

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes

March 13 – 14, 2012

Day 1: Tuesday, March 13, 2012

Welcome: Jim Walker, Navigation Business Line Manager & Convener

Start-up: Tricia Gibbons, Facilitator

- Participant introductions and accomplishments.
- A look back to the August 2009 Workshop (PowerPoint)

Accomplishments and Successes: As participants introduced themselves, each identified an accomplishment over the last 2 years.

- Getting support for the RAMP Act
- Corps coming into the 21st century, e.g., LOMA
- Renewed interest in Panama Canal, people paying more attention to navigation
- Cooperative accomplishment – input to Corps & Coast Guard – hurricane protection
- Awareness outside of Corps of what it does – due to stakeholder communication
- Got additional \$90 million in 2013 budget
- Attention to where we want to go – Strategic Vision – input from others
- Need to develop “risk-based” prioritization fair system
- Survived earmark ban – new normal
- Communicating priorities – getting projects funded in priority order
- Internal communication
- Improved networking with stakeholders and partners
- Corps viewing programs more as a system
- Improvements in planning within the Corps
- Using economic analysis and asset management tools
- Operate and maintain navigation facilities – still efficient
- Stakeholders development of economic value & communicating it
- Opportunity to work collaboratively within Region/Area; cooperation
- Working with Resource Use Agencies – reducing costs; benefits
- Setting up data to be used holistically – multiple uses; integration with other agencies – crossing several business lines
- Strides in our business processes related to data
- Planning modernization effort and beneficial use coming to forefront
- Advancement/awareness about navigation – locks, dams – starting to gain traction, e.g., Ramp effort in Congress (160 members have signed bill); advocacy – Corps needs to be part
- Survived two major floods – communication to stakeholders and community
- Ten-year project – partnership – to continue dredging; external communication
- Corps taking a leadership role in e-navigation
- Leadership – partnering and understanding each other – industry and Corps; recognize part of the team – funding, tech, etc.; respect, promote & perspective
- New people/new stars coming into the profession – Corps – new ideas – what we do and why we do it
- Congress has found a way to continue our programs
- Strong partnerships – Corps & industry – best practice is having workshops like this with stakeholders present

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes March 13 – 14, 2012

- Integration of everything in a purposeful way
- Progress on use of science to resolve constraints → bring balance
- Coordination and integration with Coast Guard – teamwork
- Teamwork with stakeholders; willing to share resources with one another
- Communication with stakeholders; partnerships; need more environmental folks involved
- IMTS Capital Investment Strategy – come together with stakeholders to prioritize; outreach to international best practices
- Help contribute to next couple of years!
- Don't forget where we have been – we know the normal – good system that we're still building on

Status of the Program - *Where we are and where we need to go* – Jim Walker (PowerPoint) Navigation Business Line Manager, Jim Walker, provided an update and status of the Program since the initial Navigation Strategic Visioning Workshop held in August 2009. Jim emphasized the activities that have influenced and impacted the Program, reviewed the current focus areas, and shared his expectations for this meeting. The PowerPoint presentation is posted on the Navigation Gateway.

A Look at the Current Conditions: Participants were asked to review the 2009 Context Map and modify, add or delete trends and factors influencing navigation. Attendees analyzed internal and external trends, political factors, customer and partner needs, technology factors, environmental impacts, and reliable navigation uncertainties. Changes were made to the PowerPoint graphic based on these suggestions. **The Context Map PowerPoint Graphic** is posted on the Navigation Gateway.

What does success really look like? Participants were asked to think 3 – 5 years out to get a picture of the desired future state. What will success look like? Ideas were collected on flip charts. To build consensus on ideas, participants were then given 5 votes (dots) to choose those that fit their vision of the desired future state. The top ideas in order of priority:

- Trust funds resolved (19)
- Good/great data on economic impact & using it! (Economic Impact Study) (17)
- Defined policy/guidelines on cost-sharing/contributing funds (13)
- Defined Value to the Nation (13)
- Reliability of navigation (10)
- Established guidelines – level of service (10)
- Full implementation of Capital Development Plan (CDP) (10)
- Efficient & effective data collection & communication (9)

These are represented on the **Journey Map PowerPoint** posted on the Navigation Gateway. Additional ideas that described the desired future state included: Divestiture Plan, reduced groundings & collisions, allisions, more interagency cooperation & collaboration, modern & efficient fleet of Corps dredges & available for use (taken off “ready reserve”), maintain the authorized dimensions when appropriate, one hundred percent 100% of the time, and Navigation R&D focused on goals & achieving.

