

A-Team Minutes for July 23, 2003

Welcome and Role Call. There were 25 people present, as listed in Attachment A and no additions or deletions to the agenda.

Minutes of April 23, 2003 were approved without changes. (MSP)

Budget updates: Roger Perk reported the House and Senate have both done sub-committee markups. House 18.3 million, Senate at 20 million. Once the full Appropriations Committee is done with it, it goes to the floor. Once it is on the floor it is usually close to being a done deal. John Sullivan asked about past 2 year's budgets. 2003 budget was 12.2 with 16% savings and slippage. 2002 was 20 million with 14 % savings and slippage. Once the budget is passed they determine savings and slippage. They have projections from the markup but do not do the final determination until budget is done. The final budget figure is usually somewhere between the House and Senate numbers but it depends on what the House and Senate will do. Jenny Sauer asked what the odds were of bumping the number up with letter writing. Roger Perk reported the odds of getting it up some were better than the odds of getting it back up to 33 million. We usually have more success within the full appropriations committee or the joint House and Senate Committee. A couple million is within the realm of possibility, he said. Usually the full joint conference committee splits the difference—or goes to one side or another—they don't go outside the appropriation. Roger Perk reported that chances are slim of an exemption from savings and slippage, but anything is possible. At the Washington level, it is not likely. John Chick asked what a good justification would be. Roger Perk explained what savings and slippage used to be, but within the last few years, Congress has started to use it as a way to get what they want if the President's Budget isn't as much as they want. One might write that the costs are fixed every year. One could also use the good past spending record of the construction side. It would be an uphill climb, however. UMRBA is aware of the markups, but not EMPCC members yet probably. Last Thursday was the official date of the markups. (Post-meeting update: As of July 25, 2003, both House and Senate Appropriations Committees had voted in markups of 18.3 million and 20 million, respectively, so only floor action remained. An amendment for an exemption to Savings and Slippage for EMP would have to be introduced by a Senator during floor action and passed, then agreed to in Joint Committee for EMP to be exempted from Savings and Slippage.)

Tom Boland asked the group, "How much time should we spend on all these proposals knowing the backbone of the program is what is left?"

Linda Leake commented that it was critical for future planning to thin the proposals and determine which was high priority. John Sullivan felt it would be good to know what members feel are high items and why, and share those thoughts among the group. We need to focus on those that are consistently high and why they are high. Marvin Hubbell added that we've put a lot of time and energy into these and we ought to finish the project. Linda Leake added that Leslie asked for anything and everything and did not want to limit or stifle creativity. Some can likely be combined and some will get weeded out. Pete Redmon also added that other sources of funding are out there (example: exotic and invasive species) and some projects might get support from a wider base. Tom Boland added that as we go through it we need to think about refining the process and this exercise would also help us do that.

John Chick proposed that in light of the mark-up news we discuss and determine an LTRMP baseline prior to discussing pre-proposals on the agenda. The chair and the group agreed by consensus to discuss the LTRMP baseline immediately following the Science Planning Update.

Science Planning Update: Barry Johnson distributed a table that summarized agency responses from the 10 member agencies of the A-Team. They ranked the highest 5 and provided a high-medium-low priority of each question. Of those 50 questions, 22 were ranked by at least one agency. The "Habitat" category had 9 questions ranked with 4 questions ranked high. The "Structure and Function" category was next with 8 questions ranked and 5 ranked high. Among ranked questions, 10 of the top 11 were high priority. 24 questions are listed on the table. The top 6 came out with broadest support—5 of six agencies ranked those as top questions. These included at least 2 of the top-ranked questions and in some cases all 3. Those were the ones UMESC decided to focus on. Now they are starting to take the top six and break them down

