



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

US Army Corps of Engineers  
National Operations Center for Water Safety  
3037 N. Alfalfa Loop  
Post Falls, ID 83854  
(208) 773-8442  
(208) 699-5944 cell phone

---

# REVIEW FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Southwestern Division  
Water Safety Program Review  
June 19-22, 2006

---

## Review Team

### HQs

Lynda Nutt, Manager, HQUSACE National Operations Center for Water Safety  
Brenda Warren, Manager, Loss Prevention and Recreation Safety Programs, HQs Safety Office  
Marsha Gilbert, SWD/SPD Safety Manager, HQs Forward

### SWD:

Larry Bogue, Operations Division

### District:

Madeline Morgan, SWF Safety Officer/National Water Safety PDT Safety Representative  
Allison Smedley, SWL Park Ranger/National Water Safety PDT SWD Division rep

## Other Review Participants

### Grapevine and Lewisville Lakes (Elm Fork Project)

Randall Mayne, manager  
Steve Lindamood, park ranger  
Steve Perrin, park ranger  
Dale King, natural resource specialist

### Lavon Lake

Ken Robinson, manager  
James Murphy, recreation specialist  
Eric Peterson, park ranger  
Captain Garry Collins, Game Warden, Texas Parks and Wildlife

### Joe Pool Lake

Bobby Faucett, manager  
Sgt. Chris Chopin, City of Grand Prairie Police

### Lake Texoma

Ron Jordan, manager  
Duane McBee, park ranger  
Jim Ballard, Texas Fish and Game  
Darrell Richardson, Oklahoma State Police  
Bob Vandegriff, Tulsa District Safety Office  
Ross Adkins, Tulsa District Public Affairs Office  
Louis Holstead, manager, Ft. Gibson Project; Chair, Tulsa District Water Safety PDT

### SWD Water Safety PDT meeting

Review team (listed above)  
Tim Gibson, Operations Division, SWF  
Chris Smith, Operations Division, SWL  
Kris Brown, park ranger, SWG  
Rhonda James, SWD Public Affairs Office  
Louis Holstead, chair, Tulsa District Water Safety PDT  
Ross Adkins, SWT Public Affairs Office  
Dana Matics, park ranger, Falls Lake, Wilmington District, SAD rep to national water safety PDT  
Bob Vandegriff, SWT Safety Office  
Benoit Palmer, SWF Safety Office

## Review Summary

At the request of SWD leadership, a limited water safety program review was conducted during the period 19-22 June 2006. The review team was designed to include water safety, safety, and recreation subject matter experts from Headquarters, Division, District and field level, and included staff from both Operations and Safety offices.

The informal review included a pre-review briefing with BG Jeffrey Dorko and COL Emmett DuBose, discussion with project personnel as well as local law enforcement representatives, visual inspections of random parks, beaches and ramp sites, and district program briefings by members of the division water safety PDT. A field representative from SAD was present to share some of her division's water safety successes with the PDT.

Projects visited included Grapevine, Lewisville, Lavon, Joe Pool, and Texoma Lakes. Specifically, the review team had opportunity to visit day use, campground, beach and boat ramp areas at each of these lakes. The Joe Pool and Texoma Lakes visits each included looks at large marina concessions. Additionally, lunch during the Lake Texoma visit was spent with a "friends of the lake" tourism group.

It should be noted that while this report addresses problematic findings, a lot of good management effort was found throughout the tour. Management, for the most part, was found to be particularly in tune with the need for water safety and very supportive as much as resources would allow. The parks were very well designed and maintained for public use; however, this report will focus for the most part on efforts toward public safety.

## Review Specifics

The review team used a pre-designed checklist during their project staff interviews and site observations. This enabled consistency throughout visits to each area. The checklist (Appendix A) addressed specifics such as facility observations, personnel, demographics and reporting. Staff interviews included all levels of personnel, from park rangers to operations managers; in several cases, local state or county agents who work the particular project were on hand to participate in the discussions.

A significant impact on the review was that it was conducted mid-week, rather than during a day of high visitation, such as a weekend or holiday. Park usage was low and schedule patrols were not being conducted. Information gathered was dependent on staff input, which may have

skewed some of the findings. That being said, the review team felt that all staff interviewed were very candid and honest with their responses.

Additionally, the review of facilities was impacted by the fact that most of the lakes were experiencing low water, which made it difficult to measure controls such as beach delineation, maintenance, etc.

Through verbal discussions, the review team learned about each lake staff's current efforts towards public safety. Not surprising, similar challenges faced each office, the biggest of which was staff size. The summary below reflects management responses to direct questions; where multiple answers are listed, they are ranked in order of importance (per manager's input):

*Top 5 (five) management challenge(s):*

1. **Resource cutbacks.** The prevalent concern was reduction of staffing, in particular loss of ability to bring on summer-hires to pick up the extra staff burden associated with recreation season. Along with staffing issues, concerns were expressed about lack of funds required to upgrade recreation areas, including important management tools such as signage.

2. **Carrying capacities.** During certain holiday periods, park capacities often reach their maximums; in one area, management described being ordered by the local fire marshal to close access gates and not let anyone enter until someone left. This kind of overload of recreation areas particularly affects staff's ability to maintain a safe recreation environment and presents new visitor assistance challenges. While holidays are expected to increase visitation, conditions such as favorable weather conditions or unanticipated events (family and/or company picnics, etc.) can contribute to the impact. Several of the managers felt their challenges were amplified because of their close proximity to large metro areas.

3. **Alcohol.** Without strong state laws to control consumption within the parks, alcohol definitely contributes to management problems. This not only was expressed by Corps personnel, but by state agents we interviewed as well. The two most common violations for which citations were issued at each lake visited were identified as Boating Under Influence (BUI) and inadequate safety equipment. Title 36 CFR 327.3(e) does include requirements



for vessel safety equipment which are enforceable by Corps park rangers, but alcohol violations are state sanctioned and can only be enforced by the appropriate law enforcement agency for the area.

4. **Communication.** Several staff members expressed concerns over new challenges associated with increases in numbers of non-English speaking visitors. Signage is primarily posted in English, although some areas have made limited attempts to post translations in Spanish in beach areas. Rangers have limited translation skills and often have to rely on others to assist in communicating messages (for instance, several reported communication is often through children of family groups). Hispanic (Spanish-speaking) populations seem to be most prevalent, but reference was made to increasing numbers of Vietnamese, Asian and Russian populations.



5. **Workload.** Demands on recreation staffs' time have increased dramatically over the past decade. Rangers interviewed during this review reported that the bulk of their time is spent at a desk, working on reports, contracts, and other administrative-type work, rather than in parks conducting patrols. Managers specified that they do assure that rangers spend time in the parks during weekends when visitation is highest, but rangers admitted that even time they get in parks is spent less on public contacts and more for dealing with contract gate attendants, maintenance and fee issues. Patrols are often conducted from a vehicle in order to cover project areas efficiently with the "park time" scheduled. Additionally, the review team learned that not all areas are able to manage park ranger boat patrols during busy weekends; many lakes are patrolled only by local law enforcement dependent upon their availability.

