



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN
1100 COMMERCE STREET, SUITE 831
DALLAS TX 75242-1317

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CESWD-PDS-P

06 NOV 2008

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Little Rock District

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for White River Minimum Flows Reallocation Study

1. References:

- a. EC 1105-2-410, 22 August 2008, Review of Decision Documents.
- b. Memorandum, CECW-CP, 30 March 2007, subject: Peer Review Process.
- c. Document, CECW-CP, September 2008, subject: Supplemental Information for the "Peer Review Process" Memo Dated March 2007.

2. The enclosed Review Plan for the White River Minimum Flows Reallocation Study has been prepared in accordance with the referenced guidance.

3. The Review Plan has been made available for public comment, and the comments received have been incorporated. The Review Plan has been coordinated with the Ecosystem Restoration Center of Expertise of the Mississippi Valley Division, which is the lead office to execute the plan. The Review Plan does not include Independent External Peer Review.

4. I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as study circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent substantial revisions to this plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

5. If you have questions or need further information, please contact Ms. Margaret Johanning CESWD-PDT at (469) 487-7045.

Encl

BILLY G. TOLLISON
Colonel, EN
Acting Commander

CF:
CESWD-PDL
CESWL-PE/Michael Biggs

Review Plan Update
White River Minimum Flows Study
US Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District
November 2008

1. Project Background. The White River Minimum Flows study began with the Water Resource Development Acts (WRDA) of 1999 and 2000. These two WRDAs modified the basic authorization and operation for the five multipurpose White River Basin lakes: Beaver, Table Rock, and Bull Shoals Lakes on the White River; Norfork Lake on the North Fork River; and Greers Ferry Lake on the Little Red River. All five lakes are located in the White River Basin of Arkansas and Missouri. Under the original authorization, the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Water Supply Act of 1958, project purposes include flood control, hydropower, water supply, and recreation (fish and wildlife purposes were later added). WRDAs 1999 and 2000 authorized a storage reallocation in the lakes to sustain the downstream trout fishery. A storage reallocation was necessary to implement the WRDA measures because all of the storage space in the lakes was already allocated (there is no surplus storage) to other project purposes. The reallocated water storage is intended to provide minimum flows in the tailwaters of the multipurpose reservoirs when there is no flood release or hydropower release. Implementations of these modifications were conditioned on a determination by the Chief of Engineers, through the completion of a final report, that the work is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. WRDA 1999 and 2000 authorized the Secretary to provide minimum flows necessary to sustain tailwater trout fisheries within each of the White River Lakes by reallocating the following amounts:

Beaver Lake	1.5 feet
Table Rock Lake	2 feet
Bull Shoals Lake	5 feet
Norfork Lake	3.5 feet
Greers Ferry Lake	3 feet

In addition, the Secretary was directed to transmit to Congress a final report of the Chief of Engineers. The final report determined that the reallocations did not adversely affect other authorized purposes and determined Federal costs that would be incurred in connection with the modification. A Reallocation Report, signed in August 2004, analyzed reallocation and release scenarios at these five multipurpose lakes. The Reallocation Report identified economically justified, technically sound, and environmentally acceptable reallocation and release scenarios at each lake. The August 2004 Reallocation Report resulted in Section 132 of the Fiscal Year 2006 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (P.L. 109-103) authorizing and directing the implementation of plans BS-3 at Bull Shoals and NF-7 at Norfork Lakes. The actions are to be at full Federal expense in accordance with section 906(e) of WRDA 1986, with the exception of relocations or modifications to public and private lakeside facilities which shall be provided by the non-Federal Sponsor, the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. Section 132 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (EWDAA) did not authorize implementation of Minimum Flows proposals at Beaver, Table Rock, and Greers Ferry Lakes. Also, Section 132 of

EWDAAs repealed the previous project authorities in WRDA 1999 and 2000, eliminating further consideration of alternative plans. The 2008 project report is in response to implementation guidance of Section 132 of EWDAAs issued by HQUSACE 18 May 2007.

