

MINUTES
CHIEF OF ENGINEERS' ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Doubletree Hotel at Lloyd Center, Portland, OR
15 May 2003

1. The Chief of Engineers, **LTG Robert Flowers**, called the Environmental Advisory Board (EAB) meeting to order at 9:10 a.m., 15 May 2003. The following EAB members were present:
 - **Dr. Mohammed Dahab**, Chairman, Civil Engineering Department, University of Nebraska
 - **Dr. Mathias Kondolf**, Associate Professor of Geography, University of California at Berkeley
 - **Dr. Theodore Hullar**, Cornell University, formerly with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
 - **Dr. Denise Reed**, Professor of Geology and Geophysics, University of New Orleans
 - **Mr. Kenneth Babcock**, Southern Regional Office, Ducks Unlimited; formerly with Missouri Department of Conservation

Also present were **Mr. Fred Caver**, Deputy Director of Civil Works; **Mr. William Dawson**, Chief, Civil Works Policy and Planning Division, and **Ms. Patricia Rivers**, Chief, Military Programs Environmental Division.

2. **Welcoming Remarks:** **COL Richard Hobernicht**, Portland District commander, welcomed the EAB to his District, thanking them for their participation in field trips and briefings during the previous two days and their insightful questions to project managers.
3. **LTG Flowers** swore in the new Board member, **Mr. Babcock**.
4. **USACE POLICY ISSUES:** According to the Corps the Civil Works Strategic Plan, discussed at the previous Board meeting, will set a new tone for the program. The steps undertaken by the Corps since the last meeting to implement this plan were then reviewed:
 - **The Planning Improvement Program:** In recent years, the Corps had become too comfortable with its planning process, and ignored planners as an asset. Now many are on the verge of retirement, so the Corps has developed an education program to train journeyman planners for senior positions. It re-instituted the Planning Associates Program, with eight people (one from each Corps division) receiving eight months of training, then going back to share their new knowledge with colleagues. The Corps is also working agreements with several universities to offer master's programs in water resources planning – the first students will begin this fall.
 - The Corps has initiated a **research and development program** centered around economic modeling and forecasting. Its Institute for Water Resources hosted the Navigation Economic Modeling Symposium in Washington, DC, on 8-10 May 2003.
 - **Environmental Operating Principles Implementing Guidelines** have been issued – it is nice to have principles but without a way to implement them they are of little value. The guidelines are in the form of a temporary Engineer Circular – a first attempt, to be improved and evolve into an Engineer Regulation. The Board's input on the guidelines was requested.

- The success of the **Federal Principals Group for the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway Study** has led the Corps to other areas – specifically to Coastal Louisiana. The Corps needs input and cooperation from other agencies, and Federal Principals Groups are an outstanding mechanism to this end.
- Looking to streamline its project delivery and reduce overhead, especially at the Headquarters and Division levels, USACE has developed a restructuring concept known as **USACE 2012** to cut levels of review and perform the project review at appropriate level, without duplication.
- **The Strategic Plan**, is still in draft form, and the Department of the Army is working with OMB on its finalization – especially on how to include performance-based measures. The Corps does not, however, expect major changes in the Plan’s essence. Transformation of the Corps of Engineers rests on three legs:
- **Independent review** – Suggested by critics, the Corps finds merit in their criticism, but would like to see independent review accomplished without unduly burdening project sponsors in terms of cost or time. Review should be conducted at critical milestones throughout a study, not just at the end. That way the reviewers should know how project decisions were reached. The Corps has reviewed the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report on independent review, and agrees with the vast majority of its recommendations. It would support legislation for independent review – possibly something similar to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors (BERH), which functioned from 1902 until disestablished in the 1992 Water Resources Development Act.
- **Business process streamlining** – Over the years, the Corps has allowed processes to accrete into its system in response to specific problems. The individual requirements are all legitimate, but the overall volume of requirements clogs the process, so now there is a need to review them.
- **The watershed planning concept**, discussed at the October 2002 Board meeting in West Palm Beach. Corps planning today is, by in large, individual project-based. Most Federal agencies have overall authority to operate their programs, and have discretion on how and where to carry out those programs. The Corps’ authority, on the other hand, covers only specific projects and studies, with no overall authority to look at the watersheds around them. The Corps is looking for a small authority to consider watersheds, work more effectively with others, share information and data, and leverage work for more effective water resources management. It can no longer look exclusively at single-purpose projects in specific geographic locations. The Corps could also use a streamlined de-authorization process. There is already one that takes effect when a project has been inactive for seven years, but the clock starts over whenever \$1 is spent on the project. The Corps now has an inventory of about \$2 billion in un-funded, inactive projects with little support. Each of them, however, is in a congressional district, so Congress will have the final say on their de-authorization.