into the hierarchical questions. Steve Gutreuter will head this effort for question #1, the question with the highest rank, which was “What are the key components needed to sustain a viable ecosystem for the UMR?” The 2nd question in rank “Are HREPS effective in increasing the abundance or diversity of biota?” will be combined with the 4th ranked question “Does size, distribution, or configuration of habitat patches affect biotic abundance?” The 3rd ranked question “Does increased connection of the river with its floodplain increase biotic abundance or diversity?” will have Brian Ickes working with a group. The 5th ranked question, “Do current Water Level Management policies affect biological abundance or diversity?” has the Water Level Management Task Force already working on the issues and will not have other action at this point. The 6th ranked question, “Are invading species changing the abundance and diversity of biotic communities, especially native species?” will likely have Cindy Kolar working to put the sequence together. UMESC hopes to have drafts by the end of August. John Chick asked how they would be addressing the question about water level management (rank 5). Barry Johnson said that Water Level Management in Pools 8 and 25 deals with draw downs, but control points would also be probably eventually be addressed as an issue. Bob Clevestine commented that the Navigation Study effort is also working on Water Level Management. The Rank #1 question is very broad and they will look at ways LTRM can address it, Barry Johnson reported. He added that they could eventually address more than just the top 6 ranked questions. Barry Johnson thanked everyone for getting their agency’s rankings in. As they put the nested smaller questions together, Barry and others will look for overlap in the nested questions and then at things like sequencing. There is no formal process to combine science planning and pre-proposals right now, but we are ready to start that process today if we want, Barry Johnson said. Tom Boland added that this could be part of the process of how we rate pre-proposals. “Is like kind of an information need?” he asked.

Barry Johnson clarified that it’s different from the information needs process, but the lower level questions will help determine what information is needed. Tom Boland commented that he tended to agree more and more with Dan Wilcox’s advocacy for an Information Needs Assessment (INA)—“We really need to know what information we need,” he said. “This provides the frame work for what we need the information for,” Barry Johnson said—“It is part of a much bigger planning process that brings not just information needs but budget process and other aspects together. “ Tom Boland asked if it would be fair to say we need to place a high priority on the science planning process to help us rank proposals. John Sullivan asked if the science planning committee would be involved working more with individual members or as a whole committee at this point. Barry Johnson answered that from now on there would likely be more work with individual members.

In a discussion about the process, Chuck Theiling asked Pete Redmon how EPA would address priorities or opportunities to answer their high priority science questions. Pete replied that Regional Administrative discretionary funding, which had customarily addressed broad regional questions in the past, was recently pulled out. The Great Lakes Region of the EPA has a formal grants process where they seek proposals and decide which they will fund on a competitive basis. In the research process, there are targeted questions that go out and people send proposals related to those. There is a shortage of process for projects that are not research and are not Great Lakes projects. At this point Pete said he was seeing no potential resources from that funding source. But in the past, he added, issues of concern got addressed one way or the other. Pete felt invasive species was a “pregnant cause” right now for special concern, but stressed that now the Regional Administrators don’t get money to fund projects they think are the most important. All Regional Geographic Initiatives (RGI) money has been pulled. Chuck asked how sources like NSF and EPA go about deciding their questions. Pete mentioned the Great Lakes Program has handed out 0-15 million \$/yr for a long time and that they have extremely useful procedures—a very good process—“It’s worth thinking about [using] it,” he said. Many people are involved in the decision process. Pete will ask for an electronic copy of what he described as “a formalized but straightforward process”. Marvin Hubbell observed that about halfway through the process the A-Team was asked to use that “the only criteria were Leslies 5” and that it let everyone use their own professional judgment. He was pleasantly surprised at how much consensus we were able to achieve and suggested going back and seeing how it sorts out and if it works without being any more formal than that. “If it works, there’s no sense spending time on it,” he said.

Defining LTRMP Baseline Monitoring: Tom Boland stated most members felt we should define it and stated that Gary Christoff has volunteered to lead the effort. Gary presented potential ideas—it was

apparent at the last meeting that there is not a concurrence on what baseline is—some thought it was dollars, some thought it was program, and in the minutes last time Barry had clarified that it was core monitoring, not the entire core program that Leslie was referring to as what the “core” or “baseline” program was. Gary clarified that subsequently 2002 was brought up as minimal program. “We can either decide that now or establish a small task force of A-Team members to work on it and come back to the A-Team for discussion”, he said. Tom Boland again clarified that we would not be deciding dollars but the technical work side.