2. Review Requirements. In accordance with Engineering Circular (EC) 1105-2-410, Review of Decision Documents, dated 22 August 2008, all decision documents and their supporting analyses will undergo District Quality Control (DQC) and Agency Technical Review (ATR) and may also require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), to "ensure the quality and credibility of the government's scientific information." The Circular addresses review of the decision document as it pertains to both approaches and planning coordination with the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise. The Circular also requires that DrChecks (<https://www.projnet.org/projnet/>) be used to document the ATR and IEPR comments, responses, and associated resolution accomplished by the review process.

The levels of technical review mentioned in the Circular are discussed in the paragraphs below and have been redefined and renamed for consistency with recent legislation and to establish a more comprehensive lexicon. The Circular uses the terms "home district" or "home MSC" to refer to the office that has been assigned responsibility for a study or project and whose Commander will sign the recommendations or decision document.

a. District Quality Control (DQC) is not covered by this Review Plan but is included in the Circular so is mentioned briefly here. DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). It is managed in the home district and may be conducted by staff in the home district as long as they are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work that is being reviewed. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan providing for reviews such as quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, and Project Delivery Team (PDT) reviews. Additionally, the PDT is responsible for a complete reading of the report and supporting documentation to assure the overall integrity of the report, the technical appendices and the recommendations before approval by the District Commander. It is expected that the MSC/District Quality Management Plans address the conduct and documentation of this fundamental level of review.

b. Agency Technical Review (ATR) is an in-depth review, managed within USACE, and conducted by a qualified team outside of the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of a project or its product. The purpose of the ATR is to ensure the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices. The ATR team reviews the various work products and assures that all the parts fit together in a coherent whole. ATR teams are comprised of senior USACE personnel (e.g., Regional Technical Specialists), and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. To further assure independence, the leader of the ATR team is from outside the home MSC.

c. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. The criteria for application of IEPR are: (1) the total project cost exceeds \$45 million; (2) there is a

significant threat to human life; (3) it is requested by a State Governor of an affected state; (4) it is requested by the head of a Federal or state agency charged with reviewing the project if he/she determines the project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on resources under the jurisdiction of his/her agency after implementation of proposed mitigation (the Chief has the discretion to add IEPR under this circumstance); (5) there is significant public dispute regarding the size, nature, effects of the project; (6) there is significant public dispute regarding the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project; (7) cases where information is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretation, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices; or (8) any other circumstance where the Chief of Engineers determines IEPR is warranted. IEPR may be appropriate for feasibility studies; reevaluation studies; reports or project studies requiring a Chiefs Report, authorization by Congress, or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); and large programmatic efforts and their component projects. IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) that is described in Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3), is exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; is independent; is free from conflicts of interest; does not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water resources projects; and has experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels. The scope of review will address all the underlying planning, engineering, including safety assurance, economics, and environmental analyses performed, not just one aspect of the project.

d. In addition to the technical reviews described above, decision documents are reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. These Policy and Legal Compliance Reviews culminate in Washington-level determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the Chief of Engineers. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed further in Appendix H, Amendment #1 of ER 1105-2-100. The technical review efforts addressed in EC 410 are to augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with published Army policies pertinent to planning products, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents. DQC and ATR efforts are to include the necessary expertise to address compliance with published planning policy.

e. The EC also outlines coordination with the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) in preparing the review plan. Districts should prepare the plans in coordination with the appropriate PCX and with consultation of the allied Communities of Practice. The MSC Commander's approval of the review plan is required to assure that the plan is in compliance with the principles of the EC and the MSC Quality Management Plan. The review plans must anticipate and define the appropriate level of review. All reviews are expected to be completed and documented before the District Commander signs the report. HQUSACE policy review will be completed before the draft decision and NEPA documents are released for public review and again before the Chief of Engineers signs his report. To the maximum extent practicable, reviews shall be scheduled and conducted in a manner to avoid or minimize delays in study or project completion.