The Corps would also like to see funds for **mitigation tracking**. The NAS Report notes that most projects the Corps has built since 1986 have had mitigation measures included; the Corps needs a way to assess the effectiveness of those measures.

The Corps indicated that there is interest in Congress to pass a **Water Resources Development Act**, and that they hoped that its centerpiece would be watershed legislation to re-direct the Corps focus. The secret to success in water resources management lies in

constructive partnerships with other Federal agencies, the States, local and tribal governments, project sponsors, non-government organizations, etc. The Corps asked the Board's advice on how such an approach could be implemented.

5. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Dr. Hullar said he strongly supported the independent review concept. Reviewers, he said, should begin at the beginning of a study and be part of the process throughout to avoid surprises in the review. They could offer ideas – independent reviewers need not be anonymous. The best reviewers are those who know the situation well, but are clear on what their review role is. In many academic situations reviewers start with a “statement of biases” to get their issues out front.

Dr. Reed warned that reviewers with ties too close to the project staff tend to lose their objectivity. She said she believes the NAS Report calls for something different from the old BERH, which included Corps officers as well as outside experts. The EAB, she suggested, could be of help in setting up a review process. The Corps may want a different type of review at the end of a study than it receives during the study, and the Board can help ensure the review scope is appropriate and that reviewers can retain their objectivity.

The Corps would like to see holistic reviews. The last EAB meeting discussed two types of review – scientific and general. The Corps has received independent reviews of some projects in the past, but these have focused mostly on economics, not science. The Corps has a lengthy process already and doesn't want to add to it, so they would like to see concurrent rather than sequential reviews. Additionally, the Corps is not calling for re-establishment of the old BERH; reviewers must be independent. The Corps believes that, in discussion, technical, scientific and policy reviews are often mixed up. In restoration projects, for example, the state of the science itself needs review, while for other projects the reviewers would be of most use in looking at the engineering solutions and economic models used. The Corps advocates having reviewers ask how the alternatives considered for a project were selected – a form of policy review – and asked the Board's input on how the different types of review can be fused together.

Dr. Hullar said it could be done by going back to the old NAS Report, but the topic could be addressed more effectively in a one-day workshop where the Corps could put a few projects of different type on the table, say what kind of review it would like to see for each, and let the Board examine them.

The Corps indicated that there may be a target of opportunity, using funds the Corps has received for independent review.

Dr. Reed recalled the process the Northwest Power Planning Council described in briefings before this meeting. They used an independent board to appoint review panels (with Council agencies having veto rights). Resources could be an issue in terms of whether the Corps should pay the reviewers. (She noted that the EAB serves without pay.)

Mr. Babcock recalled a quote, “People tend to be down on things they're not up on,” and said independent reviewers could make more people “up” on Corps activities. Recalling Mr. Caver's remarks, he said that implementation guidelines for the Environmental Operating Principles show the Corps is on the right track. He hopes that, with independent review, the Corps credibility issue will disappear over time; but the reviewers will still ensure that Corps projects are the best they can be.

Dr. Kondolf addressed the question of how familiar reviewers should be with a project and how it was formulated by noting that, in the CALFED program in California's Sacramento

and San Joaquin Basins, they try to mix people with expertise in that area with those with experience in similar projects elsewhere. People on the inside may overlook solutions that are readily apparent to outsiders. This approach broadens the knowledge base available to the project.

Dr. Hullar said this approach also addresses the need to “get it right in the beginning.”

