to acknowledge the importance of initiating the inland waterways and infrastructure of the construction of rehab projects and for the ease of barge transportation, to facilitate export and domestic shipments of agricultural and related products.

As you know, construction and rehabilitation for specified lock and dam sites occurred from July 1 - October 29 on the Illinois River and USDA has kept track of this for the agency's Grain Transportation Report which is published weekly, and will continue to keep track of construction and rehabilitation efforts that will resume in 2023 on the Illinois River.

We also note that USDA will continue to keep track of other construction and rehabilitation efforts along the Mississippi River and the Columbia-Snake River waterways.

USDA appreciates the opportunity to partner with the Corps during the series of interagency Regional Navigation Stakeholder Listening Sessions earlier this year. The sessions were important for bringing together grain shippers, agricultural exporters, transportation providers, and other waterways stakeholders to discuss a shared vision for the future of the inland waterways and ports. The feedback from these sessions was very informative and has been passed on to USDA leadership as well as leaders in the other participating Federal agencies. We hope this will help identify strategic areas of improvement for the waterways over the next 3-5 years.

Finally, similar to the waterways study published last year, USDA is sponsoring a study looking at the importance of the Pacific Northwest waterways to agriculture. This study is only in the very early preliminary phase at this point, but we will continue to keep the membership up to date on its progress.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you Bernadette. Actually, that was the perfect segue. I was going to move into opening remarks and comments from the Federal observers. Ms. Winston has provided some for the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Hey Bill, I'm going to go to you next to provide some remarks for the Maritime Administration.

**Mr. William Paape:** Thanks Mark. Thank you, Major General Graham and Chairman Innis - it's a pleasure to represent the Maritime Administration today as a Federal Observer to this Board. I currently serve as the Associate Administrator for the Office of Ports and Waterways with responsibility for three principle programs: Port Infrastructure Development, America's Marine Highways, and the Deepwater Port Licensing program. To assist in the outreach effort for these programs we have ten Gateway Offices located throughout the country – several of our Gateway Directors are listening in to today's meeting.

I bring regards from Transportation Secretary Chao, Maritime Administrator Buzby, and Deputy Maritime Administrator Balzano, and our entire team at the U.S. Department of Transportation.

At MARAD, our mission is to foster, promote and develop the maritime industry of the United States to meet the nation's economic and security needs. This mission set includes promoting the use of waterborne transportation and its seamless integration with other segments of the transportation system, and the viability of the U.S. Merchant Marine. The Maritime Administration works in many areas involving ships and shipping, port operations, vessel operations, shipbuilding, national security, environment, and safety.

Our portfolio of investment and partnership programs includes BUILD; INFRA, the Port Infrastructure Development Grant Program, TIFIA and RIFF financing programs through the Build America Bureau; America's Marine Highway Grant Program; the Small Shipyard Grant Program; and the Port Conveyance Program.

Thank you for the opportunity to present and I look forward to today's meeting.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you. Thanks, Bill. Appreciate it. Glad you're here with us this morning. Now we will move on to NOAA. Admiral Smith? You're up, to provide some remarks from your agency sir. Thank you.

**Admiral Shepard Smith:** Thank you, just quick audio check. I was having some trouble. Can you hear me?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** We can hear you here at my end, sir.

**Admiral Shepard Smith:** Great. Wonderful. Thank you. Well, good morning General Graham, Chairman Innis, members of the Board, fellow Federal observers, staff and the public. For the record, my name is Rear Admiral Shep Smith. I am the Federal Observer to the Board representing the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), where I serve as the Director of the Office of Coast Survey and am a member of the Mississippi River Commission. I would like to start my comments by providing updates up on of the items I mentioned at the last meeting.

We continue to move forward with the sunset of the traditional NOAA Raster Charts. NOAA's decision to sunset production of the traditional NOAA paper nautical charts and related raster products by January 2025. NOAA is introducing a new "Last Edition" status for its paper charts, which will be announced through U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) local Notices to Mariners. This will provide users with six months' notice of each specific chart cancellation. This new "Last Edition" status required some software and procedural changes by NOAA and the USCG, and we will test these new processes by cancelling NOAA chart 18665, "Lake Tahoe," sometime in the next few months.

Now I'll talk about the future, with our Precision Marine Navigation Data Dissemination System. On September 30<sup>th</sup> and October 1<sup>st</sup> more than 200 users from across the maritime navigation community, nationally and internationally, came together for a virtual workshop on precision marine navigation. The workshop included sessions geared toward different user groups including software developers, end users such as pilots, and to partners across the Federal government. The workshop featured presentations on the new processing and dissemination system from NOAA data providers, from partners across government agencies, and in industry.

Additionally, we had a presentation by your USACE colleague, Ms. Denise LaDue, on the work being done on the international standard development for the Inland ENC (Electronic Navigation Charts) and the as well as the coordination efforts between USACE and NOAA to support improved navigation services. Ms. LaDue specifically highlighted coordination with NOAA to ensure the IENC and ENC are aligned and in improving CATZOC ratings in priority channels. Ms. LaDue's talk sparked high-level questions, showing the importance of the inland ENC to all attendees.

An area where NOAA is doing some work that may be of interest to you all is how we are looking for an innovative, simpler, less costly, and lower power capability to measure visibility, specifically fog, in marine and coastal environments using advanced video and image processing systems. Capable of being deployed at other surface weather stations where visibility measurements would aid forecasters and help fulfill NOAA missions for observations. NOAA and its Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services (CO-OPS) has entered into a Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) project with Arete Associates for this initiative.

Current visibility instruments measure at a single location and interprets visibility over a distance. These systems are typically placed in remote marine locations; require relatively high power, relatively high cost (both for installation and maintenance); and are subject to operating constraints (e.g. heating to dehumidify in the cold and high humidity).

While we are, hopefully, nearing the end of the 2020 Hurricane Season, and even during this challenging year with COVID-19, NOAA's Navigation Response Teams completed hydrographic surveys in areas affected by Hurricane Delta at the request of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. These areas included portions of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway adjacent to the Calcasieu Ship Channel in Louisiana. With lessons learned from the response to Hurricane Laura — the first major hurricane of the 2020 season and the first hurricane response during a pandemic — the NRTs successfully collected and processed data in separate locations. NOAA

ship Thomas Jefferson also supported the response effort by surveying the entrance to the channel and found a sunken barge three meters below the surface. All survey data was processed and delivered to USACE to ensure timely reopening of waterways.

Additionally, the National Geodetic Survey collected aerial damage assessment images in the aftermath of Hurricane Delta. NGS flight crews collected images in specific areas identified by NOAA in coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency and other state and Federal partners. The crew flew more than 5,212 square kilometers during 12 hours and collected 9,741 images. NOAA's aerial imagery aids safe navigation and captures damage to coastal areas caused by a storm. Aerial imagery is a crucial tool to determine the extent of the damage inflicted by flooding, and to assess the damage to major ports and waterways, coastlines, critical infrastructure, and coastal communities. This imagery provides a cost-effective way to better understand the damage sustained to both property and the environment.

Thank you General, Chairman Innis and the Board for this opportunity to provide these remarks at today's meeting and I look forward to the rest of the meeting. That concludes my remarks.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you, Admiral. Appreciate you taking the time this morning to join us. Always good to collaborate and coordinate with other Federal agencies that have an interest in the maritime mission of the United States. Last, but definitely not least, I would like to ask The Honorable R.D. James, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, to provide some remarks from the Army's perspective. Sir.

**The Honorable R.D. James:** Good morning to you and everyone there. General Graham and Chairman Innis thank you so much for having me today. I certainly appreciate it and enjoy this meeting with you here. As Assistant Secretary I will continue to emphasize the benefits and value of this country's inland waterways and having had a direct impact of our economy. I'm a farmer on the Mississippi River in southeast Missouri. I know the importance of inland navigation. I've partnered with other Federal agencies on behalf of the Corps and Administration. The results of the 2019 Department of Agriculture reports the importance of inland waterways.

Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue and I visited with stakeholders with this report and sharing the fact from this report. The USDA report identifies many benefits to the navigation it provides for agricultural producers and the competitive economic advantage it creates around the world. Secretary Perdue and I finished up with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Director Russell Vought and provided the benefits it achieved and provided by inland navigation. And we were trying to influence the benefits of the waterways and the use of only Benefit/Cost ratio we're using for OMB particularly in the navigation sectors. President Trump's executive orders created a strategy for water resources management and infrastructure that includes principle leaders of Federal agencies who are responsible for water resources uses and infrastructure. Agencies like the Department of Agriculture, Army Civil Works, EPA, Energy and Commerce. This gives Army Civil Works a seat at the table which affords me the opportunity to share my inland navigation experience, knowledge, and our challenges with DC's top policy makers to actually address positive change. You all know we have the largest inland

navigation system in the world, but significant changes and upgrades are grossly behind. We don't operate in the 1930s highways for automobiles or 1930s runways for airplanes. We should not be confining one of our largest most efficient, environmentally friendly transportation systems in the 1930s locks and dams.

The entire industry depending on navigation must step forward. That's you and all the other associations that have anything to do with inland navigation. You must step forward with one voice and demand a federal focus on the inland navigation.

In the meantime, we continue to move dirt at the rate we can and focus on our part to ensure our future success. But I will pray that I will continue to be a force in D.C. supporting the improvements of inland waterways. Thank you and have a wonderful day.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Sir. Thank you very much. Again, also appreciate you finding the time this morning to join this Federal advisory committee. Appreciate it. Thank you. Appreciate having a lot of your key staff on the call as well. It's very important that they understand the proceedings and the outcome from these Board meetings. So, thank you all. Appreciate it.

At this point in the agenda we are going to move on to the approval of the minutes from the virtual Board Meeting No. 94 held on 22 July. Those minutes were sent out to the Board members as read aheads and we need to take a vote on those at this point so can I get a motion from someone to approve the minutes from Board Meeting No. 94?

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** This is Mike Monahan. Vice chairman representing the Ohio River region. I motion to approve the minutes for Board Meeting No. 94.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Do we have a second?

**Mr. Matt Ricketts:** Second. This is Matt Ricketts.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Hey Matt. Good morning. Motion to approve. Hopefully all are saying Aye.

(Several Board members said Aye.)

Do we have any nays? (*None.*)

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Mark? Is that how we are going to do the minutes from now on? It's no longer going to be like a transcript?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** No, we will have a transcript. We actually are going to do that for this go around, sir. So, "yes" we will have something more appropriate of an official transcript if you will as oppose to the minutes. That was a long answer to say yes. We're going to do it the way we've done it in the past.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Perfect. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Okay. I'm getting tongue-tied this morning, didn't have enough coffee. The motion to approve the minutes is approved unanimously. So, we're going to move right on in.

Next up, I'm going to move into the Trust Fund, the status of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. It says financial report and project summaries but every project that we would have been reporting on for this particular agenda item will be addressed as an independent item later on in the agenda so I don't intend to talk about any specific projects summaries at this point, so we'll focus on the corporate Inland Waterways Trust Fund status, as well as the projects that have received some allocations. That hasn't changed yet because we don't have any Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 appropriations at this point other than the enduring Continuing Resolution (CRA or CR) at this point.

So, this is the status as of September 30<sup>th</sup> for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. The beginning balance was approximately \$69 million. From the Treasury report the final amount of fuel tax revenues was \$111.7 million. The Trust Fund generated about \$700,000 in interest.

Total available from the Trust Fund in FY 2020, given a little bit of timing of when the fuel tax revenues get posted to the Trust Fund, was \$181 million. Trailing down a little bit, that chart shows that at the end of the year there was \$50 million that was transferred out of the Trust Fund as requested by the Corps of Engineers for activities related to those projects that are eligible from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

I believe the FY 2020 budget authority we received in the appropriations act is approximately \$125-130 million. So, there's still budget authority outstanding of approximately \$75 or \$80 million for inland waterways projects. And each of those projects are going to discuss where they are in their schedule; Kentucky and Chickamauga and Lower Mon 2-3-4 and Olmsted. Actually, Olmsted is pretty much done.

So, they'll discuss that and where they are at awarding contracts and where they are in the schedule and that will probably help illuminate why we still have a little bit of budget authority that we have not used from the FY 2020 appropriations act.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Mark?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes. What's up Rob?

**Chairman Rob Innis:** How much is left of the allocated and how much is already obligated?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** The \$50 million that was transferred out, it's all obligated probably, if it's not 100 percent, it's 99 percent. What was requested for obligations could be awarded through the contracts. So, approximately \$50 million has been obligated, thus there's approximately \$75 million more to be pulled out from the budget authority that was provided to the Corps of Engineers for Inland Waterways Trust Fund projects in the FY 2020 appropriations.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** So, there's \$65 million that would be available for obligations then? Another \$60 or \$65 million?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes, there is another \$65-\$70-\$75 million still available for work that was funded in the appropriations act.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Okay, thanks.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** This slide shows the Trust Fund revenues. A few years comparison. So, it's the last five years including end of year for FY 2020. So, it looks like we collected \$112.4 million. I don't know if that's a completely accurate number. It's a little bit less than what we had the previous year. It is an accurate number from the Treasury. I misspoke there. I think it's perhaps a little bit high. It's down from a last year, actually the last three fiscal years it's a little bit lower than the last three fiscal years.

I'm not sure that this is reflecting all the impacts that we're going to see from the COVID-19 pandemic. You guys as the industry probably know a little bit better how that's affected your traffic and your cargo movements on the inland waterways. Treasury has often done post reporting adjustments. So, I'm kind of holding my breath that this actually is the correct dollar amount that was generated for the Trust Fund and that we're not going to see a downward adjustment in October, November, or December for the Trust Fund. So, fingers crossed that this is the correct number and that we are going to have \$112 million and that's an accurate number. But we'll wait and see if any future adjustments bring that number down any.

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** This is Mike Monahan. I would like to also note the impacts of flooding and also the Illinois Waterway closure, so there are two different impacts that could affect traffic.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yeah, I agree with you Mike. I think there are a few things that you might see that could have an impact on the revenues. This is a record year for storms. I think we tied the number of major storms at this point. And the season, as Admiral Smith mentioned, the season's not over yet. So, there's potential for some other named, I guess we still call them named storms at this point. I know we're into the Greek alphabet at this point.

So yes, I think there's a lot of things that potentially that could result in affecting the traffic on the waterways and affecting the fuel taxes that are collected. So yeah. Thank you, sir.

This is a comparison of the last three months of the current year. So again, these numbers reflect pretty much the same numbers for the year that we had in the previous slide. So, you can see it's down in July, August and September as compared to the previous years, the previous four years actually. So, again we'll see how that plays out. If any post end of fiscal year adjustments are made to revenues and Trust Fund.

My computer is about five seconds behind what's on the screen, so I apologize about the pause. These numbers haven't changed. These are the fiscal numbers and the allocations that are out there at the current moment for all the projects that are currently active, including LaGrange Lock.



Understand that LaGrange and Olmsted and Lower Mon 2-3-4 have all been funded to complete the work. So, these are the current existing numbers. We don't have anything for FY 2021 yet.

I don't want to steal any thunder from the presentation coming up next, but we are under a Continuing Resolution for FY 2021 at this point and so we don't have any better numbers, any updated numbers to provide from the FY 2021 appropriations. Depending on what happens, I believe the Continuing Resolution is currently through December 11<sup>th</sup>. So, we'll see if that stays December 11<sup>th</sup> or if it gets extended beyond that.

I believe that's all I have. Do we have any questions? Like I said all the project presentations for the Mississippi Valley Division (MVD) and the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division (LRD) will be handled independently by the PMs (project managers) later on in the agenda. Any questions? Rob, any questions?

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Nope.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Nope. Alright. Mr. Paul Clouse is next up on the program. He's the Deputy Navigation Chief in our Headquarters and he's going to give us a brief update of funding for Navigation. I probably just stole all of his thunder like, I said, but he will give us a brief update on the funding for the inland program. Paul, all you.