#### ***Visitation:***

Areas visited during this review shared common patterns of visitation:

- Most visitors live within 100 miles of project; repetitive visitation prevalent
- High degree of diversity; largely non-English speaking visitors
- Day use activities, such as picnicking, swimming and boating, most popular visitor experiences
- Popular sites for large group events (company, church or family events)
- High visitation numbers that push carrying capacity of facilities

Tulsa District's Lake Texoma hosts some of the highest visitation of Corps recreation areas, and is broadly reputed to be one of the nation's primo party lakes – in the same class as Lake Mead near Las Vegas. Officers who patrol this area recommended viewing web site [cantweight.com](http://cantweight.com) for a peek at the typical crowd who visits the lake. Features of the lake include 12 parks, 17 marinas, and a slew of shoreline management issues; with a lake management staff of only 7 park rangers and 2 summer rangers, it is apparent that management is woefully challenged to keep up with daily work demands, including park surveillance and educational outreach. In previous years, the staff operated an outstanding water safety center, routinely offering lessons to area school children and visitors on water safety. The center remains closed today due to understaffing, although the lake manager expressed hopes to bring that program back in the near future.



For the most part, lakes visited during this review seemed to provide settings attractive to families and more sedate visitors. The number of Corps projects in SWD (88 projects) is very high by comparison to other large divisions of the agency (SAD has 24 projects; MVD has 58 projects). That, combined with a recreation season that virtually runs year-round, the range of available recreational opportunities and the proximity to large urban areas, operations staffs face multiple public safety challenges.

#### ***Accidents and fatalities:***

Just as in visitation numbers, SWD leads the Corps in public fatalities and has for several years. Statistical information on recreational fatalities (water-related) occurring in SWD closely follows trends seen in Corps national stats. Victims for the most part were male, adolescent to middle-aged, not wearing a life jacket. In FY06 incidents described by project staffs (records not yet available for review team) the team learned that many of the current year's most serious incidents occurred outside designated swimming areas. It was felt that many of the victims suffered difficulties caused by exceeding their abilities (stamina, swimming skills, etc.); this factor was deemed to be at least partly behind many of the drownings. While stats do not indicate high number of incidents involved alcohol or drugs, it is understood that Corps staff does not readily have access to that type of information and therefore report of such is usually indicated as "no". Conversations with both project staffs and supportive

law enforcement officers indicated that alcohol is at fault more often than our statistics would indicate. Ethnicity is not something that has been closely tracked either, although SWF has done somewhat of an effort to keep such information for their own purposes.

**Facilities:**

While some beaches were closed to the public during this period of low water, others remained open, sans buoy markers, depth markers, and other devices that enhance beach safety. In one case of particular concern, a campground area beach had been permanently closed by lake staff, as explained by the manager, but the review team’s perspective was that the public would have a difficult time knowing such – signage (“Swim at your own risk”) remained in place, buoy markers remained on shore, and nothing indicated the area was closed.



Signage associated with designated swim beaches varied significantly from area to area, in both message and appearance. Most posted restriction signs, but often only in English. Many of the signs were found to be faded and peeling; however, they were still satisfactorily readable.



During one project briefing, staff showed an example of a fungus problem affecting yellow “No lifeguard, Swim at your own risk” beach signage purchased through Unicorp (staff member advised this problem only affects yellow signs). This problem will be reported to the sign program manager.



The provision of rescue equipment available to the public for emergencies in

designated swim beaches varied greatly as well. Several of the managers expressed frustration over trying to keep life rings, throw bags and other similar devices from being stolen or vandalized. In several cases, decisions had been made to simply quit stocking these devices at the beaches. Emergency telephones were not found to be available in or even near any of the beaches we visited. When project rangers were questioned about how someone could report an emergency, the responses varied from “go to the gatehouse” to “hopefully someone will have a cell phone.” Emergency procedures were not posted anywhere, although bulletin board kiosks were available in or near most beach areas.

To further address bulletin board kiosks, most of those viewed by the review team were found to be empty or contain old, faded information virtually unreadable. Staff members addressed this during their briefings, advising that they simply didn’t have the manpower to keep these boards fresh. Several water safety posters and banners were noted at project offices and gatehouses, along with safety materials available to the public; however, there were several gatehouses in particular that did not post anything other than park hours or regulations. According to staff, gate attendants in several locations provided specific safety information to visitors as they paid their entrance fees.



The use of a “life jacket loaner board” was noted in a couple of the beaches; however, no life jackets were supplied on one board. The empty board actually created an additional safety risk by use of large nails that were jutting out at about child’s eye-level. Neither of the boards provided loaner instructions. When questioned about the empty board, the touring park ranger responded that their devices were being stolen so often, they’d “kind of given up on it.”



One project had opted to install sun shelters (taken out of surplus) near designated beaches, allowing outstanding shady retreat for parents or others to sit close to the beach and observe swimmers under their supervision. Otherwise, the team noted a lack of sitting areas along beach

areas; picnic tables and benches were available in other park locations, some distance from the swimming areas.

Concession marinas were visited at two of the projects, where the team found a range of services available to the public, including restaurants, convenience stores, nightclubs and bars. Both convenience stores visited offered packaged beer and wine available for carry-out, along with other assorted goods including life jackets. At one marina, the concession managers were on hand to describe their operation and answer questions for the review team. When questioned



specifically about their high focus on alcohol sales (there was not a wall, window or ceiling that didn't have beer signs posted or hanging), they described responsible management procedures for alcohol sales (carding, control of amount of beer sold to any individual, etc.) and showed alcohol-related safety information available near the cash register (responsibility campaign material provided by Anheiser-Busch). Managers admitted that they do not give out water safety information provided by the Corps, but both said they would if that were provided to them. Both marina concessions rented out vessels including small boats and personal watercraft; concession managers shared safety procedures associated with both and one showed a rental checklist that included safety information. Project managers for these Corps outgranted areas explained that concession agreements are established by District Real Estate personnel and seldom are restrictions such as "no alcohol sales" included in the agreement.