3. Project Title, Subject and Purpose of the Decision Document. The project title is “White River Minimum Flows Study, AR & MO”. The decision document is the “White River Basin, Arkansas, Minimum Flows Project Report.” A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was prepared as a separate document to evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed actions and accompanies the Project Report. Section 132 of EWDA authorized and directed the implementation of plans BS-3 at Bull Shoals and NF-7 at Norfolk Lakes. The purpose of the decision document is to report the findings and recommendations of the study, which include reallocation of the flood pool storage at Bull Shoals Lake and a 50/50 flood pool /conservation pool storage at Norfolk Lake for the purposes of environmental enhancement of associated tailwaters.

The Project Delivery Team (PDT) roster can be found in Appendix A. The review team members were nominated by the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise based on expertise in multipurpose reservoir economics, flood risk management, hydropower, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) related analysis, and water resource plan formulation. Questions regarding the review plan should be directed to the following:

Analysis and Report Preparation: Michael Biggs, Project Manager,
Little Rock District

Agency Technical Review (ATR): Sue Ferguson, Review Team Lead, Nashville District
Planning Center of Expertise (PCX), Ecosystem Restoration: Camie Knollenberg Rock Island District, Mississippi Valley Division

Southwestern Division POC: Margaret Johanning

4. Influential Scientific Information and Level of Review. The report does not contain novel or precedent-setting approaches or influential scientific information. The study analyses, while complex, are well within the scope that is typical of similar reallocation studies. Consequently, the recommendation of the District, with MSC concurrence, is that the level of review be Agency Technical Review (ATR) only. The Vertical Team has concluded that the White River Minimum Flows study does not require independent external peer review (IEPR), as defined in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 (Public Law 110-114), and EC 1105-2-410 for the following reasons:

a. WRDA 2007 Section 2034, Paragraph (h) (1), Applicability, states that Section 2034 is applicable to studies initiated during the 2-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act and for which the array of alternatives to be considered has not been identified. Study efforts for this project started in 1999. At the time of enactment of WRDA 2007 and the 8 November 2007 implementation for Section 2034, SWL, was preparing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and (at the direction of HQUSACE) had completed the August 2004 reallocation report with final alternatives at all five lakes, including the two scenarios BS-3 and NF-7 authorized in 2006. Documentation of the analysis of those alternatives had been coordinated with stakeholders through public scoping meetings, agency coordination, and stakeholder meetings including a 45-day public comment period on a draft EIS during the summer of 2006.

b. WRDA 2007 Section 2034, Paragraph (3)(A)(i), states peer review is mandatory if a project has an estimated total cost of more than \$45 million and is not determined by the Chief of Engineers to be exempt. The White River Minimum Flows Project has an estimated total construction cost of \$24,303,000. The Federal portion of the construction cost is estimated as \$303,000 at Bull Shoals Dam for O&M modifications and \$4.9 million at Norfolk Dam for construction of siphons, valves, and a bulkhead for a total Federal construction cost of \$5,203,000. The remaining \$19,103,000 million is a non-Federal cost and no appropriation is needed. Other costs associated with the Minimum Flows Project include an estimated \$33.9 million one time buy-out for non-Federal hydropower FERC licensee no. 2221, and an \$86.7 million debt reduction to the Federal hydropower purposes at Bull Shoals and Norfolk Dams. There is no appropriation required for the reduction to the Federal hydropower purpose.

c. EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, requires IEPR if the project poses a significant threat to human life. The White River Minimum Flows Project, as published in the SDEIS and draft Project Report, includes no change in authorized purposes and does not significantly increase historic flood heights or releases. The changes will not adversely affect any fish, wildlife or other environmental resources, will greatly increase the recreation resources, and will not impose any increased flooding risk in the project area or elsewhere. Bull Shoals and Norfolk Dams have DSAC IV ratings.

d. EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, requires IEPR if the Governor of the affected state requests an IEPR. Neither the Governor of Arkansas nor the Governor of Missouri is expected to request an IEPR.

e. EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, requires IEPR if an agency has requested a review due to adverse impacts. No agencies have requested an IEPR. The project will be implemented through the continued consultation with the Arkansas-Missouri Dissolved Oxygen Committee, County Judges/Commissioners surrounding Bull Shoals and Norfolk Lakes, and the States of Arkansas and Missouri.

f. EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, requires IEPR if there is public dispute of size\nature\effects of the project. No significant public dissent was discovered from the public comment period during the summer of 2006 comment period on the DEIS, or at the two SDEIS public meetings held in August 2008. The project has reduced the adverse impacts on fish and wildlife species and their habitat by improving wetted perimeter, stabilizing tailwater temperatures, and improving habitat for invertebrates (trout food source). In addition, the project would have additional benefits from the original project purpose of wetted perimeter by potentially increasing concentration of Dissolved Oxygen in the tailwaters, and establishing stream aquatic habitat. The project has no impact on any species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or the critical habitat of such species designated under such Act.

g. EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, requires IEPR if there is public dispute of economic\environmental benefits\costs of the project. No significant public dissent was expressed during the public comment period (summer of 2006) on the DEIS or from the two SDEIS public meetings held in August 2008. The overwhelming majority of comments

expressed support for the environmental and recreational benefits of the modified project. A few dissenting comments were received concerning the cost of the project (such as potential for moving impacted lakeside facilities), potential impacts to hydropower producing capability to FERC licensee No. 2221 (Empire Electric), and the effects of minimum flows operations during drought years and high water years.

h. EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, requires IEPR if the project has novel methods\complexity. The study does not contain any novel or precedent-setting approaches or influential scientific information. The complexity is well within the scope that is typical of these types of studies.

i. EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, requires IEPR if the project has precedent setting models\policy changing conclusions. The White River Minimum Flows implementation does not change the authorized operating purposes for Bull Shoals and Norfolk Dams, and changes no policies. All models used during the White River Minimum Flows study are approved and accepted Corps of Engineers engineering models; no planning models were used in the study.

5. Timing and Sequencing of Reviews. The project report and SDEIS were completed in accordance with the May 2007 implementation guidance that directed the District to complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other environmental compliance requirements addressing the impacts from the two authorized projects, plans BS-3 and NF-7 per EWDA. The project report and SDEIS review timing is listed below.

August 2008	Draft Report and DEIS submitted for higher level review
November 2008	Final Report and FEIS prepared
November 2008	ATR team review of Final
Nov-Dec 2008	30-day NEPA administrative review
Nov-Dec 2008	HQUSACE final review
January 2008	Final approvals

A preliminary assessment of the risks to the study completion identified several factors that may have an impact: development of an overly aggressive schedule or missing required activities that would result in schedule changes or slippages; the availability of required resources when needed; expectations of the local sponsor or stakeholders regarding the estimated implementation cost of the project or the scheduled study completion; and lastly, the complexities of the technical information required, such as the methodologies of hydropower cost compensation and the participation of outside federal agencies to develop the necessary data in a timely manner. (There is less control of the schedule for activities outside of the organization.) Any of these potential actions could affect the study cost or schedule leading to a more costly overall effort than originally communicated to the sponsor or interested stakeholders. The Project Manager and the project delivery team work diligently as a team to avoid or lessen any such impacts to the study completion.