**Mr. Paul Clouse:** Thank you, Mark. Can I get a quick confirmation please?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** I got you. You're coming in loud and clear.

**Mr. Paul Clouse:** Thank you sir. Good morning Major General Graham, Chairman Innis, Board members and Federal observers. This morning I'm going to do a quick briefing on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 navigation business line appropriations summary. Most of this information was presented at the last Users Board meeting. We'll cover a little bit more.

As most of you all know the Corps is involved in three phases of budgets at any given time, and actually four phases, for budget development, defense, and execution. Although Fiscal Year 2020 is behind us, they're still efforts ongoing to close out, finish up some of the final elements and finalize and reporting.

Moving onto FY 2021 we're under a Continuing Resolution authority also known as a CRA. The Corps has begun executing work under FY 2021 under the terms of the CRA, which is the lesser of the President's Budget or the House markup or the Senate markup for the appropriations bill. I'll have a little bit more on this later.

Moving onto Fiscal Year 2022. The Corps is currently defending the Fiscal Year 2022 budget recommendations going to OMB. This will be an ongoing process until we receive passback from OMB around Thanksgiving or early December.

I want to direct your attention to the bottom of the chart. While it doesn't show up as a formal step for Fiscal Year 2023, the Corps Headquarters is currently updating guidance for program and budget development for divisions and districts which is the precursor to the actual development process.

Overall, in Civil Works we're seeing positive trends including an increase over the President's Budget in Civil Works appropriations. This graph gives an important visual, historical view as how things have progressed over the years for Civil Works. And the big take away is that this is the part of the larger trend for the Corps.

The Corps is grateful for the increases and for your efforts to get additional funding. And I believe part of what is being presented today will illustrate the success of receiving these funds. Of course, this success does not stop at funding. It continues through the work and dedicated Corps of Engineer's professionals throughout the country. And I'm confident that any funding received will be executed.

This slide has funding for the Fiscal Year 2020 appropriations, you see on the screen a break down by account and by business line. On the left chart, Corps funding as appropriated by account in terms of how things are presented whether it'd be Construction, Operation and Maintenance (O&M), Investigations, or Mississippi River and Tributaries. These are the primary accounts that navigation falls under. We're looking at the distribution. Operation and Maintenance accounts for roughly 50 percent of the budget appropriations in Fiscal Year 2020. On the right side we see a break down by business line where navigation accounts for roughly 50 percent of the appropriations. Of course, that shows strong support for both the industry, administration, and the Congress for the navigation business line.

Okay, I'm going to circle back to the CRA and point out that while we're under the Continuing Resolution, Fiscal Year 2021 funding is the lesser of the President's Budget, or the House markup, or the Senate markup of the appropriations bill. The House markup relates earlier to this summer does not decrease funding from the President's Budget. If anything, the markups trend positive. As of yesterday, the Senate has not completed their markups so as it stands the numbers on the screen are the current numbers in the absence of an appropriations bill or Senate markup.

I want to direct your attention to the FY 2021 line for inland navigation. For Investigations, the President's Budget is \$14 million for Investigations including \$9 million for inland navigation mostly focused on the Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) phase at Three Rivers. For the Construction account, the President's Budget has \$649 million for Construction of which \$15 million is for inland navigation mostly focused primarily on the Mel Price Lock Deficiency Correction.

This shows the President's Budget provides \$2.409 billion for USACE navigation Operation and Maintenance (O&M), including \$785 million for inland navigation which is focused on mainly the high and moderate use inland waterways including Mississippi River, Ohio River, McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River System, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Illinois Waterway and Tennessee River. Major maintenance in the Operation and Maintenance account

for FY 2021 including modern anchorages at locks 2, 5a, 8 and 10 on the Upper Mississippi River.

And finally, the President's Budget includes quarter of a billion dollars for Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) of which \$46 million is for inland waterways. A little over \$28 million is focused on operations and maintenance while the remainder is for construction. Primary focus of the construction is to raise and construct dikes and levees, for example Tarpley Cutoff Dikes 1R and 2R at mile 541.

Lastly, the current fiscal year appropriation status is that there is a Continuing Resolution through December 11<sup>th</sup> and there is currently no appropriations act.

If there are any question this concludes my presentation.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** This is Rob, I have a question for you. And I understand this question is probably more suited for OMB (Office of Management and Budget). Do you have any recommendations for us to get full use of the Trust Fund funding included in the budget?

**Mr. Paul Clouse:** No sir, I do not.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Is there anybody you could reach out to, to try to figure out how we can do that?

**Mr. Paul Clouse:** I'm not tracking on that. Maybe Mr. Pointon could have some ideas on that.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Hey Rob, I would say you probably need to interface a lot more with the Assistant Secretary's Office and try to collaborate with them about how we can convince OMB that for whatever reason why it's unpalatable for them to include some funding for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund from this specific funding source for a dedicated purpose. Probably cooperate with the Assistant Secretary's Office to figure out how we can solve that mystery and see if we can convince OMB to go ahead and add it for you, so the Inland Waterways Trust Fund is included in the President's Budget. Obviously, these projects are important to the Congress because they keep plussing us up to maximize use of the estimated available dollars in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Over.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Thanks, Mark.

**Mr. Paul Clouse:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you, Paul. Appreciate it. Moving on in the agenda. Actually, we're going to David Frantz who is another colleague of ours in Headquarters in the Navigation Section, he's the inland program manager. So, he's going to give us a brief status of the Capital Investment Strategy activities. David.

**Mr. David Frantz:** Good morning, can you hear me okay?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes, we hear you, you are good.

**Mr. David Frantz:** Ah, yes. Good morning Major General Graham, Chairman Innis, Board members, Federal observers. Just wanted to bring everybody up to speed on where we are with the Capital Investment Strategy. And you'll see this presentation is basically a single slide. The Board was presented the status at Users Board Meeting No. 94 back in July. We did revise that report to include comments from the Board members after review of the report at that meeting and submitted that draft report to the Assistant Secretary's Office on the 21<sup>st</sup> of August.

We did receive some minor comments from the ASA's Office (Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works), which were very minor relation to proper citations to the purpose and of the original authorization language from the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986. We made those corrections and resubmitted the draft report to the ASA on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September.

That report was transmitted to OMB on the 28<sup>th</sup> of September. Just as an update to the slide, I wanted to offer that we just received initial comments back from OMB late yesterday. We are in the process of analyzing and assessing those comments. And that's about all I can offer you at this point.

We have not had the opportunity to look at those comments as a group. So, that is next on our plate. But I just want to give you the latest information that the comments were received as of yesterday and that's my report pending any questions from the Board.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** David, Rob Innis, I have a quick question. Can we get exactly what the changes were from the ASA's Office so we can see them? I don't think we had time to throw them up side-by-side.

**Mr. David Frantz:** At some point, Rob, I think we will. Currently, we need a little time, just so we have an opportunity to look at them. At some point, I think they will be available for all parties to look at. And again, we as the Corps have not even had the chance to digest as a group.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** David, I think he's referring to the comments from OMB, not ASA.

**Mr. David Frantz:** Okay. Yes, we could absolutely do that.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Okay. And then my next question is do you have a time frame for when you'll respond to OMB comments, and what is the timeframe for to release that draft?

**Mr. David Frantz:** Okay. That's a two-part question. The first part is we will be working on resolution of all the comments ASAP. I don't have a timeframe for how long it will take to resolve those comments. Again, we're still kind of digesting. Some were fairly straight forward, like fifty, easy to assess. Others required a little bit more explanation. And some may be more complex than that.

So again, we're just starting the analysis process. We do have a somewhat short suspense, so we'll be working on that. We are being very, very thorough.

To answer your second question, I cannot speculate as to when OMB will issue or release the final version of the report. Over.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Hey Rob. Some of the former Board members, I think we have Matt Woodruff and Marty Hettel on the line. We appreciate them staying engaged. Using our past experience from the Capital Investment Strategy Report from 2016 we had extensive comments and remarks and input from the Office of Management and Budget on that previous version of the report. So if that's a go by, as we get into this, we really do need to make an assessment of the extent of the comments that we have from OMB so it's kind of hard to give you a definitive answer right now about how long that will take for us to address those comments and incorporate those changes and then get that back to OMB for them to clear it for transmitting it to Congress. Over.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Okay. Mark, do members that are involved in the Capital Investment Strategy, is there any further involvement from them in response to OMB or is that just a Corps response?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** I believe that is to be determined. That was one of the first questions that we had when we saw that we got comments back, was we need to validate the process of how this is going to work. So, we need communication with OMB about what they think the collaboration is outside of chain of command, if you will, from Army and OMB and the Corps of Engineers. I believe they consider this to be privileged communication so we have to confirm what we can and can't provide to you all.

**Mr. Thomas Smith:** Mark. Let me just take this on.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes, sir.

**Mr. Thomas Smith:** I mean I have this great interest obviously in learning this process and coordinating with Mr. James' office and we know that the key to this report is that it reflects your input as the Users Board. From this point forward, we could circle around the question a thousand different ways. What we know is that this report, it reflects the input of the owners and operators of the inland waterways, the users. So, I'm not trying to paint anymore mystery than needs to be here but let us work with that with ASA Mr. James from here.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Hey, thanks Tom. Appreciate that.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thanks, Tom. Any more questions, Rob, or any Board members?

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** This is Mike Monahan. I do have a request. I want to understand new starts, as we start this new process.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** I believe we are looking at one new start for FY 2021.

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** Okay. I would like to see the timeline for implementation of the next projects in the CIS report.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you Mike. Any other comments? Alright.

We're going to move on to the next agenda item. Mr. Stephen Durrett from the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division (LRD) will discuss the acquisition methods that LRD uses in their construction program. This is an outcome of the discussion at the July Board Meeting No. 94. Steve, all yours.

**Mr. Stephen Durrett:** Alright. Thank you, Mark. Good morning Major General Graham and Chairman Innis. Mark said it, this is kind of an outcome of the last Users Board meeting asking LRD to kind of go over some of the acquisition methods used for the navigation program within LRD.

So, there are two primary acquisition types that LRD uses on our navigation program.

Can you hear me fine?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yeah, you're coming in clear with us Steve. Appreciate it.

**Mr. Stephen Durrett:** Okay. Alright, there are two primary methods, so Invitation for Bid (IFB) is not the only acquisition that is available to us. But there are the two priority acquisition methods that we've used in our navigation programs. And I'll try to make a clear distinction of the advantages and disadvantages of both those methodologies.

The first one is IFB, or sealed bid, or low cost, whatever you want to call it, but Invitation for Bid is one of the methods we use in USACE. It is based only on price, or price factors. It is a sealed bid. You submit the IFB, and they are opened. The lowest bidder gets the contract. It's very simple. It's very simple for contractors. It's very simple for the government preparer and to evaluate. The bid evaluation. It's just a matter of opening the IFB, seeing the price and then going through the process. There is a process even on sealed bids.

And we validate costs. When I say validate, it's a matter of if the government estimate in \$10 million and a contractor submits a bid for \$5 million, we will go back and make sure that's a legitimate bid before we just arbitrarily go and award it and penalize the contractors. So, sometimes there is some checks and balances that do go on even with an IFB type of contract. So, it's not a matter of just awarding the lowest bid, that you get it no matter what.

So, there are some pluses and minuses. And there's some action that we take related to doing an IFB. We typically use this for very routine and standard work. It's non-complex projects, it's well defined specifications, and a well-defined scope. Something that's very simple,

clear so that there is no misinterpretation of what may be required or what may be desired from the government and a contractor may misinterpret that. So, we try to make this very simple.

What we want is we don't want contractors to submit a bid and then we're in a process of doing a lot of negotiations and modifications through the process of construction that leads to a very large contract at the end of the day. Because things were not clear, things were not obvious.

So, the advantages and disadvantages are listed on this slide. Advantages such as the lead time is very simple. It's the least amount of lead time that we have in doing the procuring and acquisition process. It's a very objective process and with the ability to change or negotiate procurement we have very little ability to change or negotiate in the procurement process. A real change without the ability to negotiate really comes down to invalidating and giving a contractor an opportunity to do his business so to speak.

Like I said before, as an example, if we believe an estimate of \$10 million and our contractors submit an extremely low bid, we go back and ask, "hey, are you sure about this price? Do you know what you are getting into?"

So, we ask them general leading questions that gives them an opportunity to either say yes, we did or no, he came withdraw his bid. Again, this is about bid prices. It's all about getting the best possible price for the required work.

The disadvantage is, is this very fixed, there are very little margins for error. By either the government or the contractor. This is a firm fixed price contract and there's no way to reward contractors for any innovation or ideas they may have. It just comes down to strictly price and price only. Like I said before, in some minor cases we entered into discussion but most of that discussion is revolving whether or not this price is a good price or not a good price. It's not about making sure we can explain the scope, modify the scope, or want to control those things.

In some of our small business contracts that we do, we do also have sometimes go back to the Small Business Administration and ask for them to validate the competency of the contractor. We've had instances on IFB where we've had to go back and question the competencies. And there's a process to do that and even on IFB those processes take time and effort to run through that sequence and those actions in order to run that down.

This slide is for Best Value Trade-Off. This is predominately the area we've been going to a lot more in the last 10 years in the Federal government on very large contracts. The Military program is a USACE mission that uses this extremely a lot. Many of our contracts running into the \$20 to \$50 million range for the Military program of the Corps of Engineers usually uses the Best Value Trade-Off method. This is in the best interest of the government. This is the way for us to look at other factors other than just the price tag. If there is some unique about the facility that you want to make sure your contractor has the ability and the competency to do those particular unique type features that you may have. This allows us to check things off. We don't have to go to low bidder. We may want to select the contractor that has excellent experience in a certain area of a job because the chances of us having problems, which causes either cost increases and/or time increases are greatly reduced by our own experience in those areas. And as

I said this allows for non-cost factors to play a much more important role in that action than they do in doing an IFB type of contract.

Next, here are some of the advantages and disadvantages. Okay this is about advantages where we can tailor the evaluation of a project. It's not one size shoe used on every type of contract that we have. Depending on what the project is will determine what the evaluation factors are. This does allow the contractor then to earmark his proposal and tailor his proposal to the particular factors and/or it allows the contractor to say, "hey, instead of doing it the way you're proposing, I can do it this way" and they initially view the cost saving or the benefits to the government, would be blank. So, it allows for the contractor to also provide means and methods to come into play and this proposal that could drive the decision of the selection panel.

These proposals can be negotiated. As we're looking through the price proposal piece of this, we have the ability to look at the government estimate as well as their proposals. By their price proposals, do they understand what we are asking for or is there some confusion? We may take something that may cost \$10 million and their bids are all looking at \$20 and \$30 million.

So, we can go in and have discussions with the contractor to make sure that we all understand and are all on the same page, as far as what we are looking for and what is required in contract.

Again, what this leads us to is it helps eliminate modifications, eliminates conflict actually, in the construction process. Which would ultimately lead to delays in construction and completion of the project as-a-whole. You try to take care of some of these issues up front prior to doing the actual acquisition and award of the project. This is a very subjective evaluation and it's a very detailed process and I'll cover some of the time frames on the next slide.

The disadvantages. It does take a little bit longer to do the process and go through the things. You got to actually do more write up and the contractor actually has to spend more time as well in preparing those proposals. Instead of just preparing the bid and other documentation. And sometimes contractors are resistant to doing the more work. They've pushed back on them, on USACE about why we need to be selective.

I understand the need to be used but we sometimes get carried away and they use it too often. Because there is a cost to contractors to go through the effort and sometimes that cost to contractors is a way of weeding out some actual contractors that may be likely to bid on some of these proposals. But it's up to them to make the ultimate business decision and whether they want to make the investment into the process or not make the investment and try to compete for the project.

One of the things that this is subjective is we may receive protests relative to this process. Particularly if the government makes a conscience decision that we're going to use this, that we're going to select a contractor's qualifications over the price. That is typically the main reason why we get protests. I will tell you from LRD perspective we have been extremely successful in defending every case in which we have selected a contractor with a higher price than a contractor with a lower price. The write up is very extensive and very detailed. And we



have been very successful in defending those places where we have selected somebody with a higher price because we're willing to buy what their offering: their expertise and their experiences.