***Public education and community outreach:***

Through discussions with project and/or district personnel throughout the week, the team learned that most water safety education is done through special programs or events in the community, including programs in schools or organizations, boat shows, fairs and similar. Recent changes in curriculum requirements in schools has resulted in cutbacks in classroom presentations, and rangers described that most of their school presentations now are done in assembly style. "Teach-the-teacher" efforts that have been successful in the past are being impacted by these same conditions. Participation in community water safety coalitions has been key in most of the districts' programs, with outstanding examples of partnering found in programs such as Galveston District's Camp WADE

**program and Ft. Worth District's alignment with the North Texas Drowning Prevention Coalition. Such alliances have extended the Corps' arm to educate the public; these groups focus on large events for community outreach and through such partnerships, demands for Corps staff are minimized as other organizations share the burden. At Lavon Lake, staff park rangers provided the review team with a glimpse into their mobile water safety trailer, built onsite by project staff. This water safety trailer is an outstanding ready-made display that can be taken into parks and community events to share water safety materials, with little preparation or staff requirements to set up. This is a great example of thinking outside the box and developing tools that provide major benefit with little demand on resources and manpower.**

**During discussion meetings throughout the week and especially while meeting with the division water safety PDT, the review team was able to see that all districts within SWD have supported the formation of water safety teams, some more energized than others. These district teams have typically served as examples for other Corps regions. Tulsa District personnel explained that their program lost energy over recent years due to cutbacks, but that a dynamic rebuilding of their program is underway.**

**One interesting dynamic was observed by the review team members from outside the division: there was a notable reaction by staff members from all levels anytime it was suggested that alcohol controls be established. It was obvious that the culture of the region is that consumption of alcohol is a given right and efforts to restrict it or ban it in anyway were unacceptable.**

***Volunteer Programs:***

**During the review, no volunteer employees were found working for the projects. Staffs described difficulty in attracting volunteers or professed that staffing shortages resulted in no one available to coordinate such a program.**

### **SWD Best Management Practices (BMPs):**

Several significant BMPs were noted throughout the SWD areas visited that should continue to be supported and used in district programs:

1. District water safety teams have been formed and utilized for information exchange.
2. The stocked interpretive trailer, used by Lavon Lake rangers, provides a portable center for water safety education.
3. Corps membership and participation in community water safety councils and organizations, such as the Northern Texas Drowning Prevention Coalition (Ft. Worth) and Project Camp WADE (Galveston), strengthen local outreach efforts.
4. The Water Safety Center, a formal water safety education site established at Lake Texoma offers a unique, fun, safe and convenient setting for water safety outreach for local communities and schools.
5. Life jacket message painted on water towers near Lake Texoma is an outstanding visual for drivers passing through the project.
6. Sun shelters (brought out of surplus) installed near designated swim beach at Lavon Lake provides a protected area for observers, encouraging closer supervision of swimmers using the beach area.
7. Annual water safety program report prepared each year by Little Rock District natural resource staff provides a consolidated review of the year's activities for Commander and other leadership; report includes statistical information, project events, water safety committee reports, media interviews, and more.
8. System of accurate visitation reporting established throughout SAD; such information is important to reflect exposure hours.
9. National water safety program support for product development (i.e., Bobber, the Water Safety Dog).
10. Division NRM representative on national water safety PDT from SWL; HQs-selected Safety representative to national team from SWF.

## **Best Management Practices (BMPs) from other Divisions:**

### **MVD:**

- 1. Interagency Partnerships: St. Paul District – Kids In Boats: partnership between Lake Ashtabula, North Dakota Game & Fish, Grand Fork Safe Kids, & North Dakota Safety Council; St. Louis District - Missouri Partners for Safety - partnership between five Corps of Engineers Districts in Missouri, Missouri State Water Patrol, and Missouri State Highway Patrol; Local Water Safety Councils; Cooperating Associations; MOA between Lake Shelbyville and local Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla.**
- 2. Special Events: St. Louis District - Rend Lake School Assemblies during the month of March utilizing robotic units such as Seamoor Safety and Corkey; Mid-America River Expo at the National Great Rivers Museum; Carlyle Lake wooden coin/prize campaign; Mark Twain Lake poster contest and billboard campaign; St. Paul District – Grand Forks Children’s Water Festival.**
- 3. Water Safety Campaigns: Bobber the Water Safety Dog is a National campaign that is utilized throughout the Division; Ranger Willie B. Safe Campaign started in 1998 at Wappapello Lake and has expanded throughout the St. Louis District and across the nation; Life Jacket Loaner Program: many projects throughout the division loan out life jackets at visitor centers, marinas, and on loaner boards.**
- 4. Water safety message distribution to the public by utilizing nationally distributed & locally purchased promotional items, radio & television PSAs, signs, and ranger face-to-face contacts: campground/beach programs, safety vessel checks, visitor assistance patrol, boater safety courses, and school & community outreach programs.**
- 5. St. Louis District Water Safety Strategic Campaign Plan: This plan analyzes boating and water safety fatality statistics nationwide and within the district and establishes recommended methods for educating the public about boating and water safety.**
- 6. Throughout the division, staff is trained and educated in boat operation, basic water rescue techniques, and attend water safety seminars/conferences. St. Louis District established a District Water Safety Team in 2001.**

**LRD: Division water safety team initiatives:**

- **Division Water Safety PDT formed in 2006 including establishing a Groove Workspace**
- **Commander emphasis provided in memo with Water Safety Initiatives, including goal to reduce public fatalities by 20%**
- **Implemented Last Ranger/Next Ranger report into PAN and will do an overall AAR at the end of the fiscal year**
- **Initiating Division Water Safety Awards program**
- **Developing water safety flag and pin**

**Buffalo District:**

**Mount Morris Dam doesn't have a lake but we are partnering with a local individual who has set up a Safe Kids program. She is a member of the National Water Safety Conference and each year has gotten grants to hold water safety events. The Buffalo District participates by providing the water safety materials for the various events. Numbers at these events can be from 60-300.**

**Huntington District:**

- 1. Project restriction on alcohol beverages**
- 2. Water safety programs at local schools**
- 3. Volunteer watch patrols**
- 4, Active water safety councils**
- 5. Partnering activities with State DNR / Local police / Coast Guard  
Boat inspections, OUI check-points, lake patrols**

**Nashville District:**

- 1. District Water Safety Task Force since 1998 and participation in new Division Water Safety PDT in 2006**
- 2. Expand Life Jacket Loaner program**
- 3. Education through programs, web pages, bulletin boards, camping permits, fishing reports, visitor centers and water safety products**
- 4. Publicity through special events and media releases**
- 5. Partnerships with other agencies**

## 1. Last Ranger/Next Ranger

The Last Ranger/Next Ranger process provides an After Action Report (AAR) following a recreation-related public fatality. Last Ranger/Next Ranger is a tool to evaluate the circumstances surrounding the incident to identify preventive strategies for the future. Originated in Wilmington District, the process promotes communication and the sharing of lessons learned. The purpose is to learn and implement appropriate improvements and processes with a goal of preventing future fatalities. The Last Ranger/Next Ranger will be prepared by the project and submitted electronically within 14 days of the incident to Carolyn Bauer, CELRN-OP-R and Kareem El-Naggar, CELRD-OR for further distribution.

Last Ranger/Next Ranger is made up of three components:

### 1. Summary:

The summary includes the facts of who, what, when, where and how the incident occurred. It is essentially the same information that is included in the incident report submitted by the project at the time of the fatality.