The Corps asked whether it should pursue independent review on all projects. The Corps is inclined to say yes and have project managers include review as part of study planning. The Corps could have scientists come in annually, especially on important or long-term efforts like the Everglades. Further, the Corps should also consider review of projects already under construction to examine what kind of review was provided, and if anything else was needed. The Corps believes that the cost of review should be 100% Federal, recognizing that local sponsors have an interest in the review as well.

Dr. Reed said that review should provide a value added, and not be performed “after the train has already left the station.” As for the streamlined de-authorization process mentioned by Mr. Caver, she asked if it would include technical review or be based on other factors.

The Corps responded that some projects in the Corps inventory are very old. The Corps is required by law to re-evaluate them periodically, a process that consumes energy and time on projects where the purpose of the original authorization is often no longer valid. He would like to see the current seven-year reduced to one year in some cases.

Dr. Reed said local sponsors would be interested in the review criteria.

The Corps indicated that review would be especially useful for projects that fall into the “3 C’s”-costly, complex or controversial. Regardless, review will be a part of everything the Corps does. The desire is to incorporate reviews without adding appreciably to the time needed to complete studies. In regard to when reviewers should be involved, in the Superfund Program there are specific milestones. Technical review at these milestones is part of the program’s stakeholder involvement process and reviewers examine the options to explore for a given project.

Dr. Reed asked about the review of projects already completed that had been suggested.

The Corps responded that the budget request for FY 2004 includes “look-back” funds to enable the Corps to examine if it did the right things, and evaluate lessons learned on its projects.

Dr. Hullar asked the best way for the Board to contribute to shaping Corps ideas on independent review – send their ideas independently or meet to put recommendations together.

LTG Flowers said the Corps will develop a strawman for discussion at a business meeting in the summer of 2003, then discuss its proposals at the next formal meeting that fall.

Proposals, he said, should cover projects yet to be, those in progress, those authorized but not funded, and those already executed. Partners, stakeholders and the public must also be involved.

Dr. Reed said the Board could contribute comments from the environmental perspective, not necessarily those of engineering or economics.

The Corps suggested that the Board, in looking at the Corps, can make holistic comments, and need not feel bound to limit its comments to the environmental perspective. The environment, engineering and economics are closely intertwined in Corps activities; there are no neat lines.

6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT:

The Corps will host a workshop on these topics, as suggested by the Board.

Dr. Hullar said the Board would like to examine the question, what is adaptive management, and how it ties in with the expanding knowledge base. One sub-issue here is monitoring. Another is scoping – what are the issues that should be involved in formulating a project? Adaptive management, he suggested, is a new way for the Corps to go about its work – one that can be used by other agencies.

The Corps believes that adaptive management should be part of the Corps' suite of tools, but not everyone has embraced the concept. There are skeptics among the appropriators in Congress who fear it could lead to unlimited calls for funding without congressional control.

Dr. Hullar offered an example of adaptive management in practice: "If a company knows a product works, but nobody's buying it, change the product."

The Corps believes that adaptive management is part of the Corps becoming a learning organization. A major step in this process was the internet gateway created by Corps natural resources staff and open to the public. This site is getting more hits, with people offering their ideas on best practices for the Corps to follow. This is a first step to the Knowledge Management system he envisions for the Corps. The Corps, however, still needs to "sell" how adaptive management will be useful.

Mr. Babcock said the adaptive management concept is favored by environmentalists, and is well defined in books. It offers a process for dealing with uncertainties by identifying them, reducing them, making the best decision given the available information, then taking another look after more evidence is in. Adaptive management, he pointed out, is one of the Chief's seven Environmental Operating Principles, and the wave of the future in conservation, used by Ducks Unlimited and similar organizations. Misunderstandings about the concept persist, however, and it needs a common definition.

The Corps believes that the challenge is to get all parties to view adaptive management as a "win-win" approach to providing the best possible service to the nation.

Dr. Hullar asked to what extent it would be useful for the Corps to collaborate with others in developing an adaptive management strategy.