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes March 13 – 14, 2012

Other ideas that described the vision were: increased environmental benefits due to Navigation, strong Congressional & ONB support for MTS, well-educated & supportive NAV staff & Corps staff (contracting business), NAV National Freight Policy, and the President mentions dredging & ports in State of the Union.

Journey Vision Exercise

Participants were divided into 4 groups for Stand-up meetings about a particular topic to build the journey vision – **Core Values, Historical Milestones, Critical Issues and Corps Competencies**. Each group was to choose a facilitator & recorder and respond to the questions for each topic. Results after debrief are listed below. (Top 5 or 6 in each category marked ** and shaded)

Core Values: *Communication, Collaboration, Flexibility, Can Do Attitude. How does the Corps demonstrate daily? What else does the community value? Hold dear?*

- Service to nation**
- Delivers – get 'er done**
- Credible**
- Accountable**
- Honesty & transparency**
- Professionalism**
- Balanced
- Integrity
- Reliable
- Timely/responsive
- Passion
- Customer-oriented
- Stature/respect
- Knowledgeable
- Safety
- Trustworthy

Historical Milestones: *Identify the NAV Program's historical milestones.*

- Katrina – changed the way folks view the Corps**
- Panama Canal 1914**
- 1824 – Henry Shreve put first snag boat on river; Corps inland auth.**
- WRDA 86/cost sharing**
- 2002 – 2012 Plan**
- NEPA 1968/Clean Water Act 1970**
- 2005 – Beginning of performance metrics & NAV BL
- Corps dredge → ready reserve
- 2001 LTG Ballard
- “2012 Plan”
- 2000 – reprogram requirements & loss of flexibility
- Intercoastal waterway
- 1997 – Division reorganization
- 1969 – Soo lock completed

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes March 13 – 14, 2012

- P&G
- 1927 flood
- 2000 – NY/NJ/Oakland – deepening; started modern era of deepening

Critical Issues: *What are the barriers or obstacles or challenges?*

- Sediment quality & suitable placement sites**
- Consistent shared vision to all levels**
- External agencies**
 - Timing of permits
 - Staff turnover
 - Conflicting missions
- Increase in dredging costs**
- Funding**
- IT approval policies
 - FISMA inhibits data exchange
- Needs of multiple users
- Lack of flexibility
- Multi review processes
- Internal staff turnover & expertise
- Communication – common theme to all
- Changing guidelines/policies
- Aging infrastructure
- Overhead costs
- Contracting process
- Environmental constraints
 - Work window
 - Permitting
- Conflicting policies (internal & external)
- Lack of bi-annual WRDA

Corps Competencies: *What does the Corps bring to the table? Reputation? Core competencies?*

- Wide-ranging experience and expertise**
- Leadership/relationships **
- Strong science & engineering capabilities**
- Mission execution**
- Emergency response/disaster recovery**
- Process
- Contracting
- Consistency determination
- Invest in R&D
- Congressional authorization/authority
- Military support
- Broad focus
- Strategic vision
- Tactical

**Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes
March 13 – 14, 2012**

Opportunities for the Navigation Program

Table groups were asked to identify the near-term (3 years out) opportunities. Then they clustered the ideas emerging from the 6 table groups. The following is the result.

<p><u>Streamline MOA Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize use of funds available (Fed/non-Fed) • Contributed funds • Regional budgeting vs. line item budgeting • Constitution mandate - Commerce • Resolution of trust funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fix HMTF (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) & IWTF (Inland Waterways Trust Fund) • Re-capitalize assets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jetties ○ Locks • Disposal reimbursement (\$ back to project) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Improve how we do business</u> • Work as Systems vs. project (including budget) • Integrated water resource management – balancing other uses w/Navigation (best practices, tools, technology) • Clear out backlog of Nav feasibility studies • Improved planning process • 20 Year WRDA! • Increase BU • Streamline processes & maintain technical capabilities • Dredge fleet modernization (reduce cost, reduce environmental impact, increase efficiency) • Leverage R&D for efficient maintenance
<p><u>Maintain authorized depths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand channel dimensions • Increase level of service • Improved dredging safety • Perform channel deepening • Low-use demo • Arctic navigation 	<p><u>Environmental Leadership</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental leadership (e.g., beneficial use) • Sharing of best practices & education of dredged material as a resource • Dredged material management plans • Regional sediment management plans • Expand range of dredged material benefits from Navigation projects
<p><u>How to characterize the value of the system</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on jobs! • Implement proactive & collaborative communication (internal & external) • Communication – transparency on options and impacts • Public/private partnerships • Early stakeholder involvement • Inter-modalism & coordination with other agencies • Partnerships w/other agencies & stakeholders on funding to meet goals • Export initiatives & reduce trade barriers 	<p><u>Data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shape data standards/collection/sharing • Expand use of electronic data resources • Improved surveys <p><u>Build bench</u></p>

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:15. Participants met at 6:00 in the lobby for the Trolley tour of the waterfront and historic Philadelphia.

