

US ARMY CORP OF ENGINEERS
Moderator: Courtney Chambers
August 27, 2013
12:28 pm CT

Courtney Chambers: Okay, at this time, I'd like to give you today's speaker on multi-objective planning, Shawn Komlos. Shawn is a physical scientist for the US Army Corps of Engineers Institute for Water Resources in Alexandria, Virginia. At the institute he assists with review - I'm sorry, just one moment. He assists with review and development of water resources planning guidance and provides technical and logistical support to the Planning Community of Practice on matters pertaining to water resources and ecosystem restoration planning. Prior to joining IWR Shawn worked for the EPA's Ecosystem Restoration Taskforce in South Florida, US Fish and Wildlife's Ecological Services office, and then the Jacksonville District Planning Division and its interagency modeling center. Shawn's non-federal experience involved international environmental consulting and working for the National Audubon Society's Everglade's Campaign. Additional information about Shawn can be found in his bio posted on the Learning Exchange, along with the PowerPoint from today. We're very happy to have you with us today, Shawn. Now I'll give you the presenter rights and we can begin.

Shawn Komlos: All right. Thanks for your kind words and I just want to confirm that everybody can hear me because I'm calling in from a cell phone because we are undergoing a phone upgrade here at headquarters.

Courtney Chambers: I can hear you good, Shawn. Just be sure to speak loud. It's not super loud but we hear you good.

Shawn Komlos: Okay, will do. All right, and the one thing that Courtney - that's not in my bio is that I've been working at headquarters working on the Sandy Program as

the Program Manager for the North Atlantic Divisional (writ), helping manage some of the Sandy work.

So I appreciate everybody's flexibility on the scheduling of this - on the webinar. (So), today we're going to be talking about challenges to water resources planning and multiple purposes. It's a very generic topic and it's difficult to explain in the absence of a very specific context. So, I'm hoping that there will be lots of comments and questions pertaining to the very specific cases that we can actually lead discussion and how to actually move forward, or lead up to future discussion with other folks that may be involved.

Next slide, please. Oh, okay (unintelligible). All right.

(Danney): Excuse me, Shawn? This is (Danney) out west. I don't know if it's something about the sound system but there's some noise in the background. If you could try to speak up, or even slow down a little, that might help. Thank you.

Shawn Komlos: Will do. Okay, so, the goal for the next 45 minutes is to essentially develop an understanding of the importance of different practices that go into (most efforts) and investigations. Which is conceptualizing the system, structuring an objective analysis and evaluation (about) different alternatives.

And then effectively communicating the story about the project or the formulated alternatives. We're going to be focusing on motivating factors, you know, when and why might someone pursue a multipurpose investigation. Scoping, how to develop the scope or understand the scope of the multiple purposes that might be explored.

How different factors that contributed to the evaluation's framework. And how multipurpose projects might be looked at and how to frame the

discussion (from) the evaluation too minimize the introduction of bias, doing the analysis, and effective communication. In alternative words, what is the planning conflict? In a highly conceptualized system, what factors go into the system for conceptualization. How do we better frame the analysis, the evaluation process, so that discipline and human bias or allegations of bias.

And making sure that when we communicate, we're communicating in a (unintelligible) fashion and that we can communicate the evaluational framework transparency and clarity and all the different factors that were considered.

Some of these advantages you'll see here have to do with Smart Planning. There is an issue paper on the Smart Planning Web site about development of multiple planning objectives. There's also a discussion about the risk register and other documentation and practices around the Corps. If you're not already familiar I find it hard to believe that people aren't aware that the Planning Community Toolbox has guidance, it's up there.

Courtney Chambers: Shawn, right quick, it really is pretty hard to hear you. If you could slow down just a little bit more and just be as loud as you can. That would be helpful. Thank you.

Shawn Komlos: Will do. Okay. So the plan for this - the backdrop for this session is going to be Smart Planning in the attempt to ensure clear communications between the three levels of the Corps of Engineers, the executed study was in 36 months at a cost of no more than \$3 million.