### 2. Last Ranger:

The Last Ranger section seeks to identify potential opportunities that a ranger or other Corps team member might have had to provide water safety information to the victim prior to the fatality. Some examples include:

- Entrance station to the recreation area
- Visitor Center
- Personal contact by a ranger on patrol by vehicle, boat, or on foot
- Outreach programs such as those at schools, libraries, boat shows, county fairs, Career Days, Environmental Days, Earth Day Events, Fishing Rodeos, and National Public Lands Days
- Written contact - Posters, brochures, news articles, billboards, signage
- Other - Fishing report message, public service announcements

### 3. Next Ranger:

The Next Ranger section is focused on action that may help prevent similar fatalities from occurring in the future. This section may suggest themes or aspects of the water safety program that might influence similar situations to help prevent future fatalities. A sample Last Ranger/Next Ranger is attached.

## Sample: Last Ranger / Next Ranger

### **Last Ranger / Next Ranger**

**20 June 2006 Drowning at Lake Discovery**

#### **Summary:**

**On 20 June 2006 at approximately 1300 hours, 65-year-old John Doe drowned after falling out of his fishing boat at Tucker Creek on Lake Discovery. Witnesses on the shore said the victim stood up in the boat, lost his balance and fell into the lake. The victim went under the water and did not resurface. Metro Rescue Squad recovered his body two hours later in water 20 feet deep. The victim was not wearing a PFD. It is unknown if alcohol or drugs were a factor.**

#### **Last Ranger:**

**A ranger on duty the day of the incident patrolled the boat ramp area by vehicle. There were no Corps boat patrols on the lake that day. The project's water safety efforts include bulletin boards, distribution of brochures and promotional items, programs, message on the fishing report, and news releases. The victim reportedly launched his boat from Tucker Creek Boat Ramp. A bulletin board in the area has water safety information, some of which is focused on the importance of wearing life jackets. Local newspapers recently printed an article about Lake Discovery and included the message to wear life jackets.**

#### **Next Ranger:**

**The staff will continue to promote water safety to influence as many of visitors as possible in an effort to eliminate fatalities. Rangers will encourage visitors to wear life jackets any time on or near the water. Some of the posters, brochures, and promotional items used in the water safety program contain this theme. Programs will also include the reminder to exercise caution when moving around in a small boat. Additional life jacket loaner boards will be installed at lake locations as resources become available.**

### **Pittsburgh District:**

- 1. Banned the consumption of alcoholic beverages at District managed projects. Pittsburgh did this in the early 80's and it took about three years to get the message across. Since that ban went into effect the number of drowning's in LRD dropped significantly. Alcohol was enforced under Title 36, Section 327.12 Restrictions.**
- 2. All persons on board a vessel under 16 feet in length including all canoes and rafts must be wearing a U.S. Coast Guard Approved PFD at all times even while anchored.**
- 3. Children bringing proof to one of the project offices that they have completed a swimming course will be rewarded with an Annual Pass for their family for one year.**
- 4. Directional arrows on all red and green Coast Guard navigational nun cans. All too often we see boaters on the wrong side of a channel marker. Directional arrows or messages stenciled on the nun buoy could read, "Boat this side." The arrow would indicate which side of the nun buoy the boat should be on.**
- 5. Develop a water safety program targeted for adults with actual pictures of drowning victims or victims involved in a boating accident. (Graphic pictures often times get the message across better) than sweet talk.)**

### **NWD:**

### **Portland District:**

- 1. Face-to-face ranger/visitor contacts – rangers are making face-to-face contacts on foot and boat patrol, at special events (parades, fairs, safety days, during power plant tours, etc.**
- 2. Team mascot campaigns - NWP effort to work with Oregon State Beavers and Buddy the Beaver**
- 3. IDIQ educational giveaways contract – District orders quantity water safety educational items for quantity/greater savings**
- 4. Division water safety PDT formed – District Water Safety PDT established; works year round to continue District and Project efforts**
- 5. Remote radio spots – PA is doing water safety radio statements, prompted by news releases (new releases shared by members of PDT)**
- 6. Indirect water safety messages/exhibits – Vinyl billboards (re-deployable) and public transportation posters (Tri-met system in Portland)**

**7. Partnering with other agencies – Examples: Water safety materials provided to state park interpreters to incorporate into programs; exhibits and materials in maritime museums (Astoria and Portland)**

**8. Groove workspace established for idea sharing**

**Seattle District:**

**1. Water Safety bill boards**

**2. Spanish Community Water safety events, products and programming, with new portable Water Safety exhibits for bilingual events and programs**

**3. Community Water Safety Outreach Education**

**4. Water Safety Parade Floats and Water Safety Dam Days activities**

**5. Personal pan pizza gift cards for their Water Safety program give-aways (can be given away by Corps rangers without Corps logo on them)**

**6. Water Safety/Park Safety Education bags for all who visit with children or use the wading pool at the project park**

**7. Life jacket loan-out kiosks with community support**

**8. Utilize graphic images and other resources provided by National Water Safety Program**

**9. Lockwall safety outreach**

**Kansas City District:**

**1. OPAA! Initiative to provide lunch hour education for one full month each school year, working with food servers; program features “Bobber, the Water Safety Dog” materials and OPAA! (food service company contracted with state schools) builds lunch menus around water safety theme.**

**2. Water safety summer rangers hired; 2 day district-led training course prepares these educators for their outreach efforts.**

**Walla Walla District:**

**1. Seamoor Safety robot used in community outreach**

**2. Centralized educational giveaways program**

3. Water safety fun day activities in the park
4. Outdoor Sportsmen events – water safety booth
5. Provides support to national water safety program (Lynda Nutt)

**Omaha District:**

1. Community programs for local tribal groups
2. Visitor center safety information

**SAD:**

1. Memorial buoys
2. Face-to-face ranger/visitor contacts
3. Team mascot campaigns
4. IDIQ educational giveaways contract
5. Division water safety PDT formed
5. Groove workspace established for idea sharing
6. Remote radio spots
7. Last Ranger, Next Ranger
8. Spanish-speaking volunteer corps
9. Life jacket loaner boards
10. Water safety messages painted on boat ramps
11. Ranger trading cards with water safety messages
12. Buddy Beaver mascot

**Review Team Recommendations:**

**It is recognized that the most powerful tool we have is face-to-face contact between a Corps employee and a visitor. Not only do such contacts provide an opportunity to encourage safe behaviors to visitors, they can improve public relations for the Corps with enhanced communication. South Atlantic Division leadership has been very outspoken on this being**