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes

March 13 – 14, 2012

Day 2: Wednesday, March 14, 2012

The meeting began with a quick brainstorm summary of the previous day.

Whole Group Activity – *Five-minute summary of yesterday:*

- Got all the participants on the same page
- Good teamwork going on; level of participation - great dialogue
- Rewrote values and guiding principles
- Built on the successes of the last two years
- A lot of convergence between the Corps and industry people – e.g., opportunities
- A lot of positive attitudes – sense of ability to move forward
- Focused on definition of success!
- Consensus – focus on what is the most important – short-term, long-term prioritizing – build based on priorities
- Validated strategies from 2009; didn't make a lot of changes; helps us move forward
- Vision alignment (what does success look like activity)
- Strategic Vision document helped force management to focus on the Navigation Program
- What success looks like

Strategic Focus Areas – Validation and Refinement

During the morning session table groups were asked to review the 4 Strategic focus areas and determine if each was still valid/most important and to provide feedback on possible modifications to the focus area. During the afternoon session, participants chose which strategic focus area to help frame. Results of both sessions are grouped together.

Focus Area 1: Communicate the Value of the Navigation Program

Initial Review (AM)

- More emphasis on the public
- Tap into what stakeholders are doing
- Public education/outreach creating jobs
- Focused audience, e.g., Congress engagement
- Get off green – get on jobs message
- As currently written, focused too much as a one-way Corps; need to be more collaborative – more explicit
- Corresponds well with/aligned with CMTS report
- Include those who might be investing in new audiences – missing those important folks
- Tools – develop a Stakeholder Map
 - Decision makers
 - Users
 - Communities of interest
 - Engagement approach different
- Take advantage of/capitalize on social media

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes

March 13 – 14, 2012

After-Lunch Discussion/Framing:

Team Members (Monica Chasten, Kareem El-Naggar, Chris Frabotta, Dave Grier, Kristin Meira, Jim Stark)

Outcomes

- Public appreciation/knowledge
- Additional funding needed for more reliable, safe, efficient navigation system
- Government decision makers – Congress, OMB understand importance of MTS (informed decisions)
- Broad stakeholder appreciation

Key Players

- PAO
- Associations
- Economists
- Ports/pilots
- Coast Guard
- Other agencies (practices) for outreach
- Academia
- User groups
- BU recipients

Resources

- Leveraging what we have
- Align messages with national priorities
- Invisible Highway video
- Social media
- Data collection
- USACE develop economic indicators – associations to support
- Outreach efforts

Benchmarks

- Varying levels of stakeholder advocacy
- USACE developing asset management principles

Discussion

- Districts/divisions go on the road to make presentations
- A NAV 101 slide show?? Waterways has one
- What resources do we have? – e.g., PAOs
- Videos can have a big impact (YouTube/Facebook/LinkedIn/Twitter)
- IMTS has put some things on the web
- About 10 SNIs would support this

Focus Area 2: Improve Business Processes

Initial Review (AM)

- Catch all
- Does not stress the planning process and it needs to
- Good ROI – what does it really mean?
- Clarify – what is end state? – What does success look like?
- Real goal is to become more efficient, using performance metrics, accountability
- Not another process – stop talking & just do it; execute

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes March 13 – 14, 2012

- HQ shouldn't drive process – just want one; difference between consistency & uniformity
- Cost-effective and time-effective
- Huge opportunity to inform campaign plan
- Missing flexibility, responsiveness & timeliness
- “Business processes” may not be the best term to use – change the name?

After-Lunch Discussion/Framing:

Team Members (Mo Chang, Steve Brown, Jim Haussener, Duane Poiroux, Rich Thorsen, Eddie Wiggins)

Outcomes

- Execute faster & cheaper
- Get more done w/ less \$
- Generate benefits faster

Future Description

- Maintained channels & infrastructure
- Deeper channels
- Recapitalize locks & dams and coastal structures
- Everyone knows goals & how they fit
- Harmonious partnerships
- Early contractor involvement

Key Players

- Ports and ports associations
- Inland waterways users
- Corps HQ
- Non-federal sponsors
- Contractors
- Environmental resource agencies

Resources

- People
- Funds
- ERDC
- After Actions Reports (AARs), Internal Technical Reviews (ITRs), best practice