Linda Leake said discussion on the baseline program (not just monitoring) had occurred on an on-going basis. The Program had been tweaked over time until they arrived at the 2002 program, which took advantage of the science review. Each of elements has gone through some type of review for refinement, with the Water Quality and Invertebrate components still in review. All of the efficiencies haven’t been implemented yet, she said. “We just spent a whole bunch of time in reviews and making changes—over time this evolved to what we did in FY02. Now in low year, the analysis will either substantiate or open new doors for consideration,” she concluded. Gary Christhoff asked for something in writing. Linda Leake said it is the FY02 program. Efficiencies have been implemented, but will be reviewed in the light of the analyses. Gary stated there still seems to be apparent confusion on what is the baseline. Linda Leake said it is important to lay out what is the FY02 program—“We need to put a matrix together that says what it is.”

Pete Redmon said, "In the final process, dollars, work years, equipment costs and inflation need to be brought together." “We need to define the work and say this is how many dollars it takes to do that work”, he emphasized. Chuck Theiling wanted to clarify the distinction between monitoring and base LTRMP—“In addition to x # samples, we have all the technical support, some of which is now deficient,” he said. Linda Leake clarified that support proposals are included in the pre-proposals. Bob Clevenstine asked, “Are we satisfied with analysis?” Barry Johnson replied that the LTRMP has been deficient in analysis for awhile and Leslie’s wish is for more, but we don’t know whether or how she would propose to incorporate that.” Linda Leake said there should be some efficiencies gained that would provide available time, and that to keep in mind the Water Quality review has not yet been fully implemented. Efficiencies gained after that might provide more available time for analysis. John Chick said that efficiency could be many things such as data management or dropping some SRS. Linda Leake said she thought it was both. “It’s everything—any efficiency that provides available time,” she emphasized. John Chick said most are concerned about trying to establish a minimum collection of data in 2002 and they want to keep doing it for some specified time period before would there would be any drastic cuts that would be major changes for the database. Jenny Sauer commented that review of the Invertebrate Component is complete and there are no efficiencies to be gained. They are still working with Missouri on modifications to methods, but those will not result in less work.

Linda Leake said once Water Quality finishes the review process, those recommendations will come back for consideration. Whether it creates time or comes back with increase, it is useful to articulate on a piece of paper what FY02 consists of. John Sullivan brought up that from a water quality committee member perspective, as far as he can remember there have been no definitive tasks identified to drop in water quality and no report. “At this point in time we are marching on with what was in FY02—there has to be a set process to make changes and these proposed changes should be reviewed by the A-Team. It’s too late to change it for FY 04, John Sullivan said, and Linda Leake agreed. Barry Johnson added that there is a draft water quality committee report in review right now. John Sullivan asked if would be shared with members on the Water Quality Review Committee. He mentioned he had seen a brief e-mail about it, but nothing else. Barry Johnson assured John and the group that it would come back for comment to the Water Quality Review Committee.

Tom Boland asked, “Do we feel comfortable that the FY02 level is a level we could use for baseline? We have never gone on record as tech advisors saying this is what we feel. That doesn’t mean we can’t over time change the baseline—maybe we can plug in a review every 5 yrs. We realize we’re going to have to adjust for changes, but we need to go on record as saying this is the minimal amount that needs to go into LTRM that still maintains a worthwhile program. FY02 level does not include the analysis. Is the baseline really collection of data and administrative support *plus* FY03 analysis? We could vote right now or get a

task force together. That will clarify for others and ourselves that this has nothing to do with budget or dollars and let them know we can make an adjustment.”

Dick Steinbach said he felt okay with the FY02 level as long as it had a caveat that it could be adjusted with time, but he recommended sticking to data collection and not get into analysis as part of the baseline. “How you use information is limitless,” he explained. Chuck Theiling had different view of same issue. “Why is data analysis separate from other responsibilities of component leader or team leader?” he asked. Yao Yin replied they are at bare bones—and that this year was an ideal year for analysis because of reduced sampling and administrative demands. “I can do analysis, but I can only do so much,” he said. Chuck Theiling used the example of Yao’s work as what should be going on—“Yao didn’t require extra funding to get it done,” he stated. “He did need extra time, though,” Jenny Sauer said. “He had to work weekends and evenings to do that stuff”—Yao added that field station component specialists like Rob Cosgriff, Heidi Langrehr, and Theresa Blackburn shared a lot of the work and credit for getting it done, even though that was not recorded on the formal Scope of Work. Chuck Theiling commented that a 3-4 month data collection season gives you 6 months to enter stuff and do analysis. Jenny Sauer stated there are many other demands beyond core monitoring—“we need time to plan and prepare for meetings, proposals, presentations, and other tasks.” Dick Steinbach asked, “How much data do you want to collect over time? What we end up doing with it is immensely variable. That question will bog you down.”