Alright, this just lays out some general timelines. These are not hard numbers. But these are what we would put out as a guideline for districts that have acquisition to resource some of the projects. Even on IFB these dates and times may vary. So, these are not hard locked-in numbers. The higher dollar value the project, typically the longer advertisement period that we would put on these things. Even on IFB, if you were going to do a \$250 million project you would probably put more than 30 days in the schedule. But these are just our general timelines just to show you the difference between the two.

And as you can see the time difference coming down into the time of the receiving reports. This is all about the evaluation period. An RFP (Request for Proposal) type of contract, you do have to do that extensive write up that is required in order to document your decisions and your rationale as to why the government is doing what it's going to be doing. Even if you're picking the low bid contractor it is still required that you do the detailed write-up that fully explains why you're picking who you're going to pick. And most of the time in these 15 days and sometimes if you have the end of the discussion, you're going to take more time. So, there's no line or no time under the IFB because it's rare that we may have to go to a Small Business Administration to ask for competency or that we have to do those kinds of activities. So, it's not something we plan for.

I will tell you, in FY 2020, we had at least one instance that I'm aware of that we did have to go through that process. And it took us over 30 days to run through that process. Even on IFB, to get those clearances we needed in order to get the award we wanted to make.

Again, some of the review periods that are shown below, the real difference is again the other big items is those projects that are over \$100 million which predominately will be most of the contracts for the navigation on some of these new lock constructions that we're running to be performing, whether they be in the upper lakes or whether they be in the Upper Ohio or whether it's going to be on the Soo Lock or on the Kentucky Lock coming up. These reviews are about reviewing the documentation. This review time has allowed us to be extremely successful at defending the decisions we have made in the IFB.

So, we get higher levels of reviews, that not only occur at the district level, but we also have national level of reviews. As experience contracting professionals that have served and have defended and know how to write these reports up with what we can defend the decisions that we do make and we are not forced to go back and go through a re-advertisement period and go into more discussions.

So, these are just general timelines. I will say from experience for LRD typically we go through these in under 90 days. The RFP and the Best Value contract is where they go longer. If they go longer, it's typically because of that discussion item that I mentioned earlier, and/or the review or protest that come into play.

Typically, for LRD our Best Value solicitations typically run around the 90-day time frame. Which would only be about a 35-day extension from a typical IFB contract. But I would argue if you're really going to compare those two apples you're going to probably add some more time in both of them or the advertised the periods that contractors had time to prepare a good realistic estimate or bid for what they are proposing to do and what the works is involved.

In the last slide, just a little bit of comments and questions people may have, it's just a summary of what we've done in LRD over the last several years. I think this is over the last five to 10 years on navigation projects. You can see the most recent stuff we've done at the Soo Lock Upstream Approach Wall even though channel deepening is underway by the contractor out there beating on rock and excavating rock under water. We've viewed that that reason why that went out big was that a the very small contractor pool and those contractors typically stood in they do dredging already and we didn't feel that you were going to get anything out of it. It was a matter of what you were going to do. It was very straightforward.

Otherwise the approach wall was a very complicated thing on Soo Lock. Means and methods of the contractor were going to be critical. And Best Value was determined. As well, as you changed some of the plans before.

Some of the Chickamauga Lock decommissioning will probably be Best Value. As Don (Getty) mentioned at the last meeting, is going to be going to the Best Value. And he'll talk to you more about the schedule for that project later this morning.

And the new Soo Lock Chamber, we've done the acquisition strategy and worked with our national organization. And we know that we are going to be using the Best Value on that particular project.

Therefore, Ohio River is listed as both either IFB and Best Value because the acquisition plan has not been finalized or even written from the Upper Ohio project. So, depending on how we break that project up and what are the components of that project we envision we would probably use a little bit of both depending on what is the actual function or what is the actual contract on the Upper Ohio. So, that acquisition plan has not been done yet, we have not actually put that down, that new start, so we haven't really got to a point of making a decision on the Upper Ohio project.

So, if there's any questions, I complete my presentation.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any comments? Any comments for Mr. Durrett?

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Mark. Rob Innis. Mr. Durrett. So, I understand that you have a proposition. Does this allow the Corps to put a less detailed proposal or specifications out?

**Mr. Stephen Durrett:** So, the details or specifications for this will probably be the same for both. What it allows the contractor to do. We may lay out a sequence. We think you should build it this particular way. It allows the contractor to give us options and alternatives that we can evaluate. So, we're going to build, let's say you're building a new lock. We say we want to build

it from the upstream to downstream then. His means and methods may say I'd rather do it downstream to upstream and I can say can you do it in this amount of time? That would be considered an evaluated process. So, it doesn't prevent us, we still present what we believe to be the best way to construct something, but it allows for the proposal to use his language and his verbiage to explain an alternative that would be better for the government. And better for the project that allows means and methods. But we still have basically the same level of plans and specifications for both methods.

**Mr. Matt Ricketts:** Hey, Stephen. This is Matt Ricketts. With respect to the two different methodologies of contracting, has the Corps ever I guess done any studies or post auditing to determine for similar type projects what if any the additional cost is that you might incur using the BVTO in order to sort of get the value that you think comes from that way of contracting versus the other method?

**Mr. Stephen Durrett:** I am not aware of any formal look at acquisition methods because honestly, it's really difficult to go through to compare, and you have so many modifications. Are the modifications because something was not clear or misunderstood in the plan that were in the specifications or was the modification due to errors or differing site conditions that no one could understand about. It's hard to distinguish between the two. What we do in LRD, what we've looked at and this is not in any kind of detail evaluation but just from the experiences of people that deal with the contract and deal with the modifications and the contracting officers, we do believe we have less modifications and less change orders on our Best Value contracts than we do on our IFB type contracts. So, we believe there is a benefit that we're getting less changes and modifications. The changes, the overall cost comparison is almost impossible, it would be hard to really determine what is actually driving that. So, it's almost an impossible question. This is almost a feeling that's very subjective. That is based on what we know from our construction folks that deal with projects and construction contracting and our project managers on how well things perform. We do believe and we do know from industry that some smaller contractors or somebody that may be stretching themselves to do a project that may be a little bit outside their normal means and methods. Probably don't compete because they're encouraging us to do IFB. So, all they have to prepare is a bid, because they know it may be a stretch to be able to beat out someone that has a lot of experience doing certain type of work. It's not about just the cost. That's not what we look for. What we look for is someone can deal with dealing with placing concrete, organizing, managing a large matrix schedule that has thousands of components in it, and those kinds of things. It's not about, "hey, have you built a lock and dam yesterday?" It's about other aspects of construction and the management of projects than it is more about whether or not you built a certain type of facility.

**Mr. Matt Ricketts:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any other questions for Mr. Durrett?

Rob? Matt? Any other Board members? (No response.)

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** No? Okay. It's about 10:20 right now. We're a little bit ahead of schedule so I'm going to ask Mr. Tom Heinold who's the Chief of Operations from the Rock Island District to go ahead and give us the report on the Illinois Waterway closure for 2020.

Rob Innis and General Graham mentioned that earlier in their remarks that they saw LaGrange yesterday. They went on a site tour of LaGrange yesterday. So, without further ado, Mr. Heinold, can you give us a formal presentation on your Rock Island Closure of the Illinois Waterway?

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** Absolutely. Can I get a quick mic check?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yeah. You're hot, you're good.

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** Awesome. Alright. Major General Graham. Mr. Innis. Mr. Smith. Thanks for your kind words at the outset of today's meeting. This season's efforts on the Illinois Waterway are, was truly a team effort by Corps of Engineers crews from Rock Island and our sister districts, the Mississippi Valley Division, USACE Headquarters, our contractors, sub-contractors, and all of our navigation partners, many of whom are on the Board. So, let go right into it.

This slide is a quick flashback to 2018. The LaGrange Lock Major Rehabilitation really drove the consolidated closures effort this past summer. As early as 2017 the districts saw that there was a light of at the end of the tunnel for Olmsted and that this work at LaGrange which had been approved in 2005 and was long overdue could finally be pursued. This slide just shows a couple of the pictures that were briefed to the Users Board in 2015 as we were the poster child going in to the 2020 consolidated closures effort and you can clearly see that it needed some work.

So, since the Illinois Waterway doesn't have twin chambers, closing one lock for maintenance shuts down the entire river. So, industry worked with us and rallied all the partners to secure a large spike in funding from FYs 2018 through 2020 to shut down multiple locks at the same time to reduce the negative impacts of the towing industry and all the industries supported by the Illinois Waterway.

It's important for the Board to note that the NESP (the Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program for the Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway) construction closure will eliminate the need for future full maintenance closures to navigation at seven lock sites at the Upper Mississippi River System. It could avoid a closure, so if you're at LaGrange this past summer, the next authorized 1200-foot chambers there that already have been authorized. Those new chambers were authorized in 2007 and our original guidance for this year's closure effort are listed here. And this pretty much came true with only a couple of minor exceptions which I'll discuss in subsequent slides.

Next, starting from downstream and moving upstream on the waterway. The plan was to close LaGrange Lock for up to 120 days and perform both a major rehabilitation and major maintenance efforts concurrently.

I was there on the first day of July when closures started and honestly I've got to tell you I feared for my life because there were so many contactors, and drill rigs, and cranes, pickups, dump trucks, back hoes, fork trucks, and equipment of every kind mobilizing to the site all at the same time. Hats off to Shimmick Construction, our contractor, for maintaining a safe work environment under those conditions. It was a very congested site.

We originally awarded a contract for the duration of 90 days. Of course, government contracts are bid and awarded, and in the interest of transparency we did let the navigation industry know that we had awarded a contract with a duration of 90 days. But since there was flooding at LaGrange right up until the closure date of the first of July, we lost an anticipated 42 days of mobilization time. We worked with Shimmick Construction, our contractor, to accelerate that schedule to the maximum extent possible but still had the modified contract early on resulting in a 13 day extension of the reopening day which despite COVID-19, and a major storm in August which nobody had ever heard of around here, and issues with site conditions and other unforeseen conditions encountered there, we were able to hold that 13 October date.

Moving upstream. The work at Peoria was done entirely by Corps of Engineers crews as planned. We borrowed personnel from St. Louis and crews and equipment from St. Paul District. The miter gate anchorages were repaired. Anchorages were replaced. Ladder recesses and checkpoints were installed. New nozzles were installed. And a new elevated compressor system was installed. So that should make Peoria a very resilient and reliable site for a generation or more to come. And Peoria opened on schedule on the 30<sup>th</sup> of September.

The next lock up stream that is Starved Rock. New vertically framed miter gates were installed, we installed a newly formed sill and anchorages that were done in the dry at Starved Rock this season. And control stands and electrical components were raised to make repairs and prevent future flood damages.

The work at Marseilles was very similar but only upper gates were installed at Marseilles. The gates at the lower end of Marseilles were of a different design since those gates have to support vehicular traffic to access the Marseilles Dam and those gates are much newer than the 1930s models that we replaced at the upper end.

Both of these locks opened midday yesterday on schedule.

This slide is at Dresden Island, the upper bulkhead recess installation went according to plan for emergency miter gates and that site is now ready for dewatering in 2023. That opened just a few days ago.

We have two issues with the original plan, for the Brandon Road Bulkhead slot work, however. One was the timing of funding. The fiscal year funding did not arrive in time to award the contract for this work. And as it turns out the funding was needed to cover a significant shortfall for work at the other sites. That funding arrived in April.

The second reason was honestly it was the capacity of our marine base contracting community to do the work. We had put out a solicitation with no funds available in FY 2019 in case we received funds early enough in FY 2020 to award the contract. But we received no bids for that contract. We asked the usual suspects who normally bid on work like that, but they all told us that they were spread too thin on the waterway already and couldn't take on additional work.

Brandon Marine for instance, one of our most popular contractors that does work for us on the river, they actually ran out of their own equipment and had to rent equipment to even get the Dresden Island Lock done.

So, hats off to them for spreading themselves about so thin, and their honesty and forthrightness in not taking on work that was too risky or couldn't be completed.

We will need sufficient funding in FY 2021 and FY 2022 to ensure that the 2023 work at Brandon Road can happen as planned. That work then that we had scheduled at Brandon Road will have to happen immediately prior to the 2023 closures.

On the next several slides I can show a bunch of pictures of what we did on the waterway this past summer. There are just a few photos of the work from this season.

This photo from LaGrange shows some of the work at this past summer. It got a major facelift. New hydraulics. New machinery. This work made this lock look as like new as it can possibly be. It can now be able to serve reliability for more than a generation to come before needing any major repairs. It got vertical concrete, new hydraulic power unit building on the high wall side, new electrical raised control stands, and a new PLC system. It looks great. And it's operating as designed. So, I'm very very pleased at the work here at LaGrange this past summer. And this is the work that the Trust Fund helped to fund.

This slide, we've got a picture again of LaGrange. This is from upstream looking down. You can see in the left foreground a new raised electrical which would be far above previous flood heights. Next to the central control station there, you see a flag flying from a brand-new elevated generator which should be reliable again for generations to come. And you would hardly recognize this site if you'd seen it earlier this summer. It really does look like a new lock.

The next slide shows the very first commercial tow to transit LaGrange Lock on the 13<sup>th</sup> of October. We're very excited to open LaGrange and Peoria a little bit earlier than yesterday at Starved Rock in Marseilles. And those two pools alone probably opened 75 to 80 percent of the agricultural commerce that needed to get out of town right in the middle of a record setting what promises to be a record setting agriculture seasons particularly for the corn and soy beans that are growing right here in the Midwest.

Next, we are moving up stream at Peoria Lock. Some of the work our USACE crews accomplished at Peoria. Doing better with modern day gate anchorages. There on the left. And checkpoints. There's a sample there on the right. We also rehabilitated the actuator hydrologic cylinders this summer.

This slide shows just one of the many challenges that we faced this summer. This is what Starved Rock looked like in late May of this year. It should be very obvious that you can see how mobilization to a site like this is not possible. Fortunately, the water was off the wall here at Starved Rock by the end of May.

But again, high water persisted at LaGrange until the very last minute. We were very very fortunate that flooding did not persist past the first of July. And actually, flooding which we originally thought was going to be one of our major threats this summer did not happen. We ended up with some actual fantastic weather for construction.

The next slide shows Starved Rock. This is the new upper sill at Starved Rock under construction back in August. During a dewatered condition, these sills were completely replaced, and the anchorages as well, completely replaced to accept brand new vertically framed miter gates to replace the old horizontally framed gates from the 1930s.

This shows again Starved Rock. Just a sample of what we did working right along our contract personnel. We had our own crews do vertically concrete surfaces in the chamber and repairs to some of the armor that is imbedded in that concrete. This is just one sample of some of the vertical work that we did at Starved Rock this summer.

The next shot is an overview of Marseilles from upstream looking down. You can see the Corps of Engineers heavy lift crane Hercules is in the forebay ready to install the new modern gates once the sills and anchorages are modified to support those. This shot was just shortly after this site was dewatered.

This slide shows again Marseilles. Just another shot of the upper sill construction at Marseilles. Major, major effort. Really appreciate our contractor for Starved Rock and Marseilles, for undertaking this effort.

This slide is also of Marseilles. Is just another example. You know, although we did not experience flooding conditions, hot weather was a challenge toward the middle of the summer. Our crews had to add ice to concrete trucks and had to start concrete placements in the very early morning hours to beat the heat and ensure the concrete didn't overheat and just crumble. This is the end of a pour at the end of August at 0500 just before the sun came up at Marseilles.

And the next slide shows Dresden Island. Not a whole lot to see here. But in place of the old emergency gate recesses, which were determined to not be sufficient for dewatering, Brandon Marine constructed brand new bulkhead slots at Dresden Island, and they are ready for the 2023 effort.