Discussion

- Save money because it will be more efficient, faster (thus generate more benefits); streamline processes
- Need some standardized processes across the Corps
- One process needing improvement – e.g., need to streamline post-dredge surveying process; review processes [need to pick 1 or 2 or 3, improve them, and then move on to others]
- Also look at what we're doing well & put on Quality Management System (QMS) to share with everyone

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes March 13 – 14, 2012

Focus Areas 3: Manage the Marine Transportation System as a System

Initial Review (AM)

- Re-word? Re-focus? Change title – add to the nation’s transportation system
- Emphasis on commercial freight; step back and consider low-use
- Measure the national economic benefit of the regional system; inter-connected/we’re intermodal; Talk about connectivity & regional benefits
- Clearly define the *system* we’re talking about – physical, funding, multiple projects,
- Need to work with stakeholders to help document how we are tied together
- If you don’t know the system, how can we plan for it or communicate the value?
- Can we really do it? Manage the Corps’ portion/responsibility as part of the system
- Modify language – NAV part of intermodal system – “end-to-end supply chain” – MTS as part of a larger system – make sure does not get consumed in the larger organization
- Broad category – separate out system engineering from environmental
- Optimizing the system to increase capacity
- How to capture – waterways important to local/regional area as well as the national
- Where do priorities fit (here or business processes)?
- Don’t have a nationally defined end state – no freight policy or plan
- What is most important to the country?

After-Lunch Discussion/Framing:

Team Members (Peter Frick, Rich Lockwood, Doug McDonald, Andrea Murdock-McDaniel, Marie Strum, Brian Tetreault)

Where are we now?

- Business lines, projects unable to save money and be agile
- Decisions are based on individual projects, not system

Outcomes

- Alignment
 - USACE budget – align with goals
 - Simple USACE rack & stack 1 → N priority policy for budget
 - Integrated watershed management; interim – look at budget by watershed
- Capacity
 - National freight policy
 - Optimize throughout
 - Technology

Key players:

- USACE senior leaders
- Stakeholders
- Other modal agencies & transportation
- CMTS

Discussion

- Use infrastructure management plan as example
- To operate as a system – is coordination of information a key component?
- Set up a data architecture for integration
- Freight system/transportation system – nearly synonymous
- Value of tweaking the name – definition (perhaps a first milestone)

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes March 13 – 14, 2012

Possible new category: Modernization

Initial Review (AM)

- Not necessarily O&M
- Service life extension
- Recapitalization of locks & dams
- System optimization
- Innovative financing by partnering
- Impacts of global shipping
- Can this fit as managing a system or separate & add (move) asset management under this?
- Investment strategy
- How structured financially – by project or system?
- Have the other business lines done this (Yes for Navigation and Recreation); how do we fit in?
- Consistent, transparent, priority list

After-Lunch Discussion/Framing:

Team Members (Dwight Beranek, Jeff Lillycrop, Mike Lowe, Jim Stark, Helen Stuppelbeen, Jon Wedgeworth)

Outcomes

- Minimal unscheduled down time
- System flexibility/maximum capacity
- Efficient intermodal system
- Integrated management/execution

Key Players

- Consulting groups
- Ports/Fed Hwy/Intermodal RR
- Construction contractors - Associated General Contractors of America (AGC)
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE)
- American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)

Resources

- Need national plan for Coastal
- Have plan for Inland, but optimize
- Need Intermodal Plan
- Need new legislation
- New relationships to make this happen
- Data collection to create new revenue sources

Discussion

- Fits under MTS?
- Need something that focuses on modernization, not just operations
- Belongs in MTS as a system, and a big/important one to move forward in the next decade
- Perhaps merge the two

**Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes
March 13 – 14, 2012**

Focus Area 4: Develop the USACE Human Capital Management Strategy for Navigation

Initial Review (AM)

- Struggles in attracting, retaining & developing human capital
- Need for cross-training, especially with number of upcoming retirements; currently a cross-training crisis – driven short-term
- Need a long-term strategic plan or program (proactive rather than reactive)
- Build the bench
- Focus on what's in NAV's area of influence or control
- Succession plan to grow
- Corps needs to change how we integrate young professionals
 - Young people mobile, willing to move
 - Apply best practices – partnerships with universities
 - Consider "Planning Associates" – other models of best practices
- Problems with the federal hiring program/process, e.g., 1-2 year contracts, OPM
- Knowing the tools for hiring
- Reflect/understand the changing workforce
- What elements are related to the NAV professional – technical & PM
- Analysis – benchmark where we are

After Lunch Discussion/Framing:

Team Members (Eric Braun, Sheryl Carrubba, Allen Churchill, George Domurat, Bill Hanson, Emily Vuxton)

Where are we now?