The Corps believes that it would be very useful. They have been working on numerous collaborative efforts for the past several years. In the Napa Valley of California, for example, an old Corps flood control project that was going nowhere was transformed through collaboration with others into a showpiece project serving a variety of purposes. The need to keep others engaged is especially great in cases like the Everglades where there are competing interests involved, and noted that the Corps recently adopted six

Communications Principles to foster cooperation:

- Listen to all constituencies both inside and outside USACE regarding issues of importance to them, respecting their viewpoints. Seek opportunities for synergy.
- Communicate early, clearly, completely, honestly, accurately and often with all constituencies on issues of importance.
- Incorporate communication as an integral part of the Project Management Business Process.
- Be accessible to all constituencies and respond promptly, without censorship or misinformation.
- Proactively inform the public and other constituencies of the Corps' vital role in areas where we have special expertise.
- Do what we say we will do.

Dr. Dahab asked about the skeptics in Congress.

The Corps indicated that their concern is that, through adaptive management, they could be buying an open-ended commitment without any say in the decisions.

Dr. Dahab recalled a conversation he had with a hotel employee, who said the Corps implements projects without much input. It isn't true, Dr. Dahab said, but the comment indicates that much of the public still thinks it is.

The Corps responded that the comment harks back to the days when the Corps considered itself a community of experts who told the public what the best public interest was. Today the Corps is working on a major cultural change to shed the substance of that view as well as the image. This change is happening more and more throughout the Corps, but for people who have been with the organization a long time it is difficult and a bit scary to change.

Cultural change is like turning an ocean liner; it takes a lot of energy up front.

Dr. Dahab, referring back to the earlier discussion of independent review, said he doesn't see it as much of an obstacle. The bigger issue in developing Corps projects, he said, is involving stakeholders, including the scientific community.

LTG Flowers recalled an earlier meeting he had with the Corps Reform Network. (He personally prefers the term "transformation" to "reform.") He expressed to the group his view that it would be difficult to "sell" independent review to project sponsors, but that he would push for it. He then asked the Board for suggestions on how the Corps could approach "look-back" review.

Mr. Caver suggested the Board could help with procedures for design review and ways to pick projects for the "look-back" review. Size of the project, he said, should not be the deciding factor – some big projects are relatively simple, while some small ones can be extraordinarily complex.

Dr. Hullar recalled that, in the staff presentation the Board heard on adaptive management, he heard a great deal about funds for monitoring, but suggested that the Corps first identify its monitoring needs, then work on how much money will be needed, then where the money should come from. The Corps should get "de-fixated on dollars."

The Corps believes that monitoring should be part of the Corps overall watershed approaches, not a separate program operated on a "define as we go" basis. Science and technology are now getting good enough that the Corps can do sophisticated modeling that can help – the Corps should press the science here to show the benefits of monitoring and adaptive management. In the FY 2004 budget, the Corps asked funding to monitor five relatively small watersheds as pilot projects. One of these, the Anacostia Watershed in Washington, DC, is also a pilot project in EPA's Urban Rivers Initiative, and the Federal Principals Group is involved.

The Corps also emphasized the plural in adaptive management – it applies to watershed approaches. In one such case in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Watershed, the Corps developed a model and then fed public suggestions into the model to see what would result. The Corps of the future will often take on a role as part of a team, contributing models and expertise where another agency may have the lead. This approach is one of leveraging expertise. Such an approach can even be used in dealing with international issues such as those covered by treaties for the Great Lakes or the Rio Grande.

Dr. Hullar asked for information on the five watershed studies.

The Corps responded that the basic concept of these studies is to ensure that government agencies be responsive to problems that should be solved and not choose non-sustainable solutions. This approach goes back to the Corps' roots – Corps divisions and districts are still largely organized on a watershed basis, although over the past 20 years much of that

watershed orientation has been lost as the Corps has become more single project focused. The Water Resources Development Act of 1986, “otherwise an excellent piece of legislation,” inadvertently narrowed the Corps focus by requiring project sponsors – usually political entities with a specific geographic focus.

Dr. Reed asked if the Corps intended to embrace all the problems in a watershed. That would make for a very lengthy planning process – the larger the system, the more issues are encountered. As the Corps partners with others, the realm of issues to be addressed expands further. Evaluating success is likewise a complex undertaking. How much of the apple, she asked, does the Corps intend to bite off?