In multipurpose studies this may seem to be a complicated challenge. There probably needs to be greater discussion about how to make this work. And that's one of the purposes for this preliminary webinar.

And, is it still - is there still a communication issue, or a sound issue?

Courtney Chambers: That's much better, Shawn. That was great.

Shawn Komlos: Okay. All right. So, for purposes of the webinar, we're going to consider that purposes beget objectives. Objectives beget criteria. And then criteria beget metrics, So that when you formulate or you look at the problems and opportunities relative to a specific purpose or purposes for which the study has been initiated - there's this hierarchy that can be established.

And (just for) consideration this is one potential way of many different ways of organizing an evaluation framework so that everything has a direct relationship back to the one or more purposes within the study. In lieu of a shotgun approach where you would actually start at the bottom up and start identifying different ways of measuring things on the ground and then trying to work them back into the planning objectives.

Based on that, just for consideration, that not all studies are all multipurpose in scope. That all studies are multi-objective in scope. And when I say that - when I suggest that these are multipurpose in scope - right now all studies are based on the authority provided.

The authority may allow for or may not allow for the evaluation of multipurposes to the extent that it opens up the door for other water (restoration) needs of the region or other supporting water resource challenges or (under that) context potentially open the door for looking at other purposes. Such as (flood) risk management's relationship to ecosystem restoration and its relationship to navigation, coastal storm damage reduction, things of that sort. When defining the problems that need solved, once again (I will say)

they're multipurpose, because there may be a single problem or a complex problem around which the formulation effort's going to be aligned.

There may be other opportunities to be pursued or the opportunities may be fairly narrow in their definition in terms of water (resources) challenges. But when I say that - or suggest that all studies are multi-objective in scope, at the very minimum we're dealing with costs and benefits. And the costs and benefits may be a combination of those that can be monetized and not-monetized. So we eventually have sizable costs, non-sizable costs, Monetizable benefits, and non-monetizable benefits.

At its very foundation we're dealing with at least two different criteria. And frequently (in) the benefits category or the cost category, we're talking about trade-offs among multiple different - multiple beneficiaries, or multiple effected (state/federal) groups.

There's been environmental tradeoffs for (federal standard) deductions, vica versa, or economic developments navigation in nature. So, (unintelligible) multipurpose planning, we'll have things to consider.

Whether, you know, when you're initiating a study whether or not you want to pursue a multipurpose approach, are you authorized to do so? When might you be authorized to do so? It's a little (providing) planning assistance to others, to states, (unintelligible) federal other agencies, technical support.

Watershed studies are innately complex. Comprehensive studies where we're actually delivering a recommended plan, or approach broad water resources challenges of a region that may not be contained within a specific watershed.

Complex challenges or any watershed where our innate tradeoffs (unintelligible) different water resources, problems, opportunities. There's lots of - there's guidance.

The principles and guidelines talk about multipurpose planning and how to go about formulating, evaluating, based on environmental quality, other social effects. Regional economic (elements) and the primary purpose, which is any professional economic (unintelligible).

Planning, Engineering Regulation and (1105) section 100 also provides guidance on how to go about (doing) planning.

If you're really interested our PCC Course six goes into multipurpose planning, formulation practices, planning commutes (unintelligible) other information and there's lots of other information on the Web that you can probably Google search or Bing search.

(You) track down different frameworks and different methods for doing multipurpose planning. So planning for multiple purposes, what are some of the motivations? Once again, authority, competing needs, complex problems, and others where tradeoffs are critical to the decision that's going to be made.

In some respects you might look at (experiences) also (in order) to avoid violating the planning constraints. Such as a TMDL or some other avoiding (impacts to) (unintelligible) (nesting windows). There may be a need to consider management measures to avoid such impacts.

Or to otherwise mitigate the (small) (unintelligible) impacts to allow for the formulated alternative to resolve (in) some environmental concerns. All right.

In terms of scoping - the multipurpose formulation effort, the planning team is critical.