Rob Mayer stated that a matrix would be very helpful and asked if the A-Team would see it in the near future. Linda Leake assured the A-Team that getting the matrix of FY02 program tasks to them is now her critical #1 action item. She estimated that a matrix by component with a list of what data was collected in FY02 would be distributed to the A-Team in a couple weeks. Instead of the task force, they would do the matrix and then the A team can react to it.

Pete Redmon stated that agencies involved with water quality don’t feel they have full coverage. Most of the water quality work LTRMP does is related to fish, vegetation, and sediments. If we discuss water quality as an upper Mississippi component, we need to consider what is going to be the full picture. Each state needs to work it out. We’re only talking about a part of the water quality monitoring program on the Mississippi River System. EPA wants enhancement and is pushing it forward. Pete said we could expect in the next 2-3 years to see increased demand for additional samples or additional fieldwork. Chuck Theiling commented that this instance is a perfect example of the difference between Information Needs Assessment and Science Planning for LTRM. John Sullivan emphasized that there needs to continue to be good coordination between LTRMP work planned and state planning. He said states need to step up to table and do their share to fill gaps while on other hand LTRMP needs to step up and state what they will do to fill gaps. Pete Redmon gave an example of a looming issue—the large number of power plants seeking certification or recertification with flows, heated water, filtering, etc. There is not very good assessment of that type of impact on the river. He gave an Ohio river example and stated a large power plant could change the whole ecology of a pool in a few years. It’s another thing to be added on in the future. Barry Johnson posed the question, “Should EMP be involved?”

Tom Boland confirmed that [power plant] upgrades are a big concern that we have not heard addressed as an LTRMP issue but that we had gotten off the topic. Discussion ensued about the timing of voting on what baseline should be, because EMPCC meets Aug 6 and 7 and budget under 20 million would really push us. Linda Leake suggested taking the FY02 budget, putting it in a matrix, and having everyone look at it and comment on it. Tom Boland agreed to distribute it for comments, but the vote could wait until November.

Terry Dukerschein asked about equipment refreshment. Linda Leake will take a look. We should send comments back to Tom Boland if it’s not on there or is insufficient.

Pre-proposals for 2004 (process discussion): Tom Boland asked for suggestions as to how to proceed to prioritize the 79 proposals submitted. Bob Gaugush summarized comments so far. He had Corps, FWS, MNDNR, IADNR, and IL responses. He assigned numerical values to High (3), Medium (2) and Low (1) ratings, summed them for each proposal, and took the average as the proposal’s score (Attachment B). He also took comments people provided and pros and cons. There is a possible range of scores of 1-3. If

ranked L-M, etc., he took the higher value. Barry Johnson said if the other agencies (MODOC, WDNR, USEPA) want to submit ratings, send them in to Bob and we'll include with input to Leslie. He asked for suggestions about how to combine and group things or other procedural suggestions. Janet Sternburg reminded the group that the agencies that haven't submitted might change the numerical values. Dick Steinbach said that rankings have been made and work has been done—it really ties back to the budget issue—if there are enough in the high category to cover the funding, it will help guide everyone. Mike Steuck brought up that we need a good range cost-wise of projects. Marvin Hubbell pointed out we have at least 3 steps to go through for this. Barry Johnson said the next step is to request larger scopes of work for some. The timeline is July 25 and based upon our input. We need to provide input very promptly. John Sullivan apologized for Wisconsin and stated, "We do have a hard copy now to give to Bob." Janet Sternburg added that Missouri has theirs here as well. Marvin Hubbell suggested that since WI and MO have scores, we could identify the high ones and WI or MO could just say whether they agreed. Barry Johnson pointed out that other things are important besides rankings and reminded the group that the most critical thing is for those agencies to get comments to Bob Gaugush so they can be included in the material that goes to Leslie Holland Bartels.