**a key component in reducing public fatalities by 25% in their region in the past year.**

- 1. Increase public contacts in parks, on the lakes and walking beaches:**
  - a. Review administrative responsibilities currently assigned to rangers to determine work that can be accomplished by clerical staff.**
  - b. Utilize summer-hire rangers for seasonal increases of visitation**
  - c. Put rangers in parks conducting foot patrols and making face-to-face public contacts**
  - d. Use ranger boat patrols as an additional and important opportunity to make contact with public on the water**
- 2. Utilize law enforcement contracts and/or cooperative agreements to define presence in problem areas during key recreation periods; agreements should include both land and water patrols.**
  - a. Contract for public safety, not enforcement of state/local laws**
  - b. Such agreements are being used in other Corps divisions**
- 3. Utilize volunteer force and partnerships.**
  - a. Assign volunteer “Volunteer Coordinator” to oversee program if staff shortages don’t allow attention to overall coordination**
  - b. Use volunteers to conduct water safety contacts in parks and at community events, as well as freshen kiosks and bulletin boards with key safety information**
    - i. Take advantage of scouting merit programs (Eagle Scouts, etc.)**
    - ii. Utilize individual and group community service programs**
  - c. Draw on current partnerships with organizations such as US Coast Guard Auxiliary and US Power Squadrons (MOUs attached under Appendix B)**
    - i. Vessel Safety Checks at boat ramps, community programs, classes, search and rescue, homeland security, environmental stewardship, etc.**
  - d. Seek volunteer services of specific community ethnic groups for outreach to communities, such as Hispanic populations**
    - i. Examples set by Lake Lanier, Mobile District and Sacramento District’s Southern Area Office**
- 4. Command emphasis on water safety**
  - a. Commander’s emphasis and support of water safety program is essential**
  - b. Support district and division-wide water safety teams**
    - i. Include staff members from OPS, PAO, SO, RE, OC**

1. RE specialists are often left out of these types of emphasis teams; however, they manage our outgrants which also have associated public safety challenges
    - ii. Focus on target audiences
    - iii. Encourage idea exchange between districts and other divisions
      1. Encourage team effort – huge benefit to “sharing” across the boundaries
    - iv. Members should utilize Groove workspaces for discussion/sharing in lieu of meetings (NOC and SAD models are available)
    - v. Utilize IDIQ contract for procurement of educational incentives for economies of scale (Mobile District IDIQ for SAD is model of successful effort)
  - c. Extend emphasis to outgranted area managers
    - i. Communicate the problem
    - ii. Share educational materials
    - iii. Encourage responsible management practices
5. Take advantage of national water safety program assistance
  - a. Products to supplement local efforts
  - b. National partnerships
  - c. Production items to fit your outreach (i.e., videos, PSAs, web site)
  - d. Downloadable artwork
  - e. Gateway ideas postings
  - f. Mascot support
  - g. Recommend new tools if not already available
    - i. Program is very grassroots
    - ii. Division representative on the national team is ready to champion your ideas
6. Establish division-wide beach safety standards/policy. Consider adopting best management practices used in other Corps divisions, including:
  - a. Utilize sign options such as International Symbols versus words to address language barriers
  - b. Maintain rescue/safety equipment at public beaches
  - c. Post emergency contact information (phone location, etc.)
  - d. Mark safety equipment with obvious Corps identity to discourage theft
  - e. Utilize depth markers for beaches
  - f. Install benches or shade shelters nearer to beaches to encourage/accommodate supervision
  - g. Establish routine of inspection of all equipment
  - h. Encourage installation of “Life Jacket Loaner Boards”
    - i. Match loaner program to fit your region:

- 1. If theft is a concern, loan from Gatehouses, project offices, park rangers –whatever your plan, make it known!
  - ii. Include instructions for use (for instance, Wear It Right posters)
  - iii. Grants available through BoatUS Foundation
  - iv. Corps national water safety program will have some life jackets to distribute in FY07 (through BoatUS Foundation donations)
  - v. Seek local sponsorship of boards; i.e., Safe Kids Coalition, women’s groups, Rotary, scouts, etc.
- 7. Prominently disseminate safety messages
  - a. Take full advantage of installed bulletin boards and kiosks for safety messages
  - b. Target variety of audiences
  - c. Consider other options for messages
    - i. Billboards enroute/near parks
    - ii. Ramp images
    - iii. Banners
    - iv. Gatehouses
  - d. Develop aggressive public relations strategy to include increased news releases with safety messages and media interaction in advance of key dates: around park openings, start of “101 days of summer” (Memorial Day through Labor Day), following serious accidents or fatalities, prior to summer holidays, announcing National Safe Boating Week, National Fishing Week, hunting season and similar periods when interest in water-based recreation is high
- 8. Challenge the culture
  - a. Risk behaviors are risk behaviors; despite the unpopularity of the decision, they should be controlled
    - i. Implementation of special regulations under Title 36 authority to restrict certain risk behaviors, such as consumption of alcohol in parks, inflatable toys in swimming areas

**Follow-up commitments made to SWD by the review team:**

- 1. Sign fungus problem will be reported to National Sign Program manager.
- 2. Review team members will follow up to provide additional guidance on issues raised during this review:
  - a. Discuss packaged alcohol sales in outgranted areas authorized under current real estate guidelines with HQs Real Estate and Operations leadership

**b. Update and/or establish current Corps-sanctioned beach standards**

**c. Seek clarification on authorities to utilize law enforcement contracts/cooperative agreements for public safety patrols on the water**

**3. Program models, such as Groove SAD water safety team workspace, Mobile District managed IDIQ contract, etc., will be provided to SWD Operations Division.**

APPENDIX A  
Review Checklist

## WATER SAFETY PROGRAM REVIEW

Division: Southwestern

Project/Lake:

Date of review: June 19-22, 2006

Manager:

Participants: L. Bogue, L. Nutt, B. Warren, M. Gilbert, M. Morgan, A. Smedley

Others:

REVIEWER:

### 1. FACILITY OBSERVATIONS:

a. Facility visited:

Type: Day-use \_\_\_ Campground \_\_\_ Combo \_\_\_ Boat Launch \_\_\_ Beach \_\_\_  
Marina \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

b. Recreation Opportunities offered at Project

Type: Picnicing \_\_\_ Camping \_\_\_ Boating/Fishing \_\_\_ Swim Beach \_\_\_ Hiking \_\_\_  
Cycling/ATV \_\_\_ Hunting \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

c. Uniformed Corps personnel observed during site visit: (assign number to activity)

Vehicle patrol

Foot patrol

Lake patrol

Other:

d. Other public safety/enforcement personnel observed during site visit:

Vehicle patrol

Foot patrol

Lake patrol

Other:

e. Other working personnel observed:

Campground/gate hosts

Resource maintenance

Contract maintenance

Volunteers

Other:

1. *FACILITY, cont.*

f. Lake patrols routinely conducted and at what frequency?

- Corps?
- LE Contract?
- State agency?
- US Coast Guard Auxiliary?
- Others?

g. Rescue equipment (life rings, throw bags, emergency phone, etc.)