The Corps responded that this was why the Corps needs to push the science and put the power of agencies, academia, etc. to work on solutions. Soon, the Corps will be able to use its models more confidently and will see where it needs to re-work them. The Corps concept is not to develop large watershed master plans but to build in collaboration with others, and in the process create a common basis of understanding.

Dr. Reed said this was really about an integrated approach.

Dr. Hullar asked how the Board could find out more.

LTG Flowers offered that, before the board’s next working meeting, the Corps would provide information. He also encouraged Board members to visit the Engineer Research and Development Center’s high speed computer center in Vicksburg, MS, to see the models in action.

Dr. Reed noted that adaptive management is fundamental to the CALFED process, but very difficult. The basic requirement of adaptive management is to identify what you don’t know. The level of uncertainty could lead to three paths: (1) targeted research, (2) pilot projects, where there is more certainty, or (3) full implementation, when uncertainty and risks are low. The Corps can incorporate adaptive management into its planning process. Using it, the Corps can assess how certain it is of measures like marsh creation, and could come up with an answer like, “we haven’t tried it here yet, but it worked elsewhere.” Models, she said, are great, but they often imply certainty that really isn’t there. The National Research Council, she said, will produce a report on adaptive management in the Corps in the next six months.

Mr. Babcock said an organization that uses adaptive management must commit to learning. Adaptive management, he said, is based on the premise that “this is the best decision we can make today, but we need to learn some things.” As for the concerns in Congress about giving the Corps a blank check, he suggested that adaptive management, if done right, could actually give Congress more control over Corps activities. He agreed with comments that Corps projects often have a very narrow focus, and asked how the Board can go to stakeholders and encourage them to advocate broader authorities.

The Corps responded that they could help the Corps tell its story and provide information. Technology is constantly improving and will tell the Corps what it needs to know, what it needs to monitor, and what looks good and should be implemented.

Dr. Reed cautioned the Corps against using the term “experiment” in its adaptive management approach – Congress doesn’t like to pay for “experiments.”

The Corps believes that with demonstrations on smaller watersheds, the Corps can show Congress what adaptive management can do. The Corps already has good models of San Francisco and Chesapeake Bays and other bodies, but will always have to do “truth in lending” and say what the unknowns are and what the models can’t do.

Dr. Hullar said one thing he saw in the Chesapeake Bay was that the input of nitrogen from the air was greater than that from land runoff.

Dr. Kondolf said that investment in monitoring will be high for the first one or two projects of a given type, such as dam breaching, but will be substantially less for subsequent projects of that type. Adaptive management, he said, is not “an endless research program;” once uncertainty has been reduced, monitoring becomes simply a check to ensure there are no surprises.

Dr. Hullar asked if the Corps will make monitoring and evaluation standard, or optional, for its projects.

The Corps believes that monitoring should be considered as part of the plan for every project. The degree will depend on the Corps’ experience and confidence level. If the Corps has created a model and identified knowledge needs, the further it goes the easier monitoring gets. There are, however, limits to models. For instance in the Tug Fork Basin in West Virginia and Kentucky, where they didn’t know the area was underlain with rock, they miscalculated the 100-year flood level by several feet.

Dr. Hullar asked to what extent the Corps, and the public, will see evaluation and monitoring as integral to projects.

The Corps responded that more monitoring and evaluation will mean more people “grading the Corps’ paper” and instigating a culture change in the Corps, but there are some examples where this has worked well.

7. GENERAL COMMENTS BASED ON TWO PRECEDING DAYS’ FIELD TRIPS:

Dr. Hullar thanked Portland and Walla Walla Districts for their highly informative programs, and their perseverance in dealing with the Board’s questions. The presentations, he noted, addressed issues that were later raised at the formal Board meeting, such as whether the Corps has enough money for monitoring and evaluation. He noted from the briefings that the Corps is being asked to take on missions that may be more appropriate for other agencies, such as Columbia Basin white tail deer issues.

Dr. Reed thanked the staff of the Corps and other agencies who participated in the Board’s field trips. It was interesting, she said, to hear about “reasonable and prudent actions” to be taken in the face of uncertainty.