Helpful traits are - people that are involved in a multipurpose formulation effort would include individuals with a diverse background in different disciplines to have experience from multiple perspectives. In some instances we may draw on experiences and input from non-federal sponsors. Other stakeholder groups, in order to get their perspective on what they are likely to focus on. On what they value, what (they might be seeking) within the abilities provided to the Corps. Individuals who are abstract thinkers and can think outside of a box or in the absence of a box. But as well as team members that are capable of actually relating to the abstract thoughts and pointing them back into a structured framework. You might be able to find those in one and the same person but sometimes it takes multiple people.

And unfortunately this doesn't bode well for projects (unintelligible). But once again, these are the types of (breaks) that, based on experiences have contributed to proper assistance conceptualization right out the gate. And we'll get into the importance of that in (our) next few slides.

But last and not least, something that apparently myself and an iPhone are not capable of, and that is effective communication skills. Finding people who understand the different stakeholder groups. Not only what messages to communicate but how to communicate with different individuals, different groups with different backgrounds and different disciplines. Able to talk across interests and across disciplines on a multipurpose formulation effort.

(It is) once again one of those traits that's (unintelligible) out of the box but valued once this (develops) (unintelligible) a team member. (Our) scope conceptualization - when scoping out the formulation effort itself, whether

planning effort, (unintelligible), the ability to conceptualize the entire system is critical.

The properly conceptualized system that looks at all these potential purposes and all essential objectives that might be effected by (water resources action) is critical (for me from the start). It's very easy to leave things off the table or to miss elements of the system.

Either different features, different interests that might be effected, or different processes, functions. Those features are very important to setting up an (evaluationic) framework, you know, roll those up back to the national planning objective and the authorized purposes.

So, understanding the system elements and processes is critical. And actually (portraying those and) ensuring an understanding of those is important. Identifying key stressors on demanded services, what pressure and what services are in demand and then how are they getting effected? How can they be benefitted?

And then what are the tradeoffs, are what we're trying to get at here. What other external - externalities or boundary conditions are there on the entire system that you're conceptualizing?

Sometimes the system is too large to characterize it in its entirety so you may have to assume certain conditions about the boundaries and about what's occurring within (the) system or what pressures are working on the system to effect demanded services?

And laying those assumptions out and being clear about those and have it coming - having it count and understanding among team members is critical.

As well as recognizing that there are certain uncertainties in the information that we know about and the information that we don't know about.

That's acting on (its) system and the performances of services or demanded services as well as the ability to put in features (that) modify provisional services. Their sensitivities are also important to disclose.

Once again, (improvements) in communication when we conceptualize the system is not just to give up (an understanding). This is also to help communicate why we are taking the actions and why the Corps of Engineers and the Federal government are involved in the action.

So conceptualizing the system can help (get to) that message. And (to) facilitate development of planning objectives and identifying underlying metrics. So assistance in conceptualization, if you've captured the critical elements, captured the critical processes, identified the boundaries in the system and what's assumed as boundaries.

And if you understand the uncertainty and the sensitivity to different processes and (courses working on). Are there, you know, better risk reduction, ecosystem structure and function, (unintelligible) damage reduction services.

We can then actually dive down deeper and understand what the (planning) objectives might look like. What metrics might be formulated to characterize how - the full plan to reformulate (and) protect those services?

And once again, looking back at the framework, the ability to (rate) those back up to the national (polling) objective and the authorized (unintelligible) is critical. And more importantly the ability to communicate that relationship.

So system conceptualization - once again, depending on how you can conceptualize the system, a picture is worth a thousand words and make a very, very strong point. Our point is to clarify - is to not show how faulty systems are but how simple they can be.

And what's on the page now is a conceptual model or a diagram of a multiple purpose river or basin development effort. Looking at balancing needs among different purposes within a watershed based on different types of water management practices (to the Corps) (unintelligible) challenged with accomplishing back in the, you know, middle of the century, or back in the middle of the last century, 1950s or so.

So the concept has been around for quite some time. It's waxed and waned in the attention that's been given to it. But multiple purpose formulation will (central) some of the water resources developments back in the 50s and the middle of the century.

There's a framework for a multiple planning - a planning for multiple purposes. And helpful traits for the framework are that it clearly ties the metrics, the objectives, and the (unintelligible) back to what's been authorized and clearly identify this relationship for policy.