- Visible to public
- Accessible to public
- Maintained by staff

h. Public swimming areas:

- Appears maintained
- Designated by buoys or other markings
- Signs advise lack of life guards (i.e., “Swim at your own risk, no life guards present.”)
- Benches or other seat options present for observers
- Free of structures that can be climbed on
- Information/water safety bulletin board or other signage
- Depth gauge present
- Scheduled regular maintenance/inspections
- Signage in languages other than English (Spanish etc.)
- Instruction on usage

i. Public information:

- Safety messages viewable/handed out at:
  - Entrance (gatehouse, etc.)
  - Beach
  - Boat ramps
  - Public restrooms
  - Kiosks
  - Marinas and other concessions
- Types of messages found
- Messages in languages other than English (Spanish etc.)

j. Life jacket loaner board (if installed)

- Are assorted sized jackets available?
- Life jacket sizing information available?
- Who is responsible for maintenance?
- Are jackets removed if damaged or moldy?
- Are instructions for use (such as “size it right”) posted?

1. *FACILITY, cont.*

- k. Kiosks with safety information (posters, etc.)
  - Information is current
  - Emergency information is posted
  - Information in languages other than English (Spanish etc.)
  - Suggestion Box (For feedback from public)
  - Posting of fatalities as warning/lessons learned for the public
- l. Signage:
  - Clarity of message
  - Maintenance of signs
  - English only
  - English/Spanish offered
- m. Rules and regulations:
  - Alcohol prohibited?
    - State law?
    - Title 36 special provision?
  - Life jacket mandate?
    - State law?
    - Title 36 special provision?
  - Boater Education/Licensing?
    - In State
    - Adjacent State
    - Title 36 special provision?
  - Other Safety prohibitions?
    - State law?
    - Title 36 special provision?
  - Jet Ski/Personal Watercraft
    - State law?
    - Title 36 special provision?
  - ATV
    - State law?
    - Title 36 special provision?
- n. Concessions:
  - Marinas
    - Slip rentals
  - Rentals
    - Type of equipment rented
  - Food concessions: Is alcohol sold?
  - Inspections of concessions are routinely conducted?
    - By whom?

## **2. PERSONNEL:**

- a. Staff size:
  - Visitor assistance rangers
  - Interpretive rangers
  - Shoreline management rangers
  - Non-specialized rangers (does all)
- b. Number of citation-authority rangers
- c. Average number of citations given each year
- d. Biggest reason for citations being written
- e. Are routine boat patrols scheduled?
  - # times per week
  - # times per weekend
  - Times of day
- f. Percent of shift rangers spend at desk doing administrative work (ranger logs, contracts, customer service, etc.):
- g. Percent of shift rangers spend on foot patrol
- h. Percent of shift rangers spend in vehicle doing drive-through patrols
- i. Percent of week rangers spend giving programs
- j. Summarize management challenges:

## **3. WATER SAFETY EDUCATIONAL/COMMUNITY OUTREACH**

- a. Public programs offered
  - Campground
  - Day use
  - Boat ramp (courtesy vessel check, etc.)
  - Off-Project (school/sports shows, etc)
- b. Other means of public information (specify):
  - Regular media interviews
  - Sporadic media interviews
  - Billboards
  - Local use of PSAs
  - Languages other than English
  - Who does translations? How is it verified for accuracy? Who is typically your target audience?

- c. Community partnering:
  - Local water safety council
  - US Coast Guard Auxiliary
  - Safe Kids Coalition
  - Diversity Organizations
  - Other: (specify)
  
- d. Support by district offices: (rate as excellent, good, average, poor, non-existent):
  - OPS
  - SO
  - PAO
  - Other (specify):
  
- e. Materials/giveaways for public:
  - Received from National Program
  - Procured from project funds
  - Procured from district funds
  - Other
  
- f. Types of materials/give aways used:
  - Educational Brochures/Activity Books
  - Posters
  - Other (list)
  
- g. Does target audience for water safety education coincide with statistical findings?
  
- h. How do you measure the effectiveness of your efforts?
  
- i. Has project personnel pursued grant funds, or challenge partnership agreements with boating safety foundations or local partners?

**4. VISITATION:**

- a. Average visitation per year
  
- b. Majority of visitors come from
  - Areas within 100 mile radius of park
  - Areas outside of 100 miles radius of park
  
- c. Ethnic diversity of visitors:
  - Large amount of diversity
  - Average amount of diversity
  - Low amount of diversity
  - Identify major ethnic groups

4. *Visitation, cont.*

d. Socio-economic diversity of visitors:

Majority of visitors are from low-middle income classes

Majority of visitors are from middle-upper middle or higher income classes

There is no definite pattern to the socio-economic class of our visitors

e. Rec season duration (specify months):

f. Popularity of activities enjoyed at the lake:

Boat                      Camp

Fish                      Hunt

Picnic                    Swim

Other

**5. PUBLIC FATAL/SERIOUS INJURY INCIDENTS THIS SEASON:**

# Swimming

# Boating

# Other

a. Known factors:

Alcohol involved

Life jacket not worn

Designated swim area

Outside designated area

b. Age of victim

Under 10

10-16

16-24

25-35

36 or older

c. Gender of victim

Male

Female

d. Ethnicity of victim (if known):

e. Primary activity at the time of incident

Swimming

Rec Boating

Fishing

Hunting

Other

5. *Incidents, cont.*

f. Other information regarding incident

g. Accident Recordkeeping

h. Current guidance on Public Accident Recordkeeping Distributed? Yes No

i. Current guidance understood? Yes No Somewhat

j. Current guidance for Public Accident Recordkeeping implemented? Yes No

k. Completing PAN for all recordable Public Accidents? Yes No

l. Completing SIR for all recordable Accidents? Yes No

m. Utilizing the Public Recreation Accident Work Sheet? Yes No

n. Copies of Worksheet in vehicles? Yes No

o. Copies provided to other law enforcement agencies for their reports to USACE?  
Yes No

p. Public Safety Partnerships? Yes No  
With whom?

q. Public Safety Lessons Learned – Are they sought? Yes No  
Documented? Yes No  
If yes where and how are they distributed/archived

r. Project Public Accident trend analysis? Yes No

s. Reporting and analysis of serious injuries? Yes No

**APPENDIX B**  
Partnership Agreements

US Coast Guard and US Coast Guard Auxiliary  
US Power Squadrons  
BoatUS Foundation



## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

441 G STREET NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Between the

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, the U.S. COAST GUARD,**

And the

**U.S. COAST GUARD AUXILIARY**

#### **I. PURPOSE.**

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by and between the U.S. Department of the Army (DA) represented by the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the United States Coast Guard (USCG) and the Coast Guard Auxiliary (USCGA) (the parties) for the purpose of establishing a mutual framework governing the respective responsibilities of the parties for the providing coordinated homeland security efforts on the Nation's waterways, and advancing public water safety and security awareness and compliance with State and Federal regulations. This MOU is entered into pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 141 and 14 U.S.C. 822 and/or 33 U.S.C. 569c, which authorizes DA to accept volunteer services.

Auxiliary units may be authorized to accept the free use of space from yacht clubs, marinas, Federal agencies and other organizations in order to conduct Auxiliary activities.