So, very quickly, onto the 2023 effort. All of this effort listed on this slide is depended on sufficient funding in FYs 2021, 2022, and 2023 to execute it. If we don't get all we need in time to award contracts for prefabrications in FY 2021 where there is a 2-year lead time on those. We have fabricators like Johnson Machine Works. Pretty well backed up with miter gate fabrications. We will need to award construction contracts in FY 2022 so that the FY 2023 work

can happen in time. If that doesn't happen, we are prepared to push to 2024 for the next large closure effort.

Push to 2024, they also have them if we're sure that the GLMRIS or Great Lakes Mississippi River Inter-basin Study can be done concurrently with the expected closures in 2024, or down the road. We can't afford to push out this work until 2025 or later. It's already overdue and we're just need a couple of free open seasons for the industry so they can recover from this summer's extensive extended closures.

Before I close, I should mention, I'd be remissive if I didn't mention, the Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP). I alluded to it earlier. This program was authorized in 2007 and it would construct seven new 1200-foot locks on the Upper Mississippi River system, among many other improvements. We received some funding in FY 2020 to conduct Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). And as soon as we receive a new start and Construction funding, we'll be ready to go forward with this program.

The new 1200-foot locks will be constructed adjacent to existing chambers while still passing traffic and the sooner we start construction the sooner the nation will start to accrue the economic return on investment that those new locks will bring. And in the future those new adjacent chambers will allow us to perform maintenance on one chamber without the need for a navigation closure like we had this summer.

In addition to the efficiency and safety gain, by not having to split 1200-foot tows to transit through 600-foot locks. Any increase cost of maintaining those new locks will be more than paid for by the transportation savings that the navigation industry, or farmers, and other businesses that depend on inland navigation.

So, that's the big next step past 2023 and beyond for the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway systems.

So, I want to thank Mark and the entire Board for the opportunity to make this presentation to you today. I'm certainly willing to take any questions now or offline as appropriate if we need to march on with the rest of the agenda. Thank you all.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Rob Innis. I wanted to thank you for the work on the Illinois. That was fantastic. And for yesterday. That was really good. And also, for the NESP update. I think the Board definitely feels the same way about those projects and getting them done and moving forward as the Capital Investment Strategy report has them as some of the key future projects in there. But I do have a question. Where are we on the funding for 2023? And how much has been received? And, what else needs to be received for future funding?

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** Chairman, that's a good question. I don't have the numbers in front of me. Of course, we are under a Continuing Resolution right now and we won't have the work plan funding. We did receive a couple of items in the President's Budget, for Brandon Road and Starved Rock in particular. The Marseilles electrical upgrade work will have to come in work plan funding in FY 2021, or the work plan in FY 2022. We do have time to receive that funding.



Unfortunately, I don't have those numbers handy. I'll have to get back to you with a total layout of the several contracts that we'll have to award in the coming years to get 2023 done.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** You know in our conversation yesterday; we were talking about it being two years, you know really two years to bring the contractors together. Everything like that. So, understanding the future funding now is critical to being ready to do 2023.

Last question. What do you think, how likely is it that the 2023 closure may be pushed back if that were to happen? Are we going to find out in time? Are we going to be too far down the road? How's that going to help put that together?

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** As I understand the local partner for the project is the state of Illinois, the other partners are entering into a design agreement this year and construction funding for that is possible after FY 2022. If that's the case, then we should be able to line up concurrent closures. It would probably be a good six or eight months away from knowing yet whether that program will be able to coincide with the 2023 maintenance closures or not.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** I think it's just that, you know, that project, if they're going forward, they need to come to the table, right? They can't ignore the big things that they did with this plan was to put five years of closures down to two, right? And so, we want to bring that back up to three years of closures in five years. That seems like a step backwards. So, we need to make sure that we are tied in and that all parties understand the need for that to happen that way.

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** That's exactly right. Thanks Rob.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Hey Rob. This is Mark Pointon. I'll work with Tom to get a layout of the funding for Fiscal Years 21, 22 and 23 as you guys have just discussed, and we can provide that feedback back on the Board members once we get that laid out for you. Over.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Thank you.

**Mr. Jeff Webb:** Hey Tom. This is Jeff Webb from Cargill Marine and Terminal. For safety sack, I just want to on behalf of the farmer customers using the Illinois Waterway and the agricultural industry and all the customers from the agriculture community, thank you guys for what you did, everyone certainly appreciate everything that the Corps has done to make that happen and you know it's vitally importance for U.S. grain exports that we connected to the Illinois Waterway for a shipping customer that we got really solid exports of all regions including grain, and so certainly appreciate that this closure was in schedule.

And one more question that I would have when you talk about NESP, how do you feel is needed for PED funding for the next couple of years to continue to advance those projects?

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** Good question Mr. Webb. I appreciate your comments. How do I feel about staying in PED for a couple of years? Well, that would certainly allow us to put more designs on the shelf so that we are I guess I call it more shovel ready when construction finally comes. My concern is that the later we start, the later we start to accrue those benefits for the

system. I wouldn't want to get to a point where we have a lot of designs sitting on the shelf, but we have nothing on the ground to show for that. What would excite me is to see that return on investment actually happen for the industry and for the nation. So, we could probably if we need to, we could afford to stay in a design mode for the next couple of years but I'm very very anxious to get Construction funding and actually break ground.

**Mr. Jeff Webb:** Thank you. We all are.

**Mr. Damon Judd:** This is Damon Judd from Marquette. I just wanted to second what Rob and Jeff said. I was one of the individuals raising concern around potential slips in the schedule at LaGrange at the last Users Board meeting. I think the Corps did an incredible job to hold to the mid-October date there and particularly execute that project.

You know several made comments about just the export market that the Illinois Waterway has and just to put some numbers to the latest USDA grain numbers, stated earlier. For October 15<sup>th</sup> it's showing export sales of 28 million, compared to 10.8 million, a year ago. And export sales of 45 million record versus 18 million a year ago. So again, critical job and critical days with access for those agricultural communities to get back to the global markets and really appreciate the efforts to hold that mid-October date.

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** Thank you sir. And thank you for your advocacy for that system.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Anymore questions for Tom?

**General Butch Graham:** Hey Mark it's General Graham here.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes, sir.

**General Butch Graham:** To the Corps and the stakeholders, the navigation stakeholders on the Illinois River, I just wanted to commend everybody for the work they've done. As we heard earlier, we learned for this system that's in the realm of the possible, if we are all working together collaboratively, and we proved we can deliver for the greater good of this country. And those numbers that were laid out, ag exports I think that's a true positive of the value this team put together.

So, not done yet. Just kind of lay it out. Work continues. Got to get ready for 2023. And I will have MVD to lay out and list of work packages that we need to get funded in 21, 22, 23 to pull this off. That needs to include the GLMRIS work as well just to get the ability to see that. So, we will shoot that out, email wise. We're not going to wait for the next Board meeting to get that out to you. We'll put that together and send that it out to you so you can track our progress and you can advocate for the funding that we're going to need. Okay?

Again, Tom, great job. We're proud of the Rock Island District for all they've done. You have tonight off. But Monday, back at it.

**Mr. Thomas Heinold:** Thank you, sir.

**General Butch Graham:** Mark, the mic is yours.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. Thank you, sir. At this point, we leapfrogged the break so that we could get Tom out there because we're little bit ahead of schedule. So, it's approximately 10:45 now, so let's go and take our break now. We're going to take a half hour break. We'll reconvene at 11:15 sharp. So, everybody go get some more coffee and stretch your legs and we'll be back online and off mute in about 30 minutes. Thank you.

(Whereupon a Break was taken from 10:45 to 11:15 a.m.)

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright everybody. We're back online. It's 11:15. So we're going to reconvene. We're moving onto the next presentation.

Next up on the program is the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock update of their study activities. I haven't seen that Mark Wingate is on the webinar, who's scheduled to give a presentation on the IHNC Lock, so hopefully he's one of the callers or is engaged.

Hoping somebody from MVD is handling it if Mark is predisposed from the storm impact from yesterday. I understand New Orleans is having some power issues and having some damage from the hurricane yesterday.

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Hey Mark, this is Mark Wingate. Can you hear me?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yeah, we can hear you loud and clear. Glad to have you online, man!

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Good. Good.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Go for it.

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Alright. Appreciate it. Appreciate the opportunity. So again, Mark Wingate here from New Orleans District. I just want to let everyone know that Colonel Murphy is also in the room with me as well as the project manager for this particular project, Jeff Varisco.

If it's okay I would like to just take a minute before I get started and give everyone just a quick update about Hurricane Zeta, Mark as you were talking it. It has been an extremely busy hurricane season in Southern Louisiana.

So, I guess about a day and a half ago we had Hurricane Zeta. Its eye come directly over the city of New Orleans. It was the fifth named storm to hit Louisiana, to hit Louisiana this year. As a result of Zeta's impact, New Orleans fared fairly well, in terms of surge and rainfall flooding. There was a lot of questions and concerns over the city's ability to pump out the rain.

The good news was this storm was moving so quickly. I believe upwards of 25 miles per hour towards the East. It just wasn't enough time to build a lot of surge in the Gulf of Mexico or to drop a lot of rainfall. So, you're really not seeing a whole lot of flooding after Zeta.

In fact, whether it was smart or not, I actually got on the road about two or three hours after this storm passed and there was little street flooding at all. The highest surge that was recorded in the New Orleans area and it's on the west bank was about 10 feet. If anyone's tracking at Grand Isle, it was maybe about 9 feet. So not as significant surge event.

But what was significant was the wind event. At its maximum peak, the New Orleans and surrounding area had 500,000 customers without power. Five-hundred-thousand. As we sit right now, we're down to about 350,000 customers without power. I know for quite some time the district building it was running on generator power. To be honest with you, I didn't look to see if the generator was running this morning. We're on city power as of this moment.

I just want to give a real quick update on navigation. So, we always see impact with these storms. All these storms bring in shoaling, they bring in obstructions such as some boat and some barges. And, believe it or not for Hurricane Laura and Hurricane Delta, an abandoned oil rig hopped out of the Gulf of Mexico into the bar channel of the Mississippi River. Twice. The same oil rig. And when I talk about oil rig, this is a huge platform that is in the river. So, all that has to be dealt with.

But where are we today as of a result of Hurricane Zeta? The Mississippi River is open at this hour and we expect to remain open. All the locks in the area are operational with exception of Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, which I'll be speaking about here in just a moment, due to ongoing repairs and maintenance work. So that was already scheduled, that was ongoing.

Baptiste Collette and Houma alternate route, which is an alternate route for the IHNC Lock closure, we are doing channel surveys as I speak. Also, the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal we have ongoing channel surveys. We expect both of those channels to be open soon, the alternate route and the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal to be opened probably within the next two days.

And very good news: The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) is fully opened as of about two hours ago.

The last thing we had to deal with was power outages were impacting bridge operations. Some of the area bridges could not be lifted. They were manually or somehow brought in generator power and got those bridges open. So, good news there.

Navigation is just about back up and running in the area.

So, just wanted to give you that quick update from Hurricane Zeta.

So, to get onto the topic at hand, we want to give the Users Board just a quick update on the lock replacement for the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal (IHNC) Lock. Where are we with our study?

We like to use fancy terms of course. So, you see on the title slide it says GRR, and that's nothing but a study, it's a General Reevaluation Report. And SEIS, that stands for Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Again, fancy terms. Complex terms. But essentially, where are we with the studies.

Okay, so next I would like to take a little bit of time on this particular slide and just give the Users Board kind of a Bottom Line Up Front with respect to this lock study. So, we are nearing the end of a study for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Study for an extremely controversial project located in the Lower 9<sup>th</sup> Ward of New Orleans. It is a neighborhood that is well known unfortunately for damages resulting from Hurricane Katrina. Many of you probably heard about the Lower 9<sup>th</sup> Ward. These are historic communities. These are minority communities. This is the area that Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie invested in and brought back. Tried to make some residential improvement in the Lower 9<sup>th</sup> Ward. So, this area is known nationally as well potentially internationally.

I am pleased to report that the study findings for the lock replacement are favorable for a replacement lock. I say it's favorable. It's favorable from a national perspective, Federal perspective with a benefit-to-cost ratio just slightly over 4 to 1. That is largely under the benefits from a reduction in lockage delay times. Right now, the existing lock has a transit time of nearly 17 hours on average. With a new proposed lock, we would bring that down to right under one hour per tow through that lock.

By the way, this particular lock transits around 8,000 locks per year, 8,000 locks per year. So why is it important to replace this particular lock? Well it's no secret this lock is an operating antique. It is nearly 100 years old and is in desperate need of being replaced. It is extremely unreliable and is in constant need of scheduled and unscheduled maintenance. It is considered a choke point on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. In fact, it is the only lock on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway east of the Mississippi. So, it's the only stop sign, if you will, from Florida to get across the Mississippi River to west of New Orleans, this particular location.

This inefficient lock is located on the GIWW which is the 3<sup>rd</sup> busiest waterway in the nation. And if that's not busy enough, it provides transport across the Mississippi River which is the Number 1 Nation's busiest waterway. And this particular lock is frustrating to all its users. Not just Navigation users. But to the communities that have to get across this canal through vehicular or pedestrian use. Because they are delayed. The local community is delayed and frustrated. Due to our bridge operations over the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal.

Furthermore, there are no efficient navigation alternate routes around the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock. One alternative route such as there's no efficient route. There are routes around it. One alternative route is the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, which adds approximately 20 days to the tows transit time. Not a very good alternate.

The only other option which adds two days additional transit time is through Baptiste Collette. And that's the alternate route that I actually spoke about when I was giving the hurricane update that we're doing channel surveys across the Gulf of Mexico right now. Because we use the alternate route through Baptiste Collette which is on the southern end of the

Mississippi River. It gives entrée, if you will, into open Gulf waters. Which, bottom line is, often has unsafe sea conditions and is not a safe route for barge or inland traffic.

When IHNC Lock is down, it cost the nation nearly \$30 million a day. In 2020 alone, with the work that we're currently doing at the lock that's a total of 90 days of time which has been extended due to the five hurricanes and has cost the nation nearly \$2.7 billion, that's \$2.7 billion.

One of the challenges replacing this lock project however is this is a classic not-in-my-backyard project. Our study recommendations are expected to generate significant opposition as they have in the past from residence from the sort of neighborhood as well as the two-lane low-level bridge.

Including, most likely, an anticipated 3<sup>rd</sup> enjoinder against the project upon study completion. So, a 3<sup>rd</sup> enjoinder is certainly a potential.

That's what we are recommending, some additional work on this study in order to deliver the most detailed data possible, given the likelihood of continued legal and environmental justice opposition.

Additionally, this effort shows a greater degree of due diligence to address community concerns and possibly could even build some good will with the concerned citizens if in fact we perform this additional work.

At public meetings over the past 14 years, this is key, the Corps has been the only visible proponent for this lock. Our public meetings have been historically very contentious with little to no support from the stakeholders. It is strictly the Corps and many concerned citizens and just one example would be is when the commanders presenting at this public meeting, the public comes with their own slideshow and is texting to the community at the public meeting that the commander is flat out lying to them. So, we have no support at these meetings.

To perform the additional work, we are certainly seeking support to take a little bit more time, a little bit more money to do an exemption package. We're also seeking support and guidance in securing participation from navigation stakeholders as we work with the community to advance this project. I do not believe we will be successful without this meaningful engagement resulting in a unified mitigation strategy, allowing both the community and navigation users to coexist.

This slide is just to orient you to the existing lock, you can see the existing lock there in the red block. It is a choke point. It is a small lock, and it's 100 years old. It's 640 feet long and 75 feet wide, with a depth of 31-and-a-half feet. And again, transit times are nearly 17 hours.

The neighborhoods to both sides of the channel, left and right, are historic neighborhoods. You have four of them. Two on each side of the lock. These communities have very little faith and trust in the Federal government. As I mentioned, they were damaged significantly during Hurricane Katrina. They see very little value in a navigation lock.