They've structured and is aligned with delivering (an) objectives evaluation, an objectives framework. It's not to say that it's fixed in time and space and that it won't be modified during the formulation effort.

But to the extent that it can be structured so that you're working within the structure and continually moving in the bookends (to) identify things at a

greater level of detail, of precision. (That's) desirable over modifying the structure to accommodate things from outside of the framework.

And if you're doing the formulations - because the latter begets - or can beget allegations of (stewing) the analysis or biasing the formulation effort. So the framework is also logical. It should be laid out so that people can understand and that (you) need to communicate - once again objective unbiased.

One of the complicating factors is this concept of collaboratively developed in the framework. And this is where engagement of the stakeholders and other agencies also comes into play. But if you don't do that collaboration in scoping beyond the PDT early in the process there may be some needs or stakeholder groups that fall within the planned purposes that you're missing.

So, once again, clear communication with the stakeholder groups and all the people involved and having them - getting their input early and frequently in the process as you're going, the formulation of framework is critical.

And then last but not least the framework, to the extent it can be transparent, should be transparent, so that people that are trying to understand why decisions were made, what factors - how different factors effected the planning decisions or choices that were made by the formulation team.

But that information is readily apparent to decision makers that are involved in the process. So, planning for multiple purposes -- going back to the framework -- consider the potential uses when you're building the framework.

So there are different way to build a framework. You can describe it in words, you can describe it in illustrations, you can describe it using arithmetic and

mathematics. But, you know, consider its potential uses for disclosure of evaluation comparison of alternatives and disclosing tradeoffs.

When you're talking about evaluation comparison, you're going to be talking about preparing (M Stat) units versus monetary costs or, you know, economic benefits and economic costs versus non-monetizable costs, non-monetizable benefits.

There's those mathematical relationships that (do need) depicted in the framework or built into the framework. It might be something as simple as doing (unintelligible) representation of tradeoffs. Something that's less than mathematically (extensive).

(Once we get) rebuilding the frameworks communicate the decisions (unintelligible) decisions that you made within a team. (Unintelligible) the different objectives and metrics that are used to (unintelligible) that are built into this framework. Being able to work from the bottom up and from the top down -- and maintain that integrity back to the project authority -- is critical.

Understanding influences on decisions, once again, whether that would be decisions (unintelligible) framework. Which elements of the framework, the objectives and the metrics are the decisions most sensitive to? Understanding the influence of risk on the decisions in order to disclose our risks that might have otherwise been masked.

Woman: I've got a webinar going.

Courtney Chambers: Oh, excuse me. You're not on mute on your phone. If you could just fix that for us real quick. Thank you.

Shawn Komlos: So the properly built framework can also be used to disclose risks that may not have otherwise been apparent. So when you do a (unintelligible) analysis or you look at the relative influence (of this) sort of metric or objective on a decision, the ability to identify that, to communicate that and disclose it may also be critical to the formulating (and to formulating) alternatives (unintelligible) concerns on the alternatives.

Allocation of benefits and costs, framework (can) also be used to allocate benefits and costs among different stakeholder groups. Between Federal interests and non-federal interests. And to some extent prorate or reallocate cost share - for different types of activities (unintelligible) who the beneficiaries are.

And who's bearing the costs for those benefits. And then, let's see, the collaboration and communications time, your recommended plan is only as good as the support base that's built as you're doing the formulation. So the ability to communicate why certain decisions were made is critical (and actually getting to the) stakeholder groups and the people that we're serving.

So this is a very course attempt at trying to visualize how a framework might grow different types of benefits back up into national planning objectives, may have objectives or purposes that focus - that are more aligned with Federal interests, purposes.

They're more aligned with non-federal interests. There may be objectives that are more aligned with Federal interests, non-federal interests as well as aligned with economics and environmental social types of benefits.

The question is how do you structure the framework to allow for effective communication and tracking of our different criteria, our influencing, the

decision, in a multiple purpose formulation. I believe if it's multiple purposes you're going to be dealing with multiple objectives and multiple criteria, probably within each of those objectives.