John Chick as a proposal writer commented before we asked anyone to write a full proposal, we ought to know if the money is there. Linda Leake said that was probably not possible, but they would try to keep it simple, such as requesting short 3-page proposals and that Leslie would need to be very discriminating. Walt Popp asked how problem statements would be brought into the process—at the last minute he had suggested to the Minnesota people who submitted them that they be converted into pre-proposals to mesh better with the rest, but they were still not quite the same as pre-proposals. Barry Johnson said, "I can't tell Walt exactly what her [Leslie's] line of thought was, but it was a longer frame of time. The idea is on the table at least." Chuck Theiling commented that a lot of them were redundant—he and other corps reps thought work groups could winnow some of that and compare it to what has already been done with some of the other agencies. Barry Johnson agreed some were redundant and said, "We can discuss comments and how else we might address other things." Bob Clevestine asked if the two mussel proposals could be combined. Jenny Sauer replied that the authors had discussed that and concluded the objectives were different and could not be combined. Marvin Hubbell commented that this group has the prerogative to require collaboration if opportunities for that exist. Bob Clevestine said his approach was to look at titles first and then see if their contributions to the adaptive management approach were significant. He also proposed that the preparers of the bird monitoring projects (#39 and #40) beef them up and combine them into one proposal. The 1st one was a monitoring scheme; the second one was trying to figure out how birds are important to the area. Chuck Theiling said there is an existing plan that they need to reference more thoroughly and the group agreed to add both of these comments. Dick Steinbach said the issue—he encountered was the level of appropriateness for a different agency's action? The corps or another agency outside of the regular LTRMP funding base might fund some. It might not necessarily have to come out of this effort this year, and it would be good to refine it. Barry Johnson reminded the group that we have the list and if people can use the list in other ways to get support from other agencies, fine. Tom Boland asked, "How do we adjust those others ranked low that we feel are important? We are using titles with a general description—we don't have all the authors present—there is lots of room for misinterpretation." John Chick suggested a cutoff for what we think is low, go through those and see if anyone wants to make an argument for those being thrown out, but there was an objection to that because some had identified a number they ranked low that they felt were excellent but were not something that could realistically get started at this particular point in time.

The group discussed other ways to proceed and came to a consensus that they would discuss and ask questions about any pre-proposal scored above 2.5 first, incorporating Wisconsin's and Missouri's hard-copy scores as they went along. EPA would comment and submit written copy later. Linda Leake clarified that Leslie's not looking for a prioritized list only and will look at the rankings, pros and cons, and our comments. Attachment B details final rankings of each proposal. The group discussed the following proposals in the following order.

Proposal #4: "Pool-based Geo-referenced Mosaics of the 1890's Mississippi River Commission Maps" – This was one of the higher-ranked projects—there is high interest in historical data in general. The land cover on this one is already done. Pete Redmon mentioned there are several of these pre-impoundment

mapping proposals and asked, “Which will give the best and most comprehensive information?” USGS/UMESC staff (Jennifer Dieck, Linda Leake) said that #4 gives additional bathymetry and topographic data, and #9 has topography and bathymetry but not good land cover as #4. There was general consensus within the group that #4 gives more bang for buck and #4 is appropriately ranked high. John Sullivan commented photos and maps appear to be the products used most heavily from website and Linda Leake confirmed that. Bob Gaugush said MO and WI input would not have changed the ranking. Gary Christoff recommended changing the terminology in #4 from “pool-based” to “hydrogeomorphic reach”. Chuck Theiling clarified this terminology had nothing to do with how data would be used. Linda Leake said they would take “pool based” out.

Pete Redmon asked about Proposal #'s 2,3,6, and 8, which all have to do with analyzing or automating Land Cover/Land Use data and commented he was not sure what was being added as opposed to what exists. Linda Leake clarified that #6 is automating the photography the A-Team asked for (2003-Pools 4,8,13) at the last A-Team meeting. This proposal processes that photography.