The bridges are pointed out in the white text boxes. At the bottom is St. Claude Ave.; at the top is Claiborne Ave. Just one quick point. We currently run those bridges in a vehicular mode only between certain hours during heavy traffic in the morning hours and heavy hours in the afternoon. So, navigation is shut down for four hours a day due to the way we currently operate those bridges.

Next, what are we recommending? We're recommending the new lock. You can see that at the top of the screen in a red block. It's located to the north of the existing lock. And of course, we would keep the existing lock in place as we're constructing the new lock, with a bypass channel so navigation could continue. You also see the bridges a bit clearer over here. At the bottom is the St. Claude Bridge. If you see the white text box. In the middle is the Claiborne Ave. Bridge. Those are the only two ingress and egress points from that area if you're going east or west. And that is the point of contention on this project primarily from the local neighborhood.

The good news again, the new lock replacement does have a very strong benefit-to-cost ratio of 4 to 1 again reducing transit time from 17 hours to one hour through that lock.

But again, the community's concerns stem from the construction of the lock. Air, noise, duration of the construction, traffic delays, as well as vehicular impacts. Vehicular impacts. And so really what it comes down to is, we need to develop, in accordance with our laws an effective community mitigation strategy. And that is the further analysis that is required for this project.

This slide right here in green just highlights what has been completed today. I will not focus on all the reporting requirements and so forth. I'll focus on what's underneath the black line because that's where we are. And that's where we are requesting an exemption to the 3-by-3, \$3 million and 3-year effort because of the further analyses. Again, to develop that comprehensive mitigation strategy, hopefully, with the intent to resolve and document today's concerns, because we know litigation is out there. And, hopefully, we run some goodwill to the community.

So, bottom line this is the timing and cost exemption request. It is a request at this time, it has not been approved. The request resides at MVD. It just, was sent, either the beginning of this week or last week.

As you can see here, we are seeking an additional \$2 million and 30 months to do that work. In the middle of the slide you can see I call out these four major tasks. I'll bring your attention to the middle 2 tasks. As the first task and the 4<sup>th</sup> task are really minor efforts. It's all about developing a community mitigation plan, again, that is actually a requirement of law to the developing a community plan, in fact mitigation plan and a traffic mitigation plan. We have worked on these plans in the past. We worked on these plans recently. The challenge is some of our recent information shows us that more work is required to thoroughly address the needs of the mitigation plan.

So, what are our next steps? The exemption package is at the division, just recently got there within the last couple of days. I anticipate the division to push that onto Headquarters for consideration in seeking approval of the exemption package.

And of course, we are in position to move forward. Contingent upon that review and subsequent approval and whatever that approval might look like in terms of time and cost.

So, that concludes my brief pending any comments or questions.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Do we have any comments for Mark, for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock? The continuing studies activities.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Yeah. Rob Innis here. What are we thinking will be the change? I mean, we were supposed to have this in 2019. And we're in 2020. Do you really think, what major changes will this effort have from waiting from 2020 to 2023?

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** So, my response is that the biggest thing, the major change is, we've got to run some updated models, both for traffic and a third bridge.

*(End first video clip)*

*(Begin second video clip)*

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Mark, I recognize the need to do the work that you identified, but it just seems like there's got to be a more efficient manner than to go back for three more years and deliver this stuff. Better that we are updating the plan and not a change of project, right.

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Yes, it's not current, the plan. I appreciate those comments. And I don't disagree with you. I think the biggest thing on this is that again, we see a lot of concerns for this project and it's coming from an opposition standpoint. You know, and that's why we are recommending additional work. Maybe what we ought to be thinking about is how do we start showing support and generate support for this project? And maybe some of the concern would come down. You know when you're trying to push something forward, and it appears that the majority of interested parties are opposing it, you know what they're preparing to do so you just keep trying to build those documents stronger. The real issue is, is that I just don't have any support, visible support, in the community, for this particular project. Maybe if we had, just maybe, if we had more support, maybe the requirements to build a stronger document might be reduced. That's just a thought.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Mark, I understand that, for the 3x3x3 exemption, to complete this work and move this project forward, how can we speed this process up and do what we need to do but do it in 2020 or 2021 and not in 2023?

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Without getting into, you know, plan formulation and so forth, there's always opportunities in life to reduce things. So certainly, we can go back to the drawing board and come up with a little bit different approach. You know, it's all about risk, how much risk do



you want to take? Do you not want to take any risk? Well, then we will never produce a report. Do you want to take less risk? We'll get out a report today. What is the right answer?

So, I think in terms of working with industry, I think working with our Headquarters, we certainly can go back and confirm that we really do have the best data to move forward. This is the current recommendation. Doesn't mean that's what's going to be approved. But certainly, I do appreciate your comments. That doesn't give you a number of answers, I'm just not in position to provide that, I don't know that answer right now.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** And the 3x3x3 extension request. What is that, how long does that generally take? What the process is? I know what the 3x3x3 is, but I don't know the extension process on it.

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** What I will lay out to you, what I showed on my last slide. I just got the other day, so we need to give MVD a little bit of time to review that. It will go to Headquarters. Typically, it will stay at the MVD level, not 30 days. Maybe 30 days at Headquarters. And then on to the Assistant Secretary (ASA) for consideration. As is typical, as is typical timeline when working today at Headquarters and for the ASA. So it is, ultimately, a decision for the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Okay. Well, I know the Secretary was on earlier.

Again. I don't disagree with the subject matter. A lot of work has been done. I just feel like there got to be a way to shrink that timeline. So, I would just ask the General and to the Assistant Secretary's Office to please do what can be done to expedite it. You know we thought we were done a year ago with this. Now we're hearing about another years-long delay.

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Okay. Got it.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** And Mark Wingate. I want to ask about another project. I will wait and see if anybody else has questions on this before I move on.

**General Butch Graham:** Mr. Murphy it's General Graham here. Can you hear me?

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Yes sir.

**General Butch Graham:** Okay. So, right now I'm not inclined to support a waiver on this. Now, because we don't have, it's not going to get local support. As Mark laid out, and I think he acknowledged, there's no support for the local community for this. And until we figure out where we're on that I'm not inclined to recommend to putting any more money on this or waste any more time. We have been working this for a long time, as you said 1956. I'm going to say we've probably spent about \$10 million on all this stuff. And again, know what the issues are. So, we got to figure out ways to get around it, or two to work through those issues.

So, happy to meet with you and whoever, and General Holland down at MVD, and Colonel Murphy and Mark and the team to figure out how we approach that. I think everybody

recognizes the importance of this facility, but we are stuck in neutral. And we got to figure out a different way forward. Or we're going to be staying in neutral. And that's not going to serve your industry, your business, or your country well.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** I appreciate your candor. And, I certainly, I think speaking for myself and I think for the larger Users Board, you know this project is, it would've ranked you know, number one or two on the project listing of the Capital Investment Strategy report. So, we got to find a way through. Which I think is what we all want.

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Okay. Yes. Again. Just to reiterate. That's totally great. The importance of the transportation system. But we've got to get the community down there to recognize that as well. And so, if we're in it together we're going to need some help. Now we're going to need some help beyond the Corps of Engineers on this because we're going to have to explain to them why we spent so much time studying something. We're going to probably end up right back here. Unless we do something different.

**General Butch Graham:** This is General Graham. I interpret that as a challenge. And that's why I recommended you know putting that bridge work for the neighborhood to get that benefit served for the navigation benefit. Wait until you get around that. And there's going to be some hard local opposition. That you know, it doesn't matter what you, it literally does not matter what you do. They're going to oppose it. And so, at that point you have to just do it. I think we need to do our best to win the fight. Taking into account whatever reasonable concerns there are and addressing them the best they can. If the goal is to wait until the neighborhood approves the project, you know it's never going to happen. So, it's a balance. Do the best we can to address those reasonable concerns. And then move forward with it. That's how I would put it.

So, we can talk to General Holland. And if there's no objections, we can plan to get together on this. And we'll kind of discuss and see what we can come up with. Are you okay with that?

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Yes, sir. Like I said, I'm ready to work with you. Again, I appreciate the concern. I know they're real. I know it's not easy moving forward from here.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** I totally agree, and I mean we thought we're going through the Capital Investment Strategy where this would be planned. So, it definitely has a huge impact on it especially the whole system view. I think the industry could really get behind this one for sure.

**General Butch Graham:** Okay. Thank you. So, you know I'll get a hold of General Holland. She's traveling right now. She should be all in with us more likely. And we'll craft a way forward in the near future, a call with Mr. Murphy and we'll kind of team up and go from there and Rob I'll keep you informed of what we're doing.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Thank you.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Thank you, General. Mark Wingate. Can you quickly tell us what's happening with the GRR for the Bayou Sorrel Lock?

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** Sure, okay.

So, should probably start with a little view of it historically. We recently studied that, a number of years back. That project, that study was put in suspension, we put it in suspension at the MVD level. That is what was determined at that time.

So, you know, there needs to be changed conditions in the future or present to resume that study, such that it should be reinitiated. We reviewed that. As of late, we do believe there may be transportation changes that warrants to go back and relook at the numbers.

We do believe that there could be some reporting issues at that particular location in our Lock Performance Monitoring System (LPMS). So, we've been discussing here is a resumption of that study. We have developed our resumption memo. That was just recently pushed up to MVD, so our headquarters. So, they will review that resumption memo. We've been in communication with Mr. Belk at the business region level on there. So, we are working as a team. I would expect that we will get a favorable review. And that we do have some funds on hand that we can move out with looking into the LPMS data and other data sources that aren't historically used in computing the transit times. And if we see some changes, that could definitely lead us in a new direction or a new way on the Bayou Sorrel Lock.

What I have a rough estimate is the money that we have on hand, that we could at least kick off and start looking at some of the data. Once the resumption memo is approved. I've got about \$500,000 in the bank account here that we could apply towards at. And that's probably about a six- to nine-month effort. But those numbers show there is something there, that this lock does in fact look like it's economically justified. We're in here talking about a new investment decision. And so, we budget.

You need a position that you can budget for. Right now, we're not expecting funding at capability because the latest benefit-to-cost ratio is about a point six to one. The project is just not economically viable. We're not seeing any growth and commodities going through that lock.

In fact, I just had that updated a few weeks ago. Checked into that. We're not seeing commodity growth in that area. But what we do want to do, is go back and look at the data and started computing the transit times. We used these typical ways of doing that throughout LPMS, but we believe after speaking to the lockmaster and industry that the transit times are being understated. Understated in the LPMS data.

So, you know, to give you a time when I think I can get to a decision that the lock is a go or no go, you know, sir, I don't have that. What I do have is I think we can get there, if approved, and I can't get ahead of my division Headquarters, but they will consider the request, and if approved, I think we can knock out some data in a couple months that would give us a second look. If the numbers look favorable to advance the study.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** I think it was two years ago when we heard about the problems of the LMPS data and the under counting the traffic going through there with the delays that traffic was

experiencing. So, we know that data is not good. I heard that from you. So, we want to try to get the right data into the mix because I think that point-six BCR or one-point-six BCR, I think it's based on bad intel. So, this has been an issue. It's been an issue for some time because it's a problem identifying the traffic delays.

**Mr. Mark Wingate:** I hope I'm not getting ahead of myself. But I think that we are in agreement in the Corps that we tend to agree with you. That we want to look at those numbers. Because we do have some concerns that it may have been understated. The LPMS data that is.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Okay. Appreciate it. Again, with the right data I think Bayou Sorrel Lock would be near the top of the list in terms of the value of the Nation in the Capital Investment Strategy.

So, these are two projects that you know are really important. And we get them off the sidelines. Get them in the game. Appreciate what you can do. Let's move this forward as smartly as possible. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. We have now leap frogged over being a little ahead to being behind schedule, so we are going to move onto the updated Inland Waterways Trust Fund projects for the Lakes and River Division, LRD. Steve Fritz, I hope you're still on the line. Let's move onto the Monongahela River Locks and Dams 2-3-4 Replacement project.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** Thank you Mark. Just a comm check. Can you hear me?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yup, you're good. Coming in loud and clear.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** Good morning. I just got in before afternoon. So that's perfect. General Graham, Chairman Innis, Secretary James, Board members and all the Federal observers, my name is Steve Fritz and I'm just going to present to you the Lower Mon River project.

This slide shows the Bottom Line Up Front. Just a couple key points on this slide. The total estimated computed price for the projects still remains well below the project cost estimate by about \$100 million. So, that \$1.07 billion number is a calculated number using the necessary metrics and contingencies. But that tracks very closely with what we've received to complete the project of about \$1.12 billion. And the estimated costs for the overall project is about \$1.2 billion total. So, that's where that \$100 million savings comes in.

Some major accomplishments here. One is shown on this slide. The other one is not. The major accomplishment really is the completion of the M22-M27 contract. That is now physically complete. So that kind of frees up some work area out there for us. It's a very constrained work site and I'll show you a slide in a little bit that represents that.

Not shown on this slide, but still very important to note is that there's only three more concrete placements remaining in the middle wall and they expect to wrap those up here before the end of November. So that's going to be another major accomplishment. So, if there's no question on the Bottom Line Up Front, I can move on.

Alright this is just a scope of the project. There's been nothing that's changed on this. So, if there's no question we can move right along.

Okay. As mentioned in the previous slide, for M22 and M27, that contract is physically complete. I have added Pool 3 dredging completion to this slide. It was an anticipated completion date in July of 2021. It wasn't on the slide back at the last Users Board meeting, so I added to this slide. Other than that, there are no other changes on this slide. So, we can move on to the next slide unless there's questions.

So, there's still a lot of work going on out there at Charleroi. We're making a very steady progress. This kind of shows a graphic of all the work that's in play out there with the exception of the really dark blue area. That was the emptying base and that work is done now. And that's been done for a couple of years. But on the river chamber completion portion, Option 2 that's increased above 7% from the last report with the primary work consisting there of the middle wall work and the control tower, along with M12. The Option 3 work has increased about 19% and that the primary work associated with that is mostly for concrete.

And as I mentioned for that, that work is almost wrapped up. So, we're doing very well there.

And I jumped down to the yellow and the orange which is Options 4 and 5. Those are still showing 1% complete. There's not a lot of work that begin on Options 4 and 5 until that middle wall is done and the lock walls are done, as part of Option 2 and Option 3. But that work is scheduled to be finished up here pretty quickly, probably within the next six months you're going to start seeing upticks in Option 4 and Option 5 work. Both of those, Option 4 specifically is a lot of in chamber work.

So, we have to complete that middle wall, work on the middle wall to start that work.

The stilling basin work, that's increased 7% from the last report. The contractor has only a few more placements to complete all of the gate bay 5 and about 30% of gate bay 4 drop bags in there. He thinks. We believe that the schedule shows that he's going to complete that before a required contract work stoppage December 1<sup>st</sup>. We stopped the work December 1<sup>st</sup> because the river conditions are such out there that you know we don't want the contractor to start something and then it becomes damaged because of changing river conditions, typically high flow, high velocities in the late fall and winter months. So, if no questions on this slide we can move on.

And this is a pretty familiar image to most of you. I should be getting new aerial imagery probably by the next Users Board meeting. The primary reason though I showed this slide is to demonstrate the site congestion. It still continues to be an issue. But now at kind of the middle right hand side of that slide where it shows the M22 to M27 work, that contractor is now out of the picture because they're physically complete.

Is there a question? Okay, I'm going to continue on. Most recently, I believe we still have the congestion issues out there between the Stilling Basin work and the river chamber

completion contractor. But we recently mitigated the majority of those conflicts by issuing a modification to the river chamber completion contractor. That did cost us some money. We hit a little bit of contingency. But it allowed us to continue construction out there without having to stop any work. And if there's no questions, we can move to the next slide.