And people need two (unintelligible) going through the (unintelligible) keyed and start integrating the results before they understand what their information objectives are.

So (Art) suggested if (unintelligible) teams move out into a multiple purpose formulation effort that they give serious thought about structuring their decision model or their evaluation of framework to A, disclose how the different criteria are influenced from decisions.

B, how they marry up with the national planning objectives. And then C, how they work with our authorities and (unintelligible) our policies. And if you - it is possible to develop a framework that allows for us to - I don't want to say zero-out, but deemphasize those types of benefits that are not consistent with Corps policy or that are not entirely relevant to the national planning objectives.

To, once again, help inform decisions about what the national plan might look like as opposed to some of the other plans that might have stronger stakeholder, non-federal sponsor support.

I guess some of the other things that we may see more of, and this is on a radar screen, as is presented at this last national conference (unintelligible) system restoration, there's this discussion of ecosystem services or just services in general.

And how to consider multiple services that are either derived from natural environments or from the built environment. And how to consider the full spectrum in a planning context. And there are different ways, different metrics, different types of objectives that could be used to put into a framework. Metrics are related to the objectives, the objectives are related to the purposes to help tell the story from the ground up and from the top down. To help different stakeholder groups understand where the Federal interests lie and where the non-federal interests are likely to be a challenge in getting funds for construction of such a project.

So planning for multiple objectives, focusing on communication, I would encourage those to pursue transparency in both framework, disclosing the influence of different metrics and objectives on planning decisions.

Focusing on characterizing, understanding and being able to walk through the relationships of the individual metrics that are being measured and used to characterize the performance of an alternative. All the way back up through our policy. To the authority and back to the national planning objective.

And being able to maintain that pedigree throughout, and communicate that effectively. I've seen it works actually - (its) work well. And where that wasn't given enough attention early on in the process. And there was a lot of time spent on trying to rebuild that connection after such an alternative had been identified.

Development of common understandings, (done with) different groups, different backgrounds and disclosure of sensitivity risks. And this is an element that is also critical to the Smart Planning initiatives. And documentation of risks and sensitivities - (inner) risk register, for instance.

Disclosing it for purposes of informing (or) documenting or providing some context for the decision log in the Smart Plan document (or) Smart Plan report. (Cracking those) sensitivities, understanding the sensitivities and their influence on decisions that have been made or will be made.

(Unintelligible) key. And if you lose track of those it can open up your study to second guessing. Key takeaways and - all right, I just lost connection and I got connection back.

Key takeaways, what I would ask the team or the group to take away when they go back to their (unintelligible) (study) some of (unintelligible) multiple purposes in nature, to once again focusing on assembling a diverse team.

Diversity is a key to effective scoping, identifying where the landmines are, identifying the different opportunities, trying to find opportunities that maybe weren't revealed when (unintelligible) was planted. Once again, diversity is key to a successful process, or at least that's been my experience in (it).

The long (Corps) (gather) is to embrace collaboration, (once) again reach out to (unintelligible) I think is (unintelligible) anyone would embrace collaboration and reach out to different stakeholder groups. (We are) going to be effected by the projects.

We may have different views on the purposes or maybe their interpretation of our purpose. Their focus might be different. We may see differences among different stakeholder groups.

Their understanding (of what they) expect in terms of the (unintelligible) expectance in their project. In conceptualizing the system - take the time out

to properly conceptualize the system. Take the time out to sit back and go slow to go fast.

Proper planning will highlight what we need done, what gaps in the information that we would need to be discovered, revealed, developed. So in conceptualizing the system the key elements that keep stressors on the system, the demands in the services (that exist) within the system.

Parting those out and understanding the relationships is key to mapping out (our) framework (to allow you) to identify how the different things that you're measuring measure up and link into our authorized purposes and the national (primary) objective.

(We) identify key relationships (unintelligible). We help them work with structure, help with transparency clarity and objectivity. The objectivity of an analysis is one that I tend to get hung up on because of prior efforts in which (unintelligible) involved there.