Proposal 10: “Bathymetric mapping for the UMR”—It was generally agreed there is substantial need for Bathymetric mapping to do HREP and Pool Planning. Barry Johnson reported that 1) the Corps would collect the data and UMESC would process it, and 2) it can be done in pieces as funding and need permit.

Proposal 16: “LIDAR-derived Elevation Pilot Study for the Foley Quad, Pool 25”—WI did not rank this proposal and MO ranked it low, Bob Gaugush reported. Jennifer Dieck described it as Lidar Floodplain elevation with 6” resolution, every meter mapped, but only for the Foley quadrangle, which is a large chunk of Pool 25. “It’s a good one to do,” Chuck Theiling commented, because it’s diverse and is an important project site. He recommended forwarding it with the condition that the authors work with all other groups who have done Lidar. “If they can’t get the Lidar through the trees, it’s not worth doing,” he added. Jennifer Dieck commented that the bald earth Lidar that will be used is supposed to go through trees but agreed it’s critical to deal with what’s been done. John Sullivan said his first comment is that some other group or activity should pilot this. Second, he thought bathymetry is more important and remains to be finished for the river, “That’s why WI ranked it low,” he stated. Gary Christoff reported that MO ranked 16 low because it sounded like more investment and ranked 17 higher because it was more “on the ground. We support Lidar,” he concluded. Linda Leake commented there are real issues we have to deal with, “such as John’s comments about balancing between bathymetry and land cover.” Dick Steinbach added that he generally took a dim view of any proposals that addressed methodology instead of resource issues. “Pool 25 is one pool with the highest likelihood of change. There is more need for elevation than bathy there,” he said. “We can go forward, but only if we get data we can use to go forward.” Tom Boland summarized, “That one could drop below the high level.” Dick Stenbach commented that if the comments get to Leslie and are addressed maybe ranking wouldn’t matter.

Proposal #23: “Water quality modeling”—Both MO and WI ranked this project as *medium*. “Is this something that could be handled under base level?” John Sullivan asked. MO also rated it medium partly because it should be part of the core program, not an add-on.

Proposal #25: “Proposal to Continue FY03 Analysis Levels While Reinstating FY02 Levels of Monitoring in FY04”—The general consensus was this is extremely important and should also be included in the baseline or core program. “Right now we’re understaffed and don’t have time to do it,” Mike Steuck explained. “USGS Component Specialists are overwhelmed and do not have enough time to do it, either.” Jenny Sauer states this is an -important comment and must be addressed. Mike Steuck added that field station staffs agree they love doing analysis but can’t do it all. Chuck Theiling asked, “If we funded something like this, would it really equate to new people? Do you have the space for people to do this extra work at UMESC? Barry Johnson said, “It will involve more people—there’s no extra time for the folks here.” Chuck Theiling asked, “At the specialist level?” Barry Johnson said, “not necessarily. We have to replace someone’s time -we can do it more cheaply with technical folks. We want to retain flexibility—to try to figure out a way to do it without having to hire permanent people.” Linda Leake added that there are a variety of people everywhere within the program with potential to come back on and help with this task. “I don’t see that’s a limiting factor for us,” she concluded. Jenny Sauer reminded the groups that that they also have to look at proposal—there are different options. “The final number is big

but can be whittled down,” she said. “It’s a mix,” Walt Popp said, “not an all or nothing proposal. Some parts are more important than others.” Barry Johnson asked, “Is this a high priority?” Chuck Theiling added it also needs to be viewed in context of developing a core monitoring program. Tom Boland confirmed that it is a high priority, stating, “It rates higher than a 2.5.”