Incorporated into this MOU by reference is the current Coast Guard Auxiliary Manual, COMDTINST M16790.1F and the current Coast Guard Auxiliary Directory of Services. As the Coast Guard Commandant revises the authorities of the Auxiliary, this document shall not conflict with those changes.

#### **II. SCOPE**

A. The Corps, USCG and the USCGA share similar concerns and responsibilities for our nation's inland navigable waterways. The objective of this MOU is to allow each of the parties cooperate in areas including, but not limited to, increasing educational outreach, ensuring the accuracy of electronic aids to navigation, providing homeland security assistance initiatives, search and rescue efforts, and conducting vessel safety checks. This agreement will encourage communications between the agencies, allow the agencies to share information and technology, and provide continuity of navigation assistance throughout navigable waters.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, THE U.S. COAST GUARD, AND THE U.S. COAST GUARD AUXILIARY

B. Any Local CORPS office may establish local partnership or volunteer agreements with the USCGA to assist in non-law-enforcement efforts to promote safety and security on the Nation's navigable waterways, including locks and dams, lake projects, and the Intra-Coastal Waterway.

C. After request and appropriate training and course completion from the USCGA, any Local CORPS office may provide vessel safety checks on or upon USACE vessels.

D. Nothing in this MOU shall be construed to require the CORPS to use the Auxiliary, nor for the CORPS to be responsible for conducting USCGA programs.

**III. RESPONSIBILITIES.** Subject to applicable Federal laws, regulations and policy:

A. A representative from each Party at the headquarters level may regularly provide each other updates through written correspondence, coordination meetings, and other mechanisms, on program activities, technology application, development and related work pertaining to cooperative activities pursued under this MOU.

B. Each Party may provide leadership and program oversight of the cooperative activities described in Support Agreements conducted under this MOU. Each Party may review overall program requirements and cooperative arrangements under this MOU at least annually. Each Party may establish work groups, and review and approve group charters, work plans and reports.

C. Each Party may collaborate in the conduct of a broad range of domestic projects that support public water safety for the Nation, including but not limited to homeland security public education programs, navigation support, vessel safety checks, water safety educational outreach, facilities resource support, and search and rescue.

D. Each Party will work cooperatively in the exchange of applicable data, information and products.

E. Each Party will cooperate on joint outreach and educational activities that may involve other partners of either organization.

**IV. MUTUAL UNDERSTANDINGS.** It is mutually agreed and understood by the parties that:

A. Specific activities to be conducted under this MOU and the method of their implementation will be defined on a case-by-case basis by the Corps, USCG and Auxiliary, considering the merit of the proposed activity, existing commitments, projected schedules, available funding and personnel resources, and other relevant factors. As appropriate,

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, THE U.S. COAST GUARD, AND THE U.S. COAST GUARD AUXILIARY

implementation of specific activities under this MOU will be outlined in separate Support Agreements. Activities may include “Challenge Partnerships,” volunteer agreements, work plans or statements of work. Support agreements will be coordinated through mutual agreement between the Commander, US Coast Guard; the Commodore, US Coast Guard Auxiliary; and the Commander, US Army Corps of Engineers or their designated representatives, and independently authorized by appropriate statutory or other authority.

B. This MOU defines the general terms upon which the Corps, USCG and Auxiliary will cooperate. Performance by any of the Parties under the terms of this MOU is subject to the availability of appropriated funds, facility and personnel resources through their respective funding procedures. This MOU is neither a fiscal nor a funds obligation document. Any endeavor involving reimbursement or contribution of funds, or transfer of anything of value, between Parties to this MOU will be handled in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures, including those for Government procurement and printing. Such endeavors will be outlined in separate agreements, such as “Challenge Partnership,” work plans or statements of work, which shall be made in writing by representatives of the Parties and shall be independently authorized by appropriate statutory authority. This MOU does not provide such authority. Specifically, this MOU does not establish authority for noncompetitive award to USCG and/or Auxiliary of any contract or other agreement. Any contract or agreement for training or other services must fully comply with all applicable requirements for competition.

C. The activities conducted under this MOU may be documented and made available through appropriate journals, publications or other established channels, consistent with good scientific practice. Publications documenting cooperative efforts may be prepared by either party, or jointly, provided that Each Party are given an opportunity to review and concur with manuscripts prior to publication.

D. The Parties may release their own materials to the public. The Parties will consult with each other prior to any releases that reference the other party’s participation, and such releases shall be consistent with the other Parties’ laws and policies.

E. The Parties agree that sharing credit is mutually beneficial and will assure that appropriate citation and attribution is given for work performed under this MOU. Uses of a Party’s logo or seal, however, will require advance approval by that party.

F. This MOU may be modified or amended by mutual agreement of Each Party in writing.

G. The MOU may be terminated at any time by mutual written agreement of the Parties, or by either Party upon 90 days written notice to the other Party. Otherwise, this MOU will remain in effect indefinitely.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, THE U.S. COAST GUARD, AND THE U.S. COAST GUARD AUXILIARY

**V. POINTS OF CONTACT.** The following individuals will be the points of contact for this MOU:

**U.S. Coast Guard**

Capt Barry Smith (or current)  
Chief Director of U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary  
2100 Second St. SW  
Washington, DC 20593-0001

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

Lynda Nutt, Manager (or current)  
National Operation Center for Water Safety  
3815 Schreiber Way  
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815

**U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary**

Commodore Warren E. McAdams (or current)  
National Directorate Commodore, Recreational Boating Safety

**VI. EFFECTIVE DATE.** The Parties have executed this MOU as of the last date indicated below.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

U.S. COAST GUARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
DON T. RILEY  
Major General, USA  
Director of Civil Works, USACE

\_\_\_\_\_  
DENNIS SIROIS  
Rear Admiral, USCG  
Assistant Commandant for Operations

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
E. W. Edgerton, Jr.,  
U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary  
National Commodore

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



US Army Corps  
of Engineers

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
between the  
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
and the  
BOATU.S. FOUNDATION



**I. PURPOSE.**

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the BoatU.S. Foundation (BoatU.S.) for the purpose of establishing a mutual framework of cooperation between the Parties on issues of common interest involving boating and water safety education.

**II. SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES.**

The Corps and BoatU.S. share a commitment to the welfare and safety of the public as it pertains to boating and water based recreation. The Corps and BoatU.S. jointly strive to:

- cooperate in areas including, increasing educational outreach, materials publication and educational activities.
- encourage communications among the agencies and allow the agencies to share information, technology, information and products.
- collaborate in the conduct of a broad range of domestic projects that support public water safety for the Nation, including but not limited to public education programs, navigation support, and water safety educational outreach.