It was very easy to allege that by modifying the framework after the formulation had been initiated, it can be easily perceived that there's an attempt to skew the analysis.

If it seems (unintelligible) -- conceptualizes the system, identifies the boundaries of the framework and the boundaries of the system and tries to work within it -- the objectivity issue and the allegations are more easily tackled.

Once again (having a) go broad to go narrow, start with (a) entire system and look at it and then work your way in from the edges as opposed to starting small and then building on things after the fact.

Because you could be building things on after the fact to skew the analysis and are the products of Group Think working in the direction of a specific alternative that may have been predetermined.

So (you hit) some potential pitfalls I would suggest folks might want to try to avoid because they have been discussed at levels as high as the ASACW. And even, you know, within the Corps of Engineers and Vertical Teams.

Understand the influences on decisions as part of Smart Planning. Understanding what's influencing the decisions and how it introduces a risk for the project. Either risks of not getting the services we're seeking.

Not giving the responses we're expecting or the cost of spending money on something that - provides a regretted solution, a solution that you regret later on. (You know) the types of risks (for you to be) disclosed and the framework should be able to reveal where those sensitivities lie and where those risks of not getting (the) results for the investment lie.

And at risk of over-communicating, over communication is - I'm not sure that you can over-communicate (while providing) the communication that you're building, the communication lines that you're building are effective.

It's one of those cases where - and it's the difference between a broken record and (a) megaphone communicating to the masses. What's being done? The broken record's not really going to convince anybody or tell them anything that they don't already - haven't already heard.

If they don't understand the message -- it's not properly crafted to effect the story behind the study -- that's going to be a problem. So effective communication is key from the very start.

So, bottom line proper conceptualization, I can't stress enough the need to conceptualize the entire system. The boundaries of the system -- both physical and also within the system in terms of assumptions about (unintelligible) uses, boundaries (unintelligible) water usage, water consumption.

Rules, regulations play within the watershed (or) within the system you can conceptualize. Those are other types of boundaries to the system as well. Talk of conceptualization is critical and is a key, in my mind, to a successful formulation effort particularly to a successful expedited formulation effort.

(Unintelligible) (run in), conceptualize your system, get a common understanding before you (can) move forward. Early establishment of an objective and analytical framework. And also proper discipline and transparency in this application and adaptation.

Once again, the framework that you have on day one for evaluating a multiple purpose project might change over time. But as it changes, are you capable of documenting or - accurately describe why changes were made.

It's important to document why things changed (that) have a justification for why those changes were made. It's also to understand whether or not it subjects things that you've already ruled out -- or alternatives you already looked at -- to second guessing.

Because it is possible to have an evaluational framework that, when you introduce things later on in the process, it could skew and violate some very

fundamental assumptions and fundamental requirements (of) multiple criteria analysis. And multiple (NCBA) type of approaches.

You're going to be wanting to adding things from our side. Adding factors in from outside the framework, to the extent you can limit them. Because it can dramatically skew the analysis and open up the analysis that you've completed to second guessing later on. So with that said, I think that is the last slide.

Courtney Chambers: All right. Thank you, Shawn. We do have a few questions in the Chat feature. The first were, "How many Corps multipurpose projects have been authorized?" Do you know that?

Shawn Komlos: I do not know. Most of my experience (this is the truth of advertising) most of my experience has been on a very specific (authorization) for the Everglade's program where multiple purposes were imbedded in the authorization.

Although the formulation efforts and the focus of the formulation efforts (have non-disclosure) of the environmental ecosystem restoration benefits. (But once) (unintelligible) some constraints to their (unintelligible) that we formulated plans (must) avoid violating.

And it is also, it's for, once again, (unintelligible) authority (unintelligible) restoration in other water-related needs of the region. So - and there have been several projects that have moved forward from, once again, from - that have results (unintelligible) reports are actually being built on the ground today from that (unintelligible) party.

In terms of specific projects that are moving forward, (the state) is through Everglades. Once again there's several different projects within the

Everglades program. One of which that comes to mind is (C111 splitter canal) project which is an ecosystem restorational project.