- We highlight our failures and don't celebrate our success
- Not enough training
- Losing expertise (retirement & uncertain workload)
- Academics in decline (at university level)
- Realization that not all offices will have all expertise
- Low training budget; move toward regional centers of expertise

Outcomes

- Energize the profession/energize to career
- Move it forward technically
- Recognized experts in the field
- More/sufficient funding – be able to devote some time & cost to training

Key players

- Corps leadership (all the way to the top)
- Consulting community
- Academia
- Industry

Resources: the key players

Where do we need to be?

- Recognized experts
- Competency in dredging & navigation disciplines
- Innovative training opportunities

Challenges: RIFs, Academic program funding; OPM rules & hiring obstacles

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes

March 13 – 14, 2012

Possible new category: Environmental

Initial Review (AM)

- Separate out
- More emphasis on environmental operating principles
- Engineering with nature (guiding principle)
- Leadership on the issue - provide solutions, how we do stuff
- Criteria
 - National focus
 - Impacts nationally but differently from region to region
 - Bang for the buck
 - Focus on what we do
 - What could improve?
 - Long-term rather than short-term
 - Competitiveness of the NAV business line
 - Grow the economy

After Lunch Discussion/Framing:

Team Members (Todd Bridges, Jessica Burton-Evans, Jim Clausner, Tim Murphy, Steve Brown)

Where are we now?

- Adversarial, messy, chaotic
- Expensive to comply with permit conditions
- Time consuming, uncertain schedules
- Location-based inconsistencies
- Little sharing of best practices
- Makes some projects seem infeasible
- Interferes with BU projects (limits BU)
- Environmental requirements and comments not aligned with budgeting process
- Inconsistency between regulatory and CW on environmental restrictions

Outcomes

- Lower operating costs
- Positive image with public & agencies – sediment a resource
- Shorten/streamline permit process
- Adaptive management, be proactive, results in increase in efficiency
- Address uncertainties over time but while the project is ongoing
- More project benefits
- Increased volume of beneficial re-use
- Corps acts as leader, helps others, Navy & ports
- Reduced number of lawsuits & litigation, while still maintaining the better channel

Key Players

- Corps national inventory of environmental challenges
- PDT, vertical Corps teams engaging federal regulatory agencies
- Corps leads serious national dialogue on ESA
 - GS9s sometimes obligate Corps to large expenditures
 - Ops and regulatory have to be aligned
- Ports and harbors/shippers

Navigation Strategic Visioning 2012 Workshop Detailed Meeting Notes March 13 – 14, 2012

- Dredging industry
- EPA, USFWS, NOAA/NMFS

Resources

- What do we have now? How can we tap into
 - Knowledge networks
 - ERDC
 - SF District
 - RSM teams
 - National dredging teams
- What do we need?
 - Study on the total cost of environmental compliance for the Corps, not just for navigation and dredging
 - Sponsors for national dialogue on this issues to understand perspectives;
 - Communication Plan

Discussion

- First step – reach out/build on a success such as San Francisco District
- Working level collaboration/cooperation
- Need accountability system
- Costs associated with environmental requirements
- Highlight successes (Portland, Jacksonville); stakeholder base will define success
- Fear of being sued over environmental laws (litigation)
- Measure success when we see a decrease in litigation
- Congressional program to streamline reform (something in next WRDA?)
- Our regulation of ourselves is less strict than our regulation of others
- Is this a focus area that needs to be raised to that of the original four?
- Can we show that cost savings are possible? If so, perhaps raising it makes sense
- Window of opportunity with Administration's focus on jobs
- Seeking efficiencies for our purposes; increase benefits & encounter fewer obstacles
- Can this fit within business processes?
- Definitely belongs somewhere in the Strategic Plan
- Root of success comes from stakeholder base, best practices, citizen stakeholders
- Don't call it "engineering with nature" – find a new name & reshape the outcome
- Need to assume more leadership

Next Steps: The ideas generated during the two-day meeting will be used by the Writing Team to inform the Navigation Strategic Vision 2012 and used by the Strategic Navigation Initiative (SNI) Teams to frame project plans.

Strategic Initiatives Task: Participants reviewed the current Strategic Initiatives Matrix. Stakeholders were asked to rank their top 10. Corps participants were asked to do the same but put names on the matrix so they can be returned for Thursday's meeting.

Wrap-up: Meeting materials will be posted on the website. A follow-up email will be sent from the registrar with the updated Networking List and the link to the website. Jim Walker closed the meeting by thanking all the participants and especially the stakeholders for their time, energy, and commitment to Navigation.