Again, just some graphics of the progress. This graphic depicts the middle wall monolith as complete and in progress. So, the very dark green blocks out there represent monoliths that are completed. And then the purple blocks represent monoliths that still have mass concrete placed in its remaining. If you recall, I just said that there's only three mass concrete placements remaining, and this graphic shows four. The graphic is just a little outdated because they just did another placement. Should be done by the end of November, early part of December.

The secant piles on the inward side of the river wall, that's completed on the upstream river wall face of the dam. And it's in progress on the downstream side of them. That's to the right of the image there. Those are in progress. And that is currently on the critical path. But we don't anticipate any issues with that right now.

The last thing that I can talk about on this slide, right in line with the dam that points north south on this particular image, the control tower is pretty much under construction there. I'll show you an image of that here in a few seconds. We can move to the next slide if there are no questions.

Okay, Slide 8 is the Charleroi Stilling Basin. The protection wall, that's the, you can just barely make out the orange dots there at the bottom of the slide and then the light blue rectangles that's the tremie slabs. Those are all complete, those are in place. And then the orange blocks they represent the grout bags and precast elements that have been put in place already.

More work has been done there. As of the end of last week, they only had five grout bags left to place to finish gate bay #5 and 30% of gate bay #4. And three of those grout bags were supposed to go in this week. As I mentioned before, they want to get that all done. That was scheduled to be done before December 1<sup>st</sup>. And it's looking like they are going to hit that without any difficulty. So, if there's no questions we can move on to some more images.

The M22 to M27 contract. This is an image of the downstream M27 area, which just shows completed. This is the river side face of that middle wall. And then just upstream from that is the M27. And then on the far-right hand side of the picture that's a portion of the old river wall, and that needs to come out. That's part of the demolition that will occur as part of the river chamber completion contract. If there's no questions we can move onto some more construction images in the next slide.

So, the image on the left-hand side is the image of the control tower I told you we would see, that I promised a couple seconds ago. So, they completed three lifts, they are working on their fourth lift now. I know they are placing a fourth lift of it for the operational control area. And if that continues to go well, there's a total of seven lifts to put in there. Like I said, we finished three for sure and I think four is in progress right now. The image on the right-hand side just kind of shows Option 3 of the river chamber completion. Option 3 work. As you can see the

gaps in there where the concrete has to be placed, in that image. I keep pointing, but I know you guy can't see what I am pointing to. So, move to Slide 11 unless there's a question.

Okay this is an image showing work that's ongoing at the stilling basin. The image on the left-hand side is when they were preparing the subgrating for the amount of sub-base material that the grout bag sat on. And then the image on the right-hand side shows a lifting frame with the grout bags strung between those and then that lifting frame gets lowered into the river and then those grout bags get pumped full of grout. So, if there's no questions we can move on to the next slide.

This is just a financial slide. You know there are no changes on this from the last time we reported. So, if there's no questions and a lot of the stuff that's on this slide I've already talked about, So, unless anybody has any particular questions we can move on. I'll just pause there.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Steve. Rob Innis. Just a quick question for you. There's over a \$2 million-difference between the remaining balance and the allocation there. If you look at the FY 2020 allocation there's \$111 million.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** We received some \$111 million worth of money and I think that's probably the delta there. Let me, I'll double check that. But I think that's probably what that difference is.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** I think we received \$111 million.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** I'll double check the difference between those amounts.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** You're welcome. So, for Slide 13, the only change here to report is that the river chamber completion contract was moved from FY 2023 for the completion to FY 2024. We moved one month. And that's kind of associated with that the stilling basin conflict. I said we mitigated most of the efforts there. Most of the impacts from that conflict. But we're looking at different ways. We have some options to pull that back into FY 2023. And that's completion of the river chamber. So, if you remember back on the first slide the benefits actually occur before the completion of this contract. September 23<sup>rd</sup> represents when we would complete the river chamber completion contract, but that really doesn't have an effect on the benefits for the project, because the benefits are achieved earlier when we can take out (Monongahela River) Lock and Dam No. 3. If there's no question there, I can move on. Thank you.

And this is the financial score card if you will. The Cost Performance Index on the right-hand side under contingency included. That shows a CPI of 1.11. As long as that is good, that means we are under budget. And that's very representative of what I talked about on that first slide. You know, \$1.07 (billion) over \$111 million that we have in our coffers now to finish the project. We remain under budget. We continue to believe that's where we're going to end up.

There are additional pieces of work we have to consider like the permanent closure of the land chamber up at Charleroi. And we'll be starting a design effort for that come January this year.

On the major activity schedule that's in the lower righthand quadrant, you'll see the lock and dam removal contract was added with the Baseline date of 30 June 2023. That's when we award that contract. Now that's a late date. And if you notice there the Current date is a year earlier than that. There's a lot of time in that schedule because we have to get better informed how the contractor will work on Charleroi Options No. 4 and No. 5. We award this Lock and Dam No. 3 removal contract right on time. The project manager kind of calls it the "Goldie Lock syndrome" in that we don't want it too soon; we don't want it too late.

So, we have some time frame in there where we can adjust this so that as soon as the Charleroi river chamber is ready to go, we can blow up Lock and Dam No. 3 and start transiting without having to lock through that point in the river. So, that's why there's a big difference in those two dates that one year. And that's the only thing that I have on that slide.

And with that, that concludes my presentation. I know I went through that pretty quickly. Certainly, if there's any questions, I'd be happy to entertain those now.

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** Steve. This is Mike Monahan. Can you hear me?

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** Yes, I can sir.

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** First, thank you for the presentation. Excellent job on the Lower Mon River project. My question actually relates to the Upper Ohio, I was kind of surprised that the Upper Ohio was not on the agenda this time giving the fact that Montgomery Lock is a shovel ready project and in the Capital Investment Strategy. Could you give me a quick update of how we stand from a perspective for the Upper Ohio project and Montgomery Lock?

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** Yes, Mike. I certainly can. So, as you know the Upper Ohio project is still in the Investigations account and it's not budgetable. It's got a BCR (Benefit/Cost Ratio) of 1.1. We did receive \$18 million in PED thus far. And we carried over about \$2 - \$2.5 million into this fiscal year from last fiscal year.

We're going gang busters on design work, design efforts. We're looking at real estate stuff right now. And that \$2 or \$2.5 million that we carried over, that's going to run out probably in the February, late February, or early March timeframe. So, that could put a significant damper on the movement that we've achieved so far on this project. You know we've developed teams, so if we stopped work on this project, those teams could you know fall apart for a while and take time to regroup.

So, I hope that answers your question. February March time frame is when we think we're going to run out of cash.



**Mr. Michael Monahan:** Thank you Steve. Given the fact the importance the Upper Ohio project the fact that it's really ready, potentially I want to ask that we keep this Upper Ohio on the agenda for future Users Board meetings and also, I guess my general question is, what can we do to keep the proper funding stream for this project, to keep this process going forward? What can the Users Board do to help with the process?

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** Mike, thanks for the question or comment. I want to make sure that I'm tracking the same thing here as you. We do have a package that's construction-ready that's shovel ready. It is not the lock's construction, it's for the secant pile contract. And if we get a Construction new start, that starts us to kick off money in this construction site. So, we're not talking a major lock's contract to be shovel ready. Right now, we're talking that first small contract to get us into Construction.

Regarding, funding that can potentially fund this to keep us moving, we're in the work plan. We have requested work plan funding. We are not in the work plan. We requested work plan funding in the amount of \$8.2 million in the Investigations account and that should pretty much wrap us up with the design effort for the Montgomery Lock, so we could be completed with the design here in a year and a half or two years with that \$8.2 million.

If we get into the Construction funding, if we get that Construction new start, we would use that \$8.2 million of Construction funds or IWTF (Inland Waterways Trust Fund) funds to work on that to finish that design for the Montgomery Lock. Plus, we are going to award that secant pile contract for you know I don't think I can disclose the amount of money, but you can do the math, I guess. We will be requesting about \$19 million in the Construction program. If we got it and we are able to get a Construction new start. \$19 million is our capability.

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** Thanks Steve. I think it's critical to note that this project is critical, and if you can be ready in a year and a half for this project as I understand it, to begin to receive benefits so from the timeline perspective, you know it measures up very well and supported by Users Board members. Thank you.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** You're welcome, Mike. Are there any other questions on the Upper Ohio River project or the Lower Mon?

**General Butch Graham:** Hey Steve. General Graham here. Appreciate that presentation. I think it has been 15 years to pull this thing forward. Taking just a little bit of time, a combination project of Mon River locks 2, 3, and 4, right? And the dams at #2 and #4 and then taking out Dam #3.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** Yes sir.

**General Butch Graham:** Right. Until we finish, this thing is going to take, what? Trying to do the math in my head.

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** We were authorized in '92, sir. Thirty years.

**General Butch Graham:** Thirty years? Okay, 30 years to get this thing done. And it was the right decision in terms of looking at this because we've been criticized for looking at individual locations. And the decision was made to start looking at things more like a system. You know putting it into context, about a system look like we're looking at like the NESP and the Upper Mississippi. Given the reality of dynamic funding, we'll call it that, would you do anything differently in hindsight?

**Mr. Steve Fritz:** You know, it's hard to say, sir. Because we are looking at things as a system you know when we put the feasibility study together for Upper Ohio. When we looked at it as a system. And maybe, if we were to look at it one lock, one lock at a time, we may get substantially less costs associated with that because we're just looking at it like that. So, maybe the benefit-to-cost ratio would work out more in our favor. But because we've used that system's approach, I think that was probably the right decision.

From the standpoint of project execution, in order to not have it take 30 years, it's best to get it funded as quickly as possible. I know right now in the Capital Investment Strategy, that does not include the potential cost sharing that might come out from WRDA. But there is an opportunity there to pull stuff back to the left if that cost share does change. And it will be my hope that we would recognize that funding these things sooner as a project as oppose to piecemealing it out now as for just Montgomery. If we would fund that whole as a project, we would get out of this quicker and realize all benefits sooner and reduce our risks much sooner. Does that answer the question?

**General Butch Graham:** Yeah. Okay. Thanks Steve. So, I'm just going to ask the Board members about it being constructed for 30 years. Any thoughts that you all have on this? Mike, any thoughts?

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** This is Mike Monahan. My perspective I think it is critical to fund upfront, to fully fund these projects up front. I believe what I've seen from the Corps like the Illinois Waterway closure, if they are allocated funding properly, we can efficiently get it done in a timely manner with the benefits to the nation. And I think that's something that you know we need to be very careful of moving forward to make sure that we fund these projects appropriately and efficiently fund the Corps of Engineers so we can effectively execute the projects. I believe on a number of projects we can have efficient funding and they can be completed in the time that suits your time frame.

**General Butch Graham:** Thanks Mr. Monahan. Any other thoughts from other Board members on watching this unfold? We want to make sure we don't lose touch. (No Board members responded.)

Okay. Alright. Thanks Steve.

Mark. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you sir. Thanks Steve. Appreciate it. We all appreciate your wisdom related to the Lower Mon project and the Upper Ohio.

Without further ado, we're going to move onto Adam Walker who's going to give us the brief project update for Chickamauga Lock Project. Adam?

**Mr. Adam Walker:** Thank you. General Graham, Chairman Innis, Board members, Federal observers. Appreciate the opportunity to talk about the Chickamauga Lock and Dam Project. So, I'll jump right into it.

Bottom Line Up Front for the project is we're actually making a little progress on the closeout of the lock excavation contract. It's been a year and a half since the contract was physically completed and that closeout is pending.

And the lock chamber contract is what we are focusing on now. We exercised all remaining options back on June 15. Still working with the contractor to finalize the rebaselined schedule. The Government disapproved the second version of the contractor's updated schedule submittal with comments this week. We expect a response to those comments next week so we can approve the schedule for the remainder of the work that extends the contract out to July 2023.

Contractor has been experiencing delays on site and the concrete production placement rate hasn't been realized as originally planned. They are reviewing the impacts of the delays. We can't really put a finger on exactly what the delays are yet but we're working on trying to get the details of that. The contractor has not made any official request to extend time or money, we are just having conversations at this point. We're trying to do what we can. We haven't seen anything yet; we hope to get that next week.

The approach wall contract is what we're working on for award in September 21. Mr. Durrett talked earlier about it briefly. We'll be doing the Best Value Trade-Off method for that. So, we are working right now trying to put together the Plans for the Best Value solicitation for that contract. I hadn't talked about this contract in detail in the past, so I plan to later outline the planning of that contract.

The Overview slide has not really changed since the last meeting, so I won't spend much time on it. Those are the expenditures through June, so that gets this to 42% complete. I think the numbers have been updated since then, I think we have expenditures through September. So, about 42% complete is big progress.

The next couple of slides gives you a little bit of current progress on the lock chamber contract. Picture on the top left.

On the next slide, in the top left is the schematic of the lock chamber that I outlined for the components which are underway now. Picture on the right side actually shows the concrete placement to date. You see the dark brown are the concrete placement. And you can see that the culvert has started to take shape.,

So, that's a photograph there on the bottom left of the culvert, it's about a 12 by 15-foot opening for the new lock chamber. It's complex placing the concrete around this area, rebar is more confining. I'm sure that contributes some to the smaller concrete placements to date. So hopefully by the time we get all the foundation covered on the entire footprint, that might help increase some of the concrete placement rates.

There's a photograph, taken from the dam looking downstream, you can see the placed concrete coming up above the chamber floor, so things are starting to take shape on site.

Going back on the right, just another shot of the culvert that's on the lower end of the culvert, where it actually turns and goes under the chamber where we will be discharging, the culverts on the back side of the river wall to help minimize impacts to navigation. As you can see, forming up a culvert like that with concrete is a little more complex. This maybe adding a little bit of complexity to the project right now.

The next slide is where we'll talk about the approach wall contract. Just kind of giving you an outline of what we're planning for that work. There will be a two-year overlap between the lock chamber contract and this one if we award in September 21.

So, the work that's going on inside the cofferdam which is that green outlined area there is the lock chamber contract. So, that's all going to be finished and completed with that work. The new chamber itself will be functional, just be located inside the cofferdam.

So, the approach wall contract will include the decommissioning also. The base of that contract is primarily going to focus on the upstream approach wall, which is in the light blue area on the right side of the photo. Once that's done, that contractor will start to breach the dam, removing the spillway gates and gantry crane bridge located on top of the existing dam. The contractor will be required to finish the commissioning and testing activities to ensure all the operating components of the new lock are working properly. The contractor will remove the portion of the cofferdam that need to be removed to allow navigation to begin transiting the new lock.

Then lastly, we'll be moving navigation over to that lock chamber at that point in time. Once navigation moves over to the new lock, they'll be able to do the remaining part in that contract which is the downstream approach walls, shown in light blue on the left side of the picture there. We'll remove all remaining cofferdam cells from horseshoe shaped green outline area.

So, we'll put a concrete closure plug in the lock chamber, represented by the red block there, the other red block located just above the chamber is the thrust block that is needed to help mitigate the alkali aggregate reaction forces reacting to the dam.

The orange block is the backfill of rock material that we will put into the existing lock to maintain stability of the lock once it is taken off-line. The purple block represents the rock fill that we plan to place in the lower approach to the existing lock, which provide access to the new operations building which is being built on the new land side chamber wall.

Moving to the photographs on the right. That top photograph is taken from the existing lock looking downstream; so we'll be removing those four dam piers and spillways labeled there as 1, 2, 3 and 4. That's actually where the new lock approach will be for vessels to transit the dam, labeled as bays 2 to 3 right now.

The second photograph there on the bottom is just the downstream view of those piers. It's hard to see in that photograph, so I put arrows pointing out where the concrete has been wrapped. The Lock Chamber contract will be placing concrete up at that elevation and follow on contract will come in later and be demolishing those piers from that level up which will open up the path for the new lock chamber.

I hope that kind of gives you a better idea of what's coming in this future contract.

On the financial slide, no real changes there from the last Users Board meeting. The changes are highlighted in red. We are still working on that rebaseline schedule, hope to nail it down in the next week or two hopefully.