It's designed to make, I guess, pretty effective use - (the) most effective use of regional storm water. We have (it falls in the) Everglade system or that falls outside of the Everglade system.

But it's providing a combination of (unintelligible) production as well as ecosystem restoration reduction benefits by keeping water in the natural system.

Our other projects that we may require consideration of multiple purposes include (Columbia) River, is another one. Basically your larger system projects. Individual (site) specific projects such as (TAFT) and some of the smaller-scale projects (but with) very, very narrowly defined purposes.

Or very specific and obviously apparent needs, (unintelligible) can look at multiple purposes and arguable probably shouldn't if we're trying to speed things quicker. And (unintelligible) smarter.

If there is a need in this (world) that (finds) focus on that specific need. But where we're (getting the) wicked problems -- and there are tradeoffs to be had in the region or the watershed -- that's when we're probably going to be looking at broader authorities that allow for consideration of multiple purposes.

Whether or not they're (conceit) is to (unintelligible) investigation team and (unintelligible) Federal sponsor (unintelligible) evaluations. Let me see here.

Courtney Chambers: The second question was, “Does the Corps have any multipurpose projects that have made it through (Chase Report) and more importantly up to the (LASA) (Civil Works) and then funded through (PED) and beyond?”

Shawn Komlos: Let me see here. Well, I think we’ve got a couple that are moving forward, I’d have to verify (unintelligible) cleared by (OND)...

(Kevin Levin): This is (Kevin Levin) in Jacksonville. The Hamilton City flood protection and flood damage reduction (I think) is the most recent project was I think the first multipurpose project that I know that was authorized. I actually get a true (NED/NER) tradeoff analysis.

And from what I read - at least it seemed like a year ago that it’s actually gone to construction? (Unintelligible) from Sacramento is on the line that could speak more to it. But Hamilton City is what we usually use as the go-to guide for things that have been multipurposed.

Shawn Komlos: Hamilton City’s come up in several discussions and that was one of the Smart Planning pilots (if I recall) as well. But once again, (Kevin), you’ve got several down in Florida that are also going to be some great cases. And I know that - I think the setup is actually moving forward.

Missouri River ecosystem is also another one where we dealing - different purposes within the purpose of ecosystem restoration. For instance on the Missouri River (unintelligible) restoration. It is also constraints having to do with flood risk management and water supply in the watershed...

(Kevin Levin): For (unintelligible) we actually have a multipurpose - we have multiple objectives. Water supply being one of them. We didn’t treat our objectives equally, though, we didn’t do a full - (NED/NER) tradeoff analysis.

We looked at formulating for a restoration primarily and then trying to get any (deep) benefits to water supply that we could without impacting the benefits that we saw through restoration.

So it's a little bit - it's still multipurpose, a little bit different than the Hamilton City tradeoff analysis, but I think that'd be another case study if you wanted to take a look at. It's gone through every decision point too, it has not gone through (unintelligible) for authorization yet, though.

Shawn Komlos: Yes. And once again there's no single answer on how to do - on multipurpose formulation. (Unintelligible) going to be very (case) specific. And once (you're going to) leave that policy you've got to follow (along) procedures.

But the frameworks might be slightly different or different ways to get to the end. (The key) is (to get) people focused on our - try and keep (can I understand it)? Try to keep it disciplined in terms of the approach and focus on committing within the boundaries of the framework that you set up.

There are differences in opinion on how to get, you know, how to best go about (this) and how (do we take the) edge out as the team needs to be.

Courtney Chambers: Hey, Shawn? You're getting a little fast and it's hard to hear you. I'm sorry to keep interrupting you with that.

Shawn Komlos: Roger. And my apologies. Too much coffee, too many meetings. But, you know, structured transparent approach to setting up an evaluation framework (unintelligible).

Once again, the webinar is a few years from now because I have a lot of lesson to learn from efforts from (unintelligible) (on the) river, Everglades. There's a couple projects in - that I'm working with on the Sandy program where they're looking at (just some) restorations (is your basic approaches).

(To) reducing risk as well as improving the quality of the ecosystem in the North Atlantic Division area. (Delaware) River is a couple projects that were identified as providing stronger damage risk reduction as well as (unintelligible) from restorational benefits.