**III. MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING.**

a. This MOU is neither a fiscal nor a funds obligation document. Any endeavor involving reimbursement or contribution of funds or transfer of anything of value, between BoatUS and Corps will be handled in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures. Such endeavors will be outlined in separate documents, such as "Challenge Partnership Agreements," which shall be made in writing and shall be independently authorized by appropriate statutory authority. This MOU does not provide such authority. Specifically, this MOU does not establish authority for noncompetitive award to BoatU.S. of any contract or other agreement. Any contract or agreement for other services must fully comply with all applicable requirements for competition.

b. This MOU may be modified or amended by mutual agreement of Each Party in writing.

c. The MOU may be terminated at any time by mutual written agreement of the Parties, or by either Party upon 90 days written notice to the other Party. Otherwise, this MOU will remain in effect indefinitely.

**IV. POINTS OF CONTACT.** The following individuals will be the points of contact for this MOU:

**The BoatU.S. Foundation**

Chris Edmonston (or current)  
Assistant VP, Director Boating Safety Programs  
147 Old Solomons Island Road, Suite 513  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
(410) 897-0512

BOATU.S. FOUNDATION



---

N. RUTH WOOD  
President  
The BoatU.S. Foundation

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

Lynda Nutt, Manager (or current)  
National Operation Center for Water Safety  
3037 N. Alfalfa Loop  
Post Falls, ID 83854  
(208) 773-8442

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS



---

DON T. RILEY  
Major General, US Army  
Director of Civil Works

# MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BETWEEN THE

UNITED STATES POWER SQUADRONS

AND THE

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS



## I. BACKGROUND

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is between the United States Power Squadrans, a non-profit organization and hereinafter referred to as the “USPS”, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers, an agency of the United States Government and hereinafter referred to as the “Corps”.

## II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this MOU is to establish a general framework of cooperation between the Corps and the USPS.

This MOU will provide a foundation for the Corps and the USPS to work together on issues of common interest and upon which the Corps and the USPS can jointly plan and carry out mutually beneficial programs, projects and activities.

## III. STATEMENT OF MUTUAL INTERESTS AND BENEFITS

The Corps, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to, among other things, construct, maintain, and operate public navigable waterways at water resource development projects under the control of the Department of the Army. Such navigable waterway projects generally serve commercial and general public traffic alike, and provide opportunity for transport, boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and access to such areas along the shores of such projects is maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary to public interest. The Corps leads the nation as the largest provider of outdoor recreation, with water-based recreational activities accounting for the largest portion of its visitation.

USPS was organized in 1914 and is a non-profit, educational organization dedicated to making boating safer and more enjoyable by teaching classes in seamanship, navigation and related subjects. Its members are boating families who contribute to their communities by promoting safe boating through education. USPS has some 50,000 members organized into 450 squadrons across the country and in some US territories. USPS is America's largest non-profit boating organization and has been honored by three

US presidents for its civic contributions. Each squadron's activities involve the three primary objectives of USPS: community service, continuing education, and enjoying the friendship and camaraderie of members.

Many of the river and lake systems directly managed by the Corps are popular waterways traveled by USPS members.

The participating parties to this MOU have responsibilities and interests in the promotion of safety awareness regarding activities on public navigable waterways through educational outreach and materials publications.

The participating parties have an interest in maintaining accurate short-range aids to navigation data for chart publications related to waters managed by the Corps, thus promoting the public safety.

The participating parties have an interest in establishing and maintaining homeland security on water resource development projects under the control of the Department of the Army.

The participating parties agree that it is to their mutual benefit to work cooperatively whenever possible on issues of common interest consistent with agency public safety objectives and plans.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above premises, the parties agree as follows:

**IV. U.S. POWER SQUADRONS WILL MAKE ITS BEST EFFORT TO:**

- a. Inform the Corps of the concerns and needs of the boating public as they relate to the management of Corps administered lands and waterways.
- b. Consider entering into "Challenge Partnership Agreements" with the Corps as may be appropriate and necessary to further the purposes of this MOU.
- c. Work cooperatively with the Corps in efforts to convey information to the public regarding the safe and responsible methods of boating.
- d. Inform the Corps on matters concerning the use of vessels, including safety, water quality, and environmental impacts, and in stream flow requirements related to boating.
- e. Convey the Corps concerns to the boating public and encourage the environmentally responsible use and operation of watercraft on or near Corps administered lands or related waters.

- V. THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS WILL, in accordance with Federal laws, regulations, and policy and subject to the availability of funds,:**
- a. Provide publicly available information to the USPS on conservation and management issues pertaining to Corps administered waterways related to recreational boating.
  - b. Advise the USPS of opportunities to participate in the public involvement processes and events that relate or impact boating.
  - c. Consider entering into “Challenge Partnership Agreements” with the USPS as may be appropriate and necessary to further the purposes of this MOU.

**VI. IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD BY AND BETWEEN THE SAID PARTIES THAT:**

- a. This MOU is neither a fiscal nor a funds obligation document. Any endeavor involving reimbursement or contribution of funds between the parties of this MOU will be handled in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures. Such endeavors will be outlined in separate agreements that shall be made in writing by representatives of the parties and shall be independently authorized by appropriate statutory authority. Specifically, the MOU does not establish authority for noncompetitive award to the USPS of any contract or other agreement.
- b. Nothing in this MOU shall obligate the USPS to expend funds or enter into any contract or other obligations with the Corps.
- c. Nothing in this MOU shall obligate the Corps to expend appropriations or to enter into any contract or other obligations with the USPS.
- d. Any activities undertaken by either party pursuant to this MOU shall be in accordance with Federal law, regulations, and policy.
- e. No member of, or delegate to Congress shall be admitted to any share or part of this MOU, or any benefits that may arise there from.
- f. The USPS will not publicize or otherwise circulate promotional material (such as but not limited to advertisements, brochures, press releases, speeches, film, photographs, articles, manuscripts or other publications), which states or implies that the Corps endorses the USPS or its position without prior written approval of the Corps. The USPS will not use the Corps’ trademarks without the written permission of USACE being obtained in advanced.

- g. The Corps will not publicize or otherwise circulate promotional material (such as but not limited to advertisements, brochures, press releases, speeches, film, photographs, articles, manuscripts or other publications), which states or implies that the USPS endorses the Corps or its position without prior written approval of the USPS. The Corps will not use USPS' trademarks without the written permission of USPS being obtained in advanced.
- h. This MOU in no way restricts the parties from participating with other public or private agencies, organizations, and individual. All parties recognize the importance of continuing cooperation and participation with non-governmental organizations and institutions in programs of mutual interest.
- i. This MOU may be modified or amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties in writing and may be terminated by either party upon sixty (60) days prior written notice.

**VII. EFFECTIVE DATE**

This MOU shall become effective upon the date of its execution by both parties and shall remain in effect until terminated by either party 60 days after receipt of written notification.

For the United States Power Squadrons

For the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

\_\_\_\_\_  
 -S-  
 Theodore Smith  
 Chief Commander  
 U.S. Power Squadrons

\_\_\_\_\_  
 -S-  
 Colonel Peter J. Rowan  
 District Engineer  
 US Army Engineer District,  
 New Orleans

DATE: 10 May 2003

DATE: 10 May 03