Proposal #27: “Biological Performance Indicators of Key Fish Species in the UMRS. This project received a very high score. John Sullivan commented that he didn’t get chance to talk to fish managers—He said he was confused and asked, “In the future should we be managing for rate of growth?” Brian Ickes replied that the idea behind this is that there are key population attributes that are sensitive and could be used to point to things like habitat limits in the context of rehabilitation. If we rehabilitate additional habitat, we see a biotic response in these key attributes that is related to population dynamics and process. How do these rates relate to habitat availability? For important managed species and species that are ecological keys, it gives us a way to develop models to construct age from length. It provides data to focus on another window. What do we use for justification for adding it back in as an additional element? The first justification is between rates and processes and how they are related to habitat. The second is that in the long term context is it informing us about how we account for the spaces we improve? For HREP activities, it’s a potential source of data to explore patterns in space and link to management actions in HREPs. Chuck Theiling and others asked a series of questions. “Is this cost realistic? Has it been coordinated with field stations? Have they been collecting scales? Will the work get done? Does the cost include reading and processing the scales and other structures?” Brian Ickes clarified that what is here is just hardware costs to get us up and running. Personnel time would have to come as a trade-off for something else given up or efficiencies gained. This is for sample jars, pressing, and reading is cost and does not include labor. With each species done, the cost will go up substantially. Chuck Theiling recommended the proposal should go forward but be done more fully. “Engage whole partnership—what key species will be done?” he asked. John Sullivan asked how we would determine this with the existing data. “Which species are most ubiquitous but most productive?” he asked. Pete Redmon commented that EPA just assessed MI contaminant data and that progressive age and growth information would have been good thing in process to allow more completed interpretation. “Most pulled scales and stored them and it never happened,” he said. “If you’re thinking about doing, make an allocation to contract someone to get it done,” he cautioned. There was general consensus the proposal should be elevated to the next level.

Proposals #31 & 41: Mussels—Proposal # 31 would stay the same and #41 would go up a little. Marvin Hubbell stated that various people from the Corps commented these have lots of merit but their needs to be lots of coordination from both groups. WI ranked # 31 low—It’s already an on-going Corps effort and there was some concern regarding starting new component for monitoring [if there are limited funds to do what we already do],” John Sullivan said. Someone else countered that with a quote from Mark Cornish that the core program will continue and let’s use this proposal process to get new efforts going and get in the water instead of just doing a literature review. Someone reminded the group that costs should include labor and data management. Eric Laux commented that proposal # 41 did a better job of focusing and watching trends. “Are we interested in trends or mapping?” someone asked. John Sullivan said the corps project assesses established beds. The LTRMP group wanted a broader spatial scale in order to cover areas not being covered yet. MO rated # 31 high, and #41 medium. Janet Sternburg commented that Missouri likes the broader perspective in #31.

Proposals #59 and 60- Fish Passage-Both would stay the same after WI and MO scores, Bob Gaughsh reported. Mike Steuck asked, “Isn’t Brian Johnson doing same thing?” It gives a broader breath up and down river, someone else answered. IA’s comment was to use dams to stop migration of exotics, not to encourage it. “It would be ideal to know how dams could be made to enhance or inhibit migration,” John Sullivan commented.

Tom Boland asked for any other questions or comments about any of the proposals.

A question about #60 was asked, how do you detect absence or presence of sturgeon? “By not hearing them,” Eric Laux explained—“Studies show fish make noises during spawning. If so, and you’re keyed in, you would be able to understand habitats much quicker. It’s a low cost effort that uses Bob Hrabik’s and Rob Maher’s previous work. Stick a hydrophone in the water and see if can hear anything. “Mike Steuck

added, "It's like the Lidar one--do we want to spend money on testing?" If all equipment is purchased already, it's worth looking at, but interpret costs more clearly, the group felt. Barry Johnson commented, "This looks like one that might go to other agencies and funding sources. There might be other ways to do this." Chuck Theiling stated there is a need for more life history information. "Brian's project [#77?] is a good life history project," he added. "The Nav study spent lots of money on equipment already and we're just asking for a little salary money to apply to this."

John Sullivan asked what Proposal # 70 covered that wasn't already being done. Linda Leake replied that the Spatial Query tool work for this year is to take data to current on the spatial query tool. Proposal #70 is to serve the data in other ways that are more efficient. The analogy is that the present container will be really full once the data is updated, she explained. John Sullivan asked her to clarify—"Does that mean more than just one CD?" he asked. Linda Leake explained that this product is both CD and web-based. The proposal would address old software-newer software could be used to package that up. "We'll know more once the data's in," she said. "We'll report back on how things are going on that effort this year."