And they were primarily formulated for the ecosystem restoration benefits. (Unintelligible) in any of the analysis (to) document (and vet) benefits from (unintelligible) benefits.

So (unintelligible) (where the team is on beyond the rubble) analysis that something was made - has gone because it has funds to do so. But it's one of those instances where (unintelligible) decisions based on multiple objectives unless the team does the documentation.

And if the authority is broad (if the team) focuses on only one line of the benefits or a single purpose of the multipurpose authorization, then the decisions are going to be based on that single purpose, when the multiple purpose might be within the jurisdiction of the decision makers.

Courtney Chambers: Okay, are there any other questions? You can ask over your phone line if you remember to take your phone off of mute for us. Or use the chat feature.

(Paul Stevenson): Good afternoon, this is (Paul Stevenson), Jacksonville District. I was just wondering if Shawn's presentation might be available on the Web in some future date.

Courtney Chambers: Yes, sir. It will. This recorded meeting with the audio and everything will be posted as a Windows Media file. As well as the PowerPoint and Shawn's bio, as well as the transcript from today's meeting as a PDF file.

So you can access all these documents. And right now I'll post the Web site where you can find that. It's on the Learning Exchange. And you can access today's meeting as well as all of our past recorded meetings on this site.

(Kevin Whitman): This is (Kevin Whitman) again, from Jacksonville district. Shawn, has there been any coordination between what you're working on with the multipurpose objectives and the watershed planning initiative that's going on now? The redoing the guidance and basically reapplying Smart Planning to watershed planning?

Shawn Komlos: Are you talking about the (EDC) in terms of (unintelligible) watershed or are you talking about the actual formulation effort for the (division) update?

(Kevin Whitman): I guess both. I mean the actual formulation efforts to a large degree in establishing the new guidance and the (Purple Book) on it. I just don't know if ERDC or (unintelligible) has been involved too much in that effort or if it's kind of separate?

Shawn Komlos: There's a team of people that were involved in some of the earlier Smart Planning discussions. And (talked about) (unintelligible) (there was an initial) (unintelligible). (And just wanted to) talk about Smart Planning and there (was an issue developed) on multiple purpose formulation and multiple objectives.

And they were all (in) (unintelligible) formulations. (Scott Myer), (unintelligible) (Cameron), myself, (unintelligible), and I know I'm leaving people off the list. (Lee Skaggs) is another.

But there were quite a few people that were involved in that effort to talk through some of the issues and (we) encountered a lot of the different discussions that we're having today where there are, you know, there are different ways at looking at multiple purposes.

(Unintelligible) multiple purposes. Communicating, developing the framework, you know, developing the evaluation of structure, (unintelligible) the evaluations. And so there's a lot of examples that are out there. Some things I've cautioned (unintelligible) is that sometimes a project can move forward out of sheer political will.

So when we're (picking up) something and we're running with it as we go by (unintelligible) and (give you) a little bit of background work of some of the - context (unintelligible) move forward. It may not be so much of (unintelligible) practices but it may have been, you know, some other factors that helped - that, you know, have gotten things over the hump.

It may have been good enough for that instance but maybe not for your instance (when all) (unintelligible) (is done). How much attention your study is going to be getting over another study and, you know, with a similar authority.

(Unintelligible) any project as well. I'm hopeful that Smart Planning is going to help me on (build some of the) structure (build some of) the (unintelligible). The Quality Management (unintelligible) documentation practices really help improve the effectiveness in communications.

(But) we don't want to have to go back and (to recommunicate it and) reanalyzing and finding alternative ways of reanalysis and (unintelligible) the documentations (unintelligible) (different need). So far it seems to be shaping up that way.

Courtney Chambers: All right, very good. Thanks, Shawn. Are there any other questions today? Okay well you can certainly interrupt me if you need to with a question here as we wrap up.

But I would like to thank you for sharing with us today, Shawn. And thanks for participants - thank you for joining us and sticking with us through the technical difficulties we encountered at the beginning.

END