The approach wall contract, as far as that goes, we're developing plans now, planning on having a 95% technical review package ready for the January time frame. We'll be working on the solicitation documents as well.

So, this slide is for the overall project. Haven't seen anything change on this. Still looking at the online date and benefits being generated in November '23 at the earliest, that is dependent on the lock chamber contract being concluded on time which is currently 1 July 2023. So, any delays on the lock chamber construction timeline will be a day for a day impact on the follow-on contractor's ability to get the new lock open.

This slide is the time and cost scorecard. We are showing yellow for the expenditures and yellow for the schedule.

I don't have it here, but Steve just mentioned the CPI and SPI, the cost and schedule performance indexes for expenditures and schedule. We are just below one or unity, which unity is right on budget. So, we are at a .98, .99, respectively.

So, we are just tracking right underneath those planned values into the yellow range, but I wanted to highlight the potential impacts that the lock chamber contractors are experiencing now. That could have an impact on the planned work. We're monitoring closely and working as closely as we can to help mitigate those impacts to the overall project schedule. As far as the major activities schedule, I do have the Lock Chamber Partnering meeting for 05 November listed where we're going to meet with the contractor to try to talk through some of the remaining issues to see if we can make it progress forward.

I already talked about the Approach Wall contract. The 95% Agency Technical Review starts in January and will finish it up in February. We are looking to hopefully get the initial solicitation out to the contractors for the first bidding in mid to late March time frame.

So, this slide is just our summary and challenges. Kind of just touched on all of these. We'll be working on closing that lock excavation contract. For the lock chamber, just trying to quantify what those delays might be with that contractor, as I said earlier. And then again, the approach wall and decommissioning contract, anticipated award in September of 2021. And then no change in that efficient funding profile from the last couple Users Board meetings.

I tried to go through that very quickly in the interest of time. But, do you have any questions you want to ask?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any questions for Adam?

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Adam. Rob Innis. With your efficient funding here and being on the CR, what happens to your construction schedule if you didn't get the \$60 million next year?

**Mr. Adam Walker:** So, we have enough carryout right now to not suspend anything going on with the lock chamber contract. So, there is no impact on the ongoing work. The moneys next year or this year in FY 2021, will actually be put toward awarding the Approach Wall and Decommissioning contract. If there are no moneys allocated in FY 2021 then that contract award would slip to the next year. There would just be a slight increase in the contract amount if award slipped to FY 2022, from escalation from one year to the next possibly. I think it is possible if we were to slip the contract award to FY 2022, we could resequence the work included the AWD contract where it would not affect that online date for the new lock. Our plan for overlapping contracts is to make sure we're moving as quick as possible and that's why we're trying to get that awarded in 2021 so we can go ahead and work on that upstream approach wall. Primarily, to mitigate any kind of impact to navigation traffic while constructing the approach walls. The more complete the walls are by the time we get to put the new lock online the better. Because we may be having to use helper boats on the upstream side and will be using helper boats on the downstream side. Those downstream piers can't be built until the new lock is online. I guess I answered your original questions. Could potentially see some slight increases due to delayed funding.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** There's no major increases due to lack of efficient funding? You're not going to see like a huge increase because of that?

**Mr. Adam Walker:** Not sure I can guarantee an answer to that, but no I do not expect a large cost increase due to less than efficient funding.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any questions for Adam? Alright. We're going to move on. Don Getty who's going to... oh excuse me. Go ahead.

**General Butch Graham:** Hey Adam. So, back up one slide to the previous slide. So, I am asking the Board members here. Okay on the Capital Investment Strategy that project doesn't show any funding for FY 2025, FY 2024 is the last year that looks like it gets any money. What if we can't get it done in 2024? So, what I want to get is a sense from the Board, on how you want to handle this. The Capital Investment Strategy is just that, it's an investment strategy and it's not a budgeting document, per se. So, I don't want to use it for things that it's not intended to be used for. I want to make sure we're not surprising any of the Board members when the additional funds start moving because it does cascade out to future years. Obviously if the projects are ongoing, it'll take longer and cost more than starting new stuff. We're going to delay it because there are so few dollars, and efficient funding is what we want to do. We got to finish the stuff we are working on before we start on something new.

So, I'm going to pause there for a second and open up to the Board members on how you want to clearly communicate with you when ongoing projects are starting to cost more and take longer than what we told you previously. Over.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** General, Rob Innis. I didn't pick up on the schedule delay there going out to 2025 based on what we put into the Capital Investment Strategy. So, I guess you know a clear statement that we extended something would be good. I mean these slides are intended to cover that, so if we can just make a clear statement, mark it where we can see it in the slides because it definitely has an impact on the critical path.

These are all coming to an end. Right? We got Mon, Olmsted, Chickamauga, Kentucky. They're all coming to an end. It's really important that we get a new start going, so that we don't end up with nothing going on for years. That's our critical path there.

**Mr. Adam Walker:** Sir. I'll add just a little to the Chickamauga perspective. The reason that one-year shift happened is from the total project cost update performed back in the summer and briefed in the July meeting. I showed that the Site Restoration contract is going to be pushed out a year because of the sequence of other contract work. So, the dollars overall hopefully haven't changed. I think that \$230 million total is a consistent number. It's just that we will spread it out a little bit. Of course, these numbers include our full contingency amounts. I just want to make sure that you're all tracking it as not a cost increase. I was just showing different figures adding up to the same total.

**Mr. Thomas Smith:** Hey, Tom Smith here. So, let me just stand up and tell you that for the Capital Investment Strategy. So, the question General Graham is asking is pretty sophisticated. And we will just take it on as we somehow make sure we know it's clear how the two connect. The one isn't, as General Graham said, the Capital Investment Strategy is not a budget document. So, what we're doing what we want with the money and the schedule, and as you talk about your timeline, but you know we're going to have some time lag and then we'll have some other complexities, but I think your point General Graham, is that we need to stand up to that challenge that you have shown us and make sure we don't just have some diversion of funds how we envision going forward and how we're actually executing these projects, so we're going to have to do some work there.

**General Butch Graham:** The Chairman talked about us clearly communicating to the Board the changes and when we're going to need funding because that impacts this whole investment strategy. I think that's kind of the point. So, okay Tom thanks for that.

And let me go back to the other Board members, as I see that we're starting to operationalize the investment strategy in terms of communicating with it.

Okay. Please get me your concerns back, you can always send me an email. What is the name of the contractor that you got working there? Was it Shimmick? Because that's the one we had up at LaGrange, and he did a great job. What's the name of your contractor, with the lock chamber?

**Mr. Adam Walker:** It's just the same contractor Shimmick. We awarded the contract to AECOM, but they did a name change and changed to Shimmick Construction Company, Inc.

**General Butch Graham:** Okay. So, this is a contract that isn't doing very well, losing sixteen days right now. So, they're losing two weeks for every four?

**Mr. Adam Walker:** Yes, sir. That's the trend for the last few months. We had 19 days in August and 15 days in September according to their updated schedules they submitted to us.

**General Butch Graham:** Okay. And for the Board members I believe that's unacceptable. And just to reiterate what Adam said is that the project executive I believe it's Mr. Savage for LRD, is going to meet with the contractor with Adam next week. And with the goal of figuring out why they're struggling and help them get back on track. Help them get them back on track.

Okay. Any other questions from the Board members?

Okay, Mark. Back to you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. Thank you, sir. I'm going to flip it over to Don Getty to give us the update on the Kentucky Lock Project. Don?

**Mr. Don Getty:** Thank you Mark. I'd like to have a mic check, please.

**Mark Pointon:** You're hot. You're good, keep going, Don.

**Mr. Don Getty:** Alright. Thank you. Major General Graham, Chairman Innis and all the Board members. My pleasure to give you a quick update on Kentucky Lock.

This slide is the Bottom Line Up Front. The downstream cofferdam construction continues to be the largest issue on the project because its progress is on the project's critical path. Our Contractor has experienced some significant delays in the last few months. I'm going to explain that. The good news is we're not experiencing high water anymore which has been the bane of this job the past two years. So that's good news. But we are still susceptible for the next month and a half. So that's still a concern of ours. The good news is that the downstream lock



excavation is on track for now. I got a couple pictures on that as well. The upcoming downstream lock monoliths award is also on track and I'll talk about that as well.

No change on this slide, see the bottom right of this slide. This picture was taken last month. The upper right-hand side you can see our downstream cofferdam taking shape. A little change every day. And then this is our other contract on lock excavation. And they moved a lot of soil and rock this summer, so they are making progress. You can see that in this picture.

So, here are some pictures of our downstream cofferdam concrete wall. The upper left-hand picture is from back in June after we just got back to work after high water. Since then, the contractor really got after it. And the bottom picture shows you what it looked like about a month ago. We made tremendous progress this summer. And we're about finished with that, so that's a great news story on this downstream cofferdam.

And the next picture, this is also the downstream cofferdam. So, we're downstream looking upstream. And you get a good feel for the scope of the cell construction. So, in the middle of the picture you can see the second cell under construction. It's now filled with gravel and basically complete. That's good news because its foundation created a lot of problems. The top of the rock geology was not as anticipated and it took a lot longer to excavate it out and get it to the shape we needed to before we placed its concrete plug and it changed the dynamics of how we supported that cell during excavation. So, that led to about a month and a half of delays on the project on that one cell. But the contractor has gotten over that.

We have great momentum. We're working on cell 2 now. Driving the sheets. We're about finished driving the sheets and we'll start excavation on that cell next week.

There are four of these 70-foot diameter sheet pile cells. So, we finished two, working on the third, and we're actually doing pre-excavation on the fourth. We expect to be finished this winter.

The next slide is actually a repeat of the slide I showed you last time in July. The helper boats try to protect that guard cell when it was under construction, and then we had two helper boats, but after completing the guard cell we're going to have only one helper boat. More importantly, with not needing the primary helper boat, we were able to cease the quadruple lockage for every upbound tow and have gone back to a normal double lockage - so we are basically taking the lock back to its original efficiency, so that's really good news to get past this significant milestone.

So, this is just a picture of the ground view of our other contract, the downstream lock excavation. Mother Nature has been extremely beneficial to us this summer. Very dry conditions led us to significant progress. You see that here. They're also installing these large strand anchors. I think they're going to have 100 of them installed. Just have completed about 50 of them.

So, this contractor actually is going to finish the downstream cofferdam. In fact, they're working up there now and have been installing strand anchors on the cofferdam.

So, this is an isometric of our next construction contract. I showed you that isometric actually in the last two meetings. It is a greater than \$250 million contract. I did put in some milestones in the yellow highlighted section. We're starting up our final reviews next month. So, we have progressed the plans and specifications to near final conditions. We plan to actually advertise the contract in February, and we plan to award by September. If things go normally as they should in LRD, we would expect to award this contract in July using the Best Value Trade-Off. September will give us some cushion if things don't go as normal, but we fully expect to award this contract this fiscal year.

This is our financial slide. So, nothing has changed from last meeting so we can go to the next slide.

This is just our schedule slide. No changes. I do want to point out Task 4 for the downstream cofferdam, we show it to be complete in November which is our contract finish date. It's not going to be finished probably until January or February. The delay is slowing down the next contractor. There's going to be time and cost associated with that. After we get through the geology in the next three weeks, we plan to work on a big schedule update and determine those time and cost impacts and we should have that in the January or February timeframe. The project's impact by 13 months of high water is the main component of these schedule issues.

This slide is our scorecard. Red stop lights there for both expenditures and schedule are a result solely to the 13 months of high water impacts we've had on the project. Those red lights are going to remain there. We're not spending as much as we planned because it didn't get expended last year and we're behind schedule because of the 13 months. Those are going to remain red until we do the updates for this project for our performance metrics, that is what we do to adjust and get those costs included. But these will remain red until we do that because there's no way for us to get back those 13 months.

I do want to point out that major activity schedule I mentioned before. The project is being reauthorized. It's in the draft WRDA. It's not going to be Fiscal Year 2020 as shown in this slide because they didn't meet that but hopefully in 2021, the project will be reauthorized for its new funding level.

For this I just want to point out the team is extremely focused on the downstream cofferdam. Just trying to get finished with that contract anyway we can. We also are focused on awarding the downstream lock monoliths this fiscal year. So, we're really working hard on it.

No change to our efficient funding profile since the last meeting anyway. That's all I have. Any questions or comments?

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Hey, Don. Rob Innis. A few questions. What happens to us if you don't get your \$110 million next year?

**Mr. Don Getty:** Excellent question. The project is carrying in \$80 million from last year because we got funds to award the downstream lock monoliths and we did not. So, if we don't

get any money in FY 2021, we probably go ahead and award the downstream lock monoliths base contract and hope to survive until we get funds in Fiscal Year 2022. But what that does is not allow us to be able to place concrete when we need to if we award in 2021 without additional funding, so we're going to have schedule impacts in that scenario. In fact, we're going to be adding time to that contract from the get-go if we don't get funds in FY 2021. So, from a schedule and cost efficiency standpoint it would be great to get funds for FY 2021, but we will go ahead with that award even if we don't, more than likely, I would think. Over.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** So, how much does that push you back? I mean beyond 2025?

**Mr. Don Getty:** It's probably going to have some impact if we get zero funding in FY 2021. It's probably going to have at least three months impact on the project schedule. We're going to 2025 now. I don't think that's going to push it to 2026, but it's not a good thing obviously.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** What about less than efficient funding?

**Mr. Don Getty:** Yes. So, inefficient funding. In fact, I think we had one year of no funding at all in our cost schedule risk assessment. We actually had 47 months of project delays built into the contingencies. We already used 13 months of that on high water, so we still have roughly 34 months of time contingencies remaining in our schedule.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Anymore questions for Don? Alright. Thanks Don. Appreciate it. Let's move onto Olmsted Locks and Dam. Mr. Durrett, I hope you're still on the line. You were the first up and now you're the last to go.

**Mr. Stephen Durrett:** I'm still on Mark.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. Thank you, Steve.

**Mr. Stephen Durrett:** Alright. Go to the next slide. Just some Bottom Line Up Front info. The dam contractor, the cost reimbursable contractor has demobilized from the site and is no longer on site so that is a great accomplishment. The remaining contracts to complete the project are in various stages of development, advertisement and construction. You will see that most of them had been awarded in FY 2020, last fiscal year. That's a great accomplishment.

Also, we have completed all of the equipment sales for the Olmsted project. So, all of the equipment has been either sold or disposed of and our sales operations are over at Olmsted as of the end of September as well.

So, those are some really great accomplishments for Olmsted in 2020.

This is just the cost. We have more than enough money to complete this project. We are not in fear of running out of any money. So, our total project cost balance is still going to be, we're in good shape.

The big accomplishment, the big unknown, the big risk on the Olmsted project was the lock and dam demo, the marine demo, phase 2. That was awarded in August. I'll show you on the next slide. That was completed in August and that was a great accomplishment. That was right around the government estimate. So, the biggest risk driver we had an unknown was the awarding of that last large contract to demolish, the second phase of demo of the (Ohio River) 53 project.

This slide shows you that we did a lot of awards, if you look at the contract award column, in 2020. We had some historic mitigation requirements that's our last major milestone. It's not going to be an expensive contract. But it is part of our historical requirements. We have to complete that historical requirement associating with Locks and Dams 52 and 53. That contract will be awarded here in the next few months in the first quarter of FY 2021. There are a few miscellaneous small contracts we will need to do like finishing out some site grading at project study and some other miscellaneous activities associated with the project, that has just developed, but identified so we need to get it fixed as well for our project and get it into operation.

There's one more training wall that's still being evaluated that may be installed as well. That's something else we may have to do that's still being looked at.

So, there's a few miscellaneous unknowns out there. We do expect to have any of those identified and done in 2021 so we can quickly close this project out in 2022.

One of the due outs from the last meeting, moving on, was the question regarding some of the property. Here's a summary of the Ohio River Lock and Dam 52 property. There's some draft language in the water resources development act or bill to transfer the property to the Massac-Metropolis Port District. That is currently in the proposed bill. Eliminate the property at 52.