Proposals #26 and #53: —MO people wanted to know how did those came out overall—ours was 2.4, they said. Bob Gaugush said EPA rated both high, but WI rated 26 low and 53 was high.

Tom Boland asked for any other program items or issues. Marvin Hubbell stressed that fiscal performance (spending all the money allotted) is especially important. "Get billings in on time. It's important to achieve for FY03. We need to work it through our systems as efficiently as possible."

"If we do a good job it makes Marv's job easier. It's critical we execute to process bills on quarterly basis. Execution is very important to the Corps," Linda Leake said.

Terry Dukerschein and the other Team Leaders stressed that it is difficult for state accountants to bill quarterly when money arrives as late as it did this year—"we need to get the money sooner," she said. Some Team Leaders expressed doubt that they even had all their FY2003 money by now (the last quarter of the federal fiscal year and the first quarter of many state's FY2004.)

Barry Johnson announced that USGS/UMESC had hired Jeff Houser-, a Post doc at Oak Ridge as Water Quality specialist (limnologist). He will be on the job next fall.

Dick Steinbach asked at what point the narrative on science planning would be distributed in a stand-alone, understandable document? Barry Johnson replied in early fall.

Tom Boland announced that Kevin Szcodronski has a new job as Parks Chief in Iowa. Tom Boland is filling in for him at EMPCC meetings until there is a new appointment.

At the next meeting, Tom Boland will step down as chair of the A-Team, and John Sullivan is taking over. The next meeting will take place on November 6, 2003 at Dubuque, IA. John Chick suggested some presentations related to work the field stations are doing. NOV 6 is after the Scope Of Work is done. Discussions between now and then will be via e-mail, therefore the agenda will be light and there will be room for presentations. Many field stations worked as part of technical groups doing analysis, and it was a good thing for analysis, Linda Leake and others pointed out. John Chick asked if the A-Team needed to meet for Scope Of Work development. Linda Leake did not think so, "but if it becomes that way we'll let Tom know and we'll meet or do a Conference Call, she said. The meeting time will be 8:30 am -4:30pm and Tom Boland encouraged members to come on the 5th if they want to tour museum. The group came to a consensus that component specialists would decide which group analyses would be represented in the presentations and one representative from each group chosen would talk. Tom Boland encouraged people to let him know if they have something they want to share or talk about. The meeting adjourned at about 12:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Dukerschein

ANALYSIS TEAM ATTENDENCE JULY 23, 2003, ONALASKA, WI–Absences indicated in parentheses,

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Phone</u>
1. Tom Boland*, Chair	IADNR	563-872-4976
2. Rob Maher*	ILDNR	618-466-3451
3. Gary Christoff)	MO Cons. Department	573-522-4115
4. Roger Perk	USACE	309-794-5475
5. Marvin Hubbell	USACE	309-794-5428
6. Pete Redmon*	USEPA	312-886-6110
7. Kevin Stauffer* (absent)	MNDNR	
8. Dick Steinbach*	USFWS	217-224-8580
9. John Sullivan*	WDNR	608-785-9995
10. Eric Laux	USACE	314-331-8148
11. Valarie Barko	MODOC	573-243-2659 x26
12. Robert Gaugush	USGS	608-791-6207
13. Chuck Theiling	COERID	309-974-5636
14. Terry Dukerschein	WDNR	608-783-7550 x706
15. John Duyvejonek	UMRCC	309-793-5800
16. Mark Pegg	INHS	309-543-6000
17. Mike Steuck	IADNR	563-872-5495
18. Walt Popp	MNDNR	651-345-3331
19. John Chick	INHS	618-466-9690
20. Barry Johnson	USGS	608-781-6230
21. Linda Leake	USGS	608-781-6269
22. Bob Clevestine	USFWS RIFO	309-793-5800 x 205
23. Jennifer Dieck	USGS	608-783-7550
24. Janet Sternberg	MODOC	573-522-4115 x3372
25. Brian Ickes	USGS	608-783-7550 x69
26. Yao Yin	USGS	608-783-7550 , ext. 53
27. Jennie Sauer	USGS	608-783-7550 x64

* Indicates voting member of Analysis Team