The Corps reported that they are working to sign agreements with other agencies on watersheds, and are not the only agency seeking funds for this kind of work. The Corps may, however, be the only agency in the process that can bring the others to the table. The Corps experience in partnering with EPA and the Department of Interior in the Anacostia Watershed work mentioned earlier was cited.

Dr. Reed said it was fascinating to hear about the different authorities and strategies being used for fish mitigation in the Columbia Basin. There is a problem, however, in that the fish and navigation studies are separate. Is there any way to integrate them?

The Corps intends to integrate previous work into new studies when they are authorized, although it didn’t happen in this case to the extent they would have liked. As the Corps develops its Knowledge Management system, planners and others will be able to punch in keywords and get access to old information bearing on current problems.

Dr. Reed cited several large projects with ecosystem restoration components, where even the 1% of funds set aside for ecosystem restoration comes to a large sum.

Mr. Caver said he had forgotten that there was a limit on the funds available for monitoring and evaluation. Now that it has been brought to his attention, he will seek to have it modified.

Dr. Reed said that fish monitoring is a particular problem. It is notoriously expensive – much more so than looking to see if the grass is still growing.

Ms. Rivers said that identifying what knowledge the Corps still needs – the cornerstone of adaptive management – will also be expensive.

Dr. Reed said that monitoring and evaluation need not be open-ended, but should always be justified.

LTG Flowers said that’s why the Corps has project managers.

Dr. Hullar asked to what extent the Corps could optimize its knowledge gathering to help other partner agencies, and how to reach agreements with them on what knowledge is needed. He recalled the Rock Island, IL, Board meeting in April 2002, where speakers expressed the view that State governors are sometimes more interested in the interiors of their States than the rivers that mark their borders.

The Corps stresses relationships at every level, and expects its Districts to maintain them with State and local governments. The Divisions sit on Federal regional councils, and in Washington there is the Federal Principals Group of national agency heads. When these relationships work, good things happen. Senior Corps leaders are evaluated based on their demonstrated ability to build and maintain relationships, and this message has been reinforced through the Communications Principles listed earlier.

Mr. Babcock echoed other Board members’ appreciation to Division and District staff for their briefings and field trips, and offered that the Corps’ work would be much simpler if the States used watershed boundaries, and not the rivers themselves, for their boundaries. He noted the complexity of working under the Endangered Species Act – the Corps must uphold the law and at the same time maintain ecosystems. At one project, he recalled, he asked the project manager to define “ecosystem” and the manager gave the project boundaries. In fact, he said, what happens at Bonneville affects the Columbia Estuary 150 miles downstream. He also stressed the importance of understanding cumulative impacts.

Dr. Kondolf agreed that the Endangered Species Act can be rigid in how it applies remedies, and can be a barrier to adaptive management. In adaptive management, the Corps may want to try a range of responses, but under the Act must do what is best for a particular species. As for the watershed approach, he said it is more difficult to do in the U.S. than in other places such as France, where a 1992 law organizes that country’s water resource management by basins. Still, he said, there is no alternative to championing a watershed approach.

LTG Flowers added that the Corps should never give up on someone for not buying into the concept right away. The Corps, he said, can work with private sector organizations such as Ducks Unlimited or The Nature Conservancy to encourage agencies to adopt the approach it favors. The watershed approach even applies on an enormous scale in the Missouri Basin, where the Corps is trying to get parties to agree on priorities among at least 10 competing uses of water.

Dr. Reed said the Corps is making excellent use of its fish mitigation funds, and is doing good experiments to measure species survival at different spill rates. Here, as in other cases, she said, the models can only say so much. The Corps needs actual field experience to know what works best.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT:

a. Mr. Dale Beasley, Columbia River Crab Fishers Association, emphasized the importance of a healthy ecosystem for his livelihood as a crab fisherman, and said he was encouraged by

what he heard at the meeting about integrated approaches to planning. Often he has heard from the Corps that “we don’t have the money” or “we don’t have the authority” for such an approach. It is good to see the box broadening, but the Corps is still scratching the surface of an integrated approach to affect its projects – he would be happy to work with it to do more. He encouraged the Corps to look at sustainable sites, especially for offshore dredged material disposal. This involves looking at an ecosystem over time – he recalled a case where the Corps did a study of crab population one summer; the following winter he caught more crabs in one pot than the Corps had in 48 during the summer. Local experience such as that in environmental matters, he said, must not be overlooked.