The Lock and Dam 53 property will probably go through the normal channels of being excessed. And any money retained from that sale of that property would go to the Treasury since Ohio River Lock and Dam 53 was not constructed with Trust Fund funds. And any of the sales from that property would be returned to the Treasury. That will be done through the normal General Services Administration (GSA) process and GSA will work that for us. That will not be associated with demo of Locks 52 and 53. We will be turning that over to the GSA and that will stop the expenditures on the Olmsted project. That's really all I have such as any questions on Olmsted.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any questions for Mr. Durrett? (No response.)

Nope. Alright. Thank you, Steve.

**Mr. Stephen Durrett:** Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** It's time for the public comment period. We have two individuals who have requested that we make a public comment. So first off is Dan Engemann from the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River. I'll remind you that you have three minutes to make your public comment during this period. Dan, I hope you're still on the line.

**Mr. Dan Engemann:** Yes. Can you hear me okay?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes, I can. Thank you.

**Mr. Dan Engemann:** Alright. Great. Well thank you everyone. I know you got a long meeting. I'll try to be really brief here. You know Mark, I know you'll give me the signal when I go too long here but I'll try to stay within the timeline.

The Coalition for Protecting the Missouri River are made up of about 30 members in six states, who support the interest of flood control and navigation facilities. I want to bring to your attention the Missouri River navigation challenges. Especially that really crept up on us this fall from the historic 2019 Flood. You're likely aware there was a record duration flood that caused extensive damage to approximately 7000 river training structures. It severely impacted the self-scouring of the river channel itself. Flooding also damaged constructed areas for Endangered Species such as the piping plover. Causing much greater diversion from the channel than originally designed. So, coupled with current low water conditions, this has created a very dangerous situation on the river, costly delays, and serious navigation accidents.

The current condition of these structures means they are not getting used effectively on portions of this waterway, which is provided the Mississippi to provide flood support which is generally about 50% of flows during normal conditions you know as much as 72% at St. Louis during the 2012 drought.

In recent years the Missouri River navigation channel has benefited from reliable flows and a pretty good channel. This has brought new towing companies, new investments and ports. The most recent being an \$11 million facility being constructed not far from Sioux City, Iowa.

The Missouri River is categorized as you know, as a commercially Low Use river. The Low Use river is based on tonnage. But we think a better term is "under-utilized" because it has huge growth potential. While USACE is doing great work with the money they have, funding has been far below the estimated \$200 million needed to repair these flood damages.

General Graham, we appreciate your recent visits to the Missouri River. I know that the senior staff of Northwestern Division are highly engaged. Tom Smith, I appreciate your visits last week and the discussion. But we really need a commitment from USACE to the Missouri River to be reliable and efficient as the rest of the inland waterways system.

So, my final point for consideration is that Missouri River Navigators pay into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, but the system receives no funding to my knowledge in return. We believe that the Missouri River structures are just as important as the locks. You know, without proper maintenance the river closes if the channel is unavailable. I think the Board should

consider treating damaged training structures the same way you treat the major rehabilitation lock and dam projects. We believe that associated repair and maintenance costs are minimal. And it would result in large increases and system reliability.

Again, I thank you for the opportunity and welcome any questions or comments you may have. I appreciated sitting in on this meeting today. This is my first time for a Board meeting. Very interesting.

So, thank you, again.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you, Dan. I'm actually impressed. You got in under 10 seconds left on your 3-minute limit. That's pretty good stuff. Moving on to Mr. James Stark who's the executive director...excuse me...

**General Butch Graham:** Hey, Mark. Hold on. Hold on.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yes, sir.

**General Butch Graham:** I'm not sure the procedures, I don't mean to mess up your rules here a little bit. But that's a good question. I'd be interested in seeing any thoughts from the Board members on funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund being used as a source for funding for the work for the Missouri River, which I think is estimated at \$200 million right now is what we're thinking. Any thought from the Board members? (No Board members responded.)

**Chairman Rob Innis:** General. Rob Innis. I don't know that I have an exact comment right now. I guess we'll have to convene as all Board members and determine or kind of get an idea together where we are on that, so I don't think we have any comments.

**General Butch Graham:** Okay Rob. Thanks. I know it's evident. We've been looking at this for a while. It's a Low Use reach of the waterways as we classify it. That's doesn't mean it's not important to Dan and the rest of the mariners on the Missouri.

Again, there will probably not protocol here. We will copy those who are senior executives for the Northwestern Division. Those with responsibility for oversight of the Missouri River system. Bethany (Coffey, USACE Northwestern Division), do you want to add to the discussion for the benefit of the Board members.

**Ms. Bethany Coffey:** Thank you, sir, for the opportunity. I think that it is something that you know we are happy to work with your team and how you look at the classification of those structures. I know that there's some other things we can look at as well. So, I think that is something we will be working with your team on as we move forward. It's just how do you look at those structures. How do they compare to, you know, a lock structure? Because there are some of these structures that I think could help the classification requirements if the river structures.

**General Butch Graham:** Okay. Thanks Ms. Coffey.

Thanks, Mark, for letting me hijack that for a minute. Back to you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yup, thank you, sir. I'm not going to be the one who tells you, "You are breaking protocol." So. Let's go ahead and move onto Jim Stark who I believe is the executive director of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association (GICA). So, he's our second public comment speaker today. Jim, you still out there?

**Mr. Jim Stark:** I am, Mark. A mic check, you got me?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Jim, you're good. Go for it.

**Mr. Jim Stark:** Okay. Thank you. Hi. I'm Jim Stark. I'm the president of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association. I'm representing about 200 members back in business on the GIWW (Gulf Intracoastal Waterway) between Brownsville, Texas and St. Marks, Florida as well as our tributaries that connect to the canal up into the rivers. I would like to make just three points.

The first is I would like to first recognize and thank the Galveston District, the New Orleans District and the Mobile District and their respected divisions for their work in restoring the GIWW following the seven named storms that affected nearly every reach of the waterway this season. I know Mark Wingate mentioned five storms in New Orleans, Louisiana, but those impacts spilled over in the other districts as well. Early on they had had one Texas storm exclusively that caused significant damage to the waterway. But I will say that the Corps is timely in its survey work, debris removal and emergency dredging. And not a lot of delays to resume that navigation as quickly as possible following the damage of the storm surges and winds. From the stakeholders, I'd like to say bravo for a job well done.

Secondly, I would like to thank Mark Wingate and Colonel Murphy whose attention and briefing by Mark today on the IHNC Lock Replacement project. We certainly will stand ready to help with the public outreach again if that's resumed, when it's resumed. And I appreciate Major General Graham's commitment to move this forward as soon as possible. And I get it, it's been there way too long.

Just add a fine point to the discussion about the IHNC Lock resiliency and reliability. As Mark mentioned, the lock right now is undergoing repairs for chamber leaks and it's been down for about 60 days and we probably have another 20 or so days left to go. And these delays that we are seeing in this lock project is a direct result of hurricanes in the area for the last couple of months. What we really need to do is have the modern lock that isn't subjected to those kinds of repairs and then subjecting mariners to the alternate route that are not reliable and have safety concerns. It is not reported although it shortens the time and distance equation. Just for instance, we probably lost 10 to 12 days of navigation during this repair, just to have the lock open. Enough said.

I think everyone understands it's been authorized since 1956. Thanks again for moving that forward.

And thank you Mark Wingate for the update on the Bayou Sorrel Lock economics, the GRR, or the effort to validate the correct delay numbers. That's also a critical piece of our infrastructure in the Gulf region.

With that, again thanks for your help. And Spencer Murphy, I appreciate your comments as well. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you, Jim. Appreciate that. General Graham. Do you have something to bring up to Mr. Stark?

**General Butch Graham:** Yes, thanks. I want to continue the dialogue on how to address IHNC Lock and others on the GIWW, and work with you how we can include it in the CIS report. Would you be interested in joining us?

**Mr. Jim Stark:** Absolutely, General. Although it was an unmuted participation last time, we were at the last public meeting which I believe was March of 2017 so, wherever we stand by and we have numbers to support that project.

**General Butch Graham:** Okay. I think having a large portion of the inland navigation industry to gain the requisite public support, it would be great, so thank you for being with us here today and I look forward to working with you on moving this forward.

Okay. Mark. Thank you.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you, sir. I was actually trying to ask if you have any questions, but you beat me to the punch. That's it for the public comment period.

We're moving onto the closing comments. Sir, I believe you are back up as the provider of closing remarks for the meeting.

**General Butch Graham:** I want to thank all the Board members for attending. Again, our commitment is to work collaboratively to build a reliable system for the organizations, your companies, and this nation. And I'll be absolutely transparent with you on where we stand and look forward to your feedback and collaboration.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Thank you, sir. Flipping to you Chairman Innis. Rob, do you have any comments; closing comments for this Board meeting?

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Just wanted to make sure that we got the items I made in my opening statement, but we looking for what's happening with the PED activities or reviews, for Mississippi River Lock and Dam 25, Three Rivers, Arkansas, at Montgomery Lock (Ohio River) and LaGrange on the Illinois Waterway. Those are the top candidates for the next stage of construction, already identified in the Capital Investment Strategy. We need a report out on those for the next and future meetings. So, we can understand so that we're ready for construction and those construction new starts, become available.



**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yeah. I got that Rob.

**Chairman Rob Innis:** Okay. And then on that note, a fantastic meeting and collaboration. Appreciate the time. I think we got some things to work on. And I appreciate it. I'll turn it over to any other Board members that want to comment.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any follow-on closing comments from any of the members other than Chairman Innis? (None.)

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** I'll remind you, you're all on mute if you're making comments. Alright.

**Mr. Damon Judd:** Mark. This is Damon Judd from Marquette. Just as a follow-up to some of the things in Rob's statement and the General's statements earlier. It may be helpful for the Corps to think about whether or not there is a schedule that could be provided to the Users Board and the industry that highlights these critical funding points around work for the future projects and the impact to these schedules, and the CIS report that will allow us to unite and make sure that the DC community is fully aware of what the impact is of cascading effects and working on future waterways projects as we wrap up current projects.

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Mark?

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Yeah?

**Mr. Spencer Murphy:** Mark. It's Spencer Murphy. I just wanted to add my thanks to the Corps for a job well done on the Illinois River Closure given the challenges of the severe weather and COVID-19 impacts. We were very concerned about the ability to execute that project on budget and within the time frame that was promised and I just wanted to say thanks to what was a really important project and very very thankful that we were able to get it done.

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Well, speaking for the entire Corps, you're welcome. That's all on Rock Island and the division and their intense management of that to get that done on schedule and on budget as General Graham said earlier. Any other members? Any other comments from members?

(None.)

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Okay. I will call for a motion to adjourn Users Board Meeting No. 95.

**Mr. Michael Monahan:** So moved.

**Mr. Jeff Webb:** Seconded.

(Several Board members simultaneously said aye.)

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Any nays? (None.)

**Mr. Mark Pointon:** Alright. We are adjourned. Everybody stay safe.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.)

**Inland Waterways Users Board Meeting No. 95**  
**Virtually by Webinar, Fort Belvoir, Virginia**  
**October 30, 2020**  
**List of Participants**

<u>Last Name</u>	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Aldridge	Joseph W.	USACE, HQ, Great Lakes & Ohio River Division RIT
Booth	Peter N.	USACE, Louisville District
Burroughs	Ms. Tiffany S.	USACE, HQ Operations & Regulatory Div, Navigation Ops
Cameron	Ms. Tamara E.	USACE, St. Paul District
Chambers	Patrick A.	USACE, Mississippi Valley Division
Chang	Kuo-Liang "Matt"	U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Transportation Services Div
Chapman	William R. III	USACE, Great Lakes and Ohio River Div
Chewning	D. Brian	USACE, Mississippi Valley Division
Clouse	Paul D.	USACE, HQ Operations & Regulatory Div, Navigation Ops
Coffey	Ms. F. Beth	USACE, Northwestern Division
Dening	Christopher T.	USACE, Pittsburgh District
Dorsey	Chad	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Doyle	John S., Jr.	Jones Walker LLC (WCI)
Durrett	Stephen G.	USACE, Great Lakes and Ohio River Div
Earl	David A.	Marathon Petroleum Company
El-Naggar	Kareem S.	USACE, Great Lakes and Ohio River Div
Engemann	Dan	Coalition to Protect the Missouri River
Felder	Ms. Cherrie	Channel Shipyard Companies
Fletcher	Ms. Lucy	AGRIService of Brunswick
Frantz	David A.	USACE, HQ Operations & Regulatory Div, Navigation Ops
Fritz	Stephen R.	USACE, Pittsburgh District
Frost	Stephen	USACE, Pittsburgh District
Getty	Don B.	USACE, Nashville District
Gilbert	Ms. Heather	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Office of Coast Survey
Graham	MG William "Butch"	USACE, Headquarters, Civil Works Executive Office
Gruber	Hank (Henry W.???)	USACE, Headquarters, LRD/NAD RIT???
Grunwald, Jr.	Gary L.	USACE, Louisville District
Harkness	William "Andy"	USACE, Inland Navigation Design Center (INDC)
Harshman	Scott	
Hearn	CAPT Rhys A.	USACE, Headquarters, Civil Works Executive Office

Heinold	Thomas D.	USACE, Rock Island District
Hettel	Martin T.	American Commercial Barge Line LLC (ACBL)
Hill	Brian	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Horgan	Thomas	SCF Marine, Inc.
Innis	Robert J. "Rob"	LafargeHolcim, Inc.
James	R.D.	HQDA, Assistant Secretary of Army for Civil Works
Joers	Frederick R.	USACE, Inland Navigation Design Center (INDC)
Judd	Damon S.	Marquette Transportation Company
Kearns	James A.	Jones Walker LLC
Lambert	Justin	
Leach	David	HQDA, Assistant Secretary of Army for Civil Works
Lichtman	Kenneth E.	Private Citizen
Manous	Dr. Joe D. Jr.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Maynard-Sims	Ms. Beverly	HQDA, Assistant Secretary of Army for Civil Works
McDonald	Douglas	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Monahan	Michael J.	Campbell Towing Company
Muench	Ms. Lynn M.	American Waterways Operators, Inc. (AWO)
Murphy	W. Spencer	Canal Barge Company, Inc.
Newbaker-London	Ms. Elaine E.	USACE, Southwestern Division
Norton	Jarod	USACE, Northwestern Division
Oakley	Dennis	Bruce Oakley, Inc.
Paape	William K.	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Pavlosky	Matt	
Pointon	Mark R.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Rich	Robert D.	Shaver Transportation Company
Ricketts	C. Matthew "Matt"	Crouse Corporation
Riley	Steven D.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Rohde	Paul	Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI)
Ruble	James "Jay"	Crouse Corporation
Sattinger	COL Steven M.	USACE, Rock Island District
Short	COL Andrew J.	USACE, Pittsburgh District
Smith	RADM Shepard M.	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Office of Coast Survey
Smith	Thomas P.	USACE, HQ Operations & Regulatory Division
Stark	James	Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association
Stephaich	Peter	Campbell Towing Company
Stewart	Vance	HQDA, Assistant Secretary of Army for Civil Works

Sullivan	Robert "Mike"	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Tarpey	Michael J.	USACE, Rock Island District
Taylor	Jim	
Tucker	Sean A.	USACE, Louisville District
Turner	Greg	Dow Chemical Company
Turner	Ms. Renee N.	USACE, Mississippi Valley Division
Vanderbilt	Dr. Forrest B.	USACE, Institute for Water Resources
Varisco	Jeffrey J.	USACE, New Orleans District
Villalona	Ms. Branden L.	U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Walker	Adam C.	USACE, Nashville District
Webb	Jeff	Cargill, Inc.
Wilson	Jeff	
Wingate	Mark R.	USACE, New Orleans District
Winston	Ms. Bernadette	U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Transportation Services Div
Woodruff	W. Matthew	Kirby Corporation
Wright	M	
Zea	Tracy	Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI)