6. Opportunities for Public Comment. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) public involvement process, a DEIS along with a draft reallocation report were made

available for public comment in June of 2006. Public meetings were held in three different towns in the affected area. As stated above, after the conclusion of the 45-day public comment period, the public review process was suspended in order to develop implementation guidance. Implementation guidance was issued in May 2007 that directed SWL to develop a SDEIS and project report that discussed impacts at only the two lakes with authorized minimum flows plans BS-3 and NF-7 per EWDA. The SDEIS and Project Report were developed per implementation guidance and posted on the District website on 6 August 2008, with a point of contact for comments and questions. The District held numerous meetings with individual stakeholder groups throughout the course of the study. The White River Minimum Flows project followed the NEPA process preparing a DEIS, SDEIS, and coordination with the following state, federal, and local agencies; 1) United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.); 2) National Park Service (Buffalo River Office); 3) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 4) Arkansas Game and Fish Commission; 5) Missouri Department of Conservation; 6) Missouri Department of Natural Resources; 7) Ozark Underground Laboratory; and 8) the six affected Counties in Missouri and Arkansas (County Judges and Commissioners). The study complied with all environmental laws and regulations. For a detailed summary of all laws and regulations see Section 4.12 Compliance with Environmental Requirements in the SDEIS.

7. Significant Comments Provided to Reviewers. Comments are documented in the SDEIS and were provided to ATR Reviewers, Division, and Headquarters.

8. Number and Expertise of Reviewers. The review team consists of seven reviewers from Nashville, Walla Walla, and Rock Island Districts. The team has extensive experience in plan formulation, water supply studies, reallocation studies with hydropower implications, water supply contracts, and the NEPA process. The review team includes Economists (1), H&H Engineer (1), Biologist/Planner (3), Realty Specialist (1), and Cost Engineer (1).

9. Nomination of Professional Reviewers. Not Applicable to ATR process.

10. Models Used. The hydrologic model, SUPER, an engineering model, was used in assessing reservoir operations, lake recreation analysis, flood damage analysis, and water supply yield analysis. At the request of the Water Management and Reallocation Studies PCX lead, the model was reviewed by the SWD Water Management Team leader for technical soundness and was determined to be the appropriate model for the study and that the analysis of the results from the model were based on technically sound engineering principles. No planning models were used in the study.

11. In-Kind Contributions. None.

12. Execution Plan. Execution of the review plan is described in the following paragraphs.

a. **Expertise.** Application for a review team was made through the Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) (Mississippi Valley Division with Rock Island as the lead

District); Nashville and Rock Island Districts were selected to conduct the ATR. Walla Walla District is the Cost Estimate PCX; therefore, they review the M2 cost estimates.

b. **Rotation.** Nashville/Rock Island/Walla Walla Districts' status as Agency Reviewers has been maintained based on their familiarity with the complexities of these types of studies and their possession of specialized expertise not readily available elsewhere.

c. **Conflicts of Interest.** There are no conflicts of interest, as the reviewers are all Federal employees. All reviewers have complied with Federal and Department of Army Ethics requirements.

d. **Independence.** Nashville/Rock Island/Walla Walla Districts' staffs have not participated in the development of the report, appendices or other work products reviewed.

e. **Reviewers' Privacy.** Nashville/Rock Island/Walla Walla Districts' have been informed that the names and other personal information of the reviewers will not be disclosed in the final report.

f. **Reviewers' Compensation.** SWL provides the labor funds for the reviews. The review costs were estimated at \$32,000 for the initial review (to include the Cost Estimating Directory of Expertise at Walla Walla District and Real Estate specialists in Rock Island District.) An additional \$15,000 is estimated for the final reviews.

g. **Reviewers Charge.** The PCX charges the review team to review all scientific and technical materials to include review of methods, analysis and formulation of the alternatives and recommended plan; compliance with the NEPA process, and completeness of supporting technical documentation. The team will review the documents and make clear, concise comments, with notation of the section and paragraph to which the comment is directed. The reviewer will state why the comment is important and the consequences of failure to address the comment. The review will also suggest how to address the comment. In a similar fashion the reviewer may offer broad evaluation of the overall document on the basis of scientific and technical merit. All policy determination is the responsibility of Headquarters and the Assistant Secretary of Army.

h. **Confidentiality.** Review will be conducted in a manner that respects business information and intellectual property.