Dr. Reed asked if Mr. Beasley wanted to broaden the scope of Corps investigations, or projects themselves.

Mr. Beasley said his comments applied primarily to the investigation phase.

b. Mr. Peter Hudala (?), Columbia Estuary Deepening Opposition Group (CEDOG), congratulated the Corps for embracing concepts for its own transformation similar to those of the Corps Reform Group, on whose steering committee he serves. He said that Corps internal transformation actions should be intended to compliment, rather than prevent, congressional action. He also said he liked the talk of collaboration with other interests. In Astoria, OR, however, he has watched Columbia Estuary deepening proposals over the past 10 years, and has seen the local consensus move from concern to distress to hostility, largely based on communication difficulties. The Corps, he said, proposed to use dredged material from deepening to form more shallow water habitat in the estuary when there is already plenty. They then proposed creation of a tidal marsh with sand in the mud, which wouldn’t work. During the process, he said, there was no communication with fisheries interests. He said it is good for the Corps to use terms like “beneficial use,” “ecosystem restoration,” or “adaptive management,” but in this case the concepts are not being applied properly. He suggested the Corps develop a better definition of “beneficial use;” in Clatsop County, it is more accurately called a “dump site.”

c. Mr. Terry Courtney, Jr., Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, said that he is a traditional platform fisherman, and the Tribes need to be involved in fisheries management. He called for flexibility in the application of laws, regulations and treaties; these were made to prevent suffering, but the Tribes reserve the right to hunt at will. He offered the tribal belief that humans should “leave no footprints” and “can’t improve on nature.” The Tribes, he pointed out, have good scientists, and good attorneys. He said he appreciated the willingness the Corps has shown over the past two years to work with the Tribes.

LTG Flowers said that a new position has been established in Corps Headquarters in Washington, DC, specifically to deal with tribal issues, and encouraged Mr. Courtney to be in contact with that office.

d. Ms. Kat Brigham, Umatilla Tribe, said that she has worked on fish issues since 1976. Those years were full of communications issues with the Corps – it took a court case for the Tribe to be heard. Today, she said, the Corps and Tribe have good relations; the Corps takes its role in managing fish seriously. In the Walla Walla Basin, there are problems of depleted stocks and not enough water, but the parties are working together to address them. She recalled old meetings with cities, States, Federal agencies, etc. that were major turf battles, where she pointed out that salmon don’t follow human boundaries, so humans need to form

partnerships to manage them. She also recalled a former Walla Walla District Engineer who approached her Tribe, saying, “this is what we’re going to do for you.” She asked why, since the District hadn’t talked to them or heard their ideas. She warned that she doesn’t want to go through that again, but said that even today there are people with ideas who are not being heard. No Federal or State agency, or Tribe, she said, can deal with fish issues alone. The parties won’t always agree, but need to work together. They should also tell Congress that they are partners with common goals and solutions.

LTG Flowers said that Ms. Brigham just made the perfect commercial for where the Corps is trying to go.

e. **Ms. Julie Coster** (?), Columbia Intertribal Fish Commission, said she hoped the Corps will consider using the resources of the Commission and Tribes in dealing with fish issues.

9. NEXT BOARD MEETING – LOCATION AND TOPICS:

LTG Flowers indicated that he would invite the Board to a working session in Washington, DC in summer 2003. He expects the next formal board meeting to be held the following October-November.

Dr. Hullar said that major decisions are pending on the Missouri and Upper Mississippi Rivers, and suggested these locations as appropriate meeting venues.

LTG Flowers said the Board could then tentatively plan for a meeting in Omaha, NE, in October-November 2003, tied in to a visit to that District’s Center of Expertise in Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Wastes.

Mr. Caver asked if the meeting should look at projects, or be more policy centered.

Dr. Hullar said he would prefer a policy-centered meeting, with a look at projects that illustrate policy issues.

Mr. Babcock said that, having been involved with the Missouri River, he would urge participation by stakeholders from all the states in the Missouri Basin.

10. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Certified by:
Norman T. Edwards
Executive Secretary & DFO