i. **Review Mechanism.** For reasons stated earlier, Agency Technical Review is recommended using a team of reviewers with specialized expertise in water reallocation studies affecting hydropower and other purposes. The purpose of the ATR is to provide in depth review of the technical, engineering and scientific work, managed within the USACE through the appropriate PCX and using a qualified review team outside the home district. The review team has been selected from Nashville/Rock Island/Walla Walla Districts' staff.

j. **Access to Information.** Reviewers will have access to all information used in the analysis and documentation of the report. Any other information maintained by SWL will be made available to reviewer. The study's project manager is Michael Biggs, who will serve as a POC for all requests for information.

k. **Disclaimer.** Information distributed for review includes the following statement: "This information is distributed solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination review under applicable information quality guidelines. It has not been formally disseminated by USACE. It does not represent and should not be construed to represent any agency determination or policy."

l. **Public Participation.** SWL has and will continue to make draft documents available for public review. Draft documents were mailed to interested stakeholders and posted on the District website. All the public involvement requirements for NEPA have been and will continue to be met.

m. **Transparency.** The PCX instructs the review team to prepare a review report. The report will disclose the names, background and affiliation of all reviewers. The nature of the review and the ATR team's charge will be presented in the report. A copy of the comments and the associated reviewer will be included. DrChecks will be used to document the ATR process and will aid in production of the review report.

n. **Responses to the Review Report.** Written responses to the review report will be prepared using DrChecks. Responses will include an explanation of how the responses/actions are expected to satisfy the comments/concern documented in the review report. Back check by the reviewers will be documented in DrChecks. The review report and comment resolution will be included as an appendix in the final report. The reviewer's names will be removed from the review report prior to its inclusion in the final report appendix, as per paragraph 11.e. above.

13. **Approval of the Review Plan.** The Ecosystem Restoration PCX reviewed this review plan, provided comments and affirmation by memorandum of compliance with the EC 1105-2-410, dated 22 August 2008. The Commander, Southwestern Division, the MSC for SWL, is the approver of the review plan. The MSC will provide the signed approval memorandum to the Headquarters Southwestern Division Regional Integration Team (RIT). The Review Plan is a living document and may be modified as the study continues. Approval of any revisions will follow the process of the original approval. The approved review plan and the MSC approval memorandum will be posted on the District webpage with links to the MSC, PCX, and HQUSACE sites.

APPENDIX A. ROSTER OF THE PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

Org	Name	Team Function	Phone
SWL	Kristina Mullins	Deputy Ch, PPMD	501-324-5842
SWL	Mike Biggs	Project Manager	501-324-5842
SWL	Chris Hicklin	Ch, Planning and Environmental Ofc	501-324-5023
SWL	Ron Carman	Dep Ch, P&E Ofc	501-324-5601
SWL	Dana Coburn	Study Manger	501-324-7343
SWL	Jim Ellis	Environmental Team Lead	501-324-5629
SWL	Mike Rodgers	Environmental	501-324-5030
SWL	Win Hargis	Environmental	501-324-5018
SWL	John Kielczewski	Reservoir Contol	501-324-6235
SWL	Tracy Fancher	Operations Project Manager, Bull Shoals and Norfolk Lakes	870-425-2700
SWL	Jon Hiser	Operations Lake Manager	870-425-2700
SWL	Brack Perser	Operations	870-425-2700
SWL	Mark Case	Operations	870-425-2700
AGFC	Scott Henderson	Director, AR Game and Fish	501-223-6305
AGFC	Mike Armstrong	AGFC	501-223-6371
AGFC	Mark Oliver	AGFC	
MDC	Chris Vitello	MDC	573-751-4115
MDC	Bob Legler	MDC	417-256-7161
MDC	Anthony Pratt	MDC	417-256-7161
MDC	Mike Smith	MDC	573-751-4115
MDNR	Charles DuCharme	MDNR	
SWPA	George Robbins	SWPA	918-595-6680
SWPA	Michael Denny	SWPA	918-595-6683