Table of Contents

EMP LTRMP Analysis Team Report
October 18, 2006
Holiday Inn
Moline, Illinois

The Analysis Team held a meeting on October 18, 2006 at the Holiday Inn in Moline, Illinois. There were eighteen members of the A-Team present, all agencies except the EPA and NRCS were represented. Objectives of this meeting were to; review the project status of FY-06 Additional Program Element (APE) Projects, discuss FY-07 LTRMP project administration, FY-07 Ape project selection process, refinement of APE selection process for FY-08 and to discuss if a shift from an administrative to more technical role for the A-Team is warranted.

FY-06 APE project status – To date five APE project reports had been submitted for review and all data entry had been completed. There was some discussion regarding spreading report deadlines out over the course of the year. This would aid the PI's with completing reports on time and aid the USGS by spreading the review process out over the year instead of cramming all the reports in at once. The COE did not object to this approach providing the PI's could produce a 12 month timeline during which the project would be completed, for budgeting purposes. It was suggested to use timeliness of project completion as criteria for future APE project rankings. The preferred approach from UMESC is to contact any PI that is delinquent in completing a project to identify extenuating circumstances and to develop a timeline for completion of the project on a case by case basis. UMESC provided hard copies of several completed reports for A-Team members.

FY-07 Project Administration – There were several pieces of equipment purchased during FY-07 including the following; survival suits for all field stations, new vegetation boats for the MN and WI field stations, an analyzer for the WQ lab, as well as several kicker motors.

FY-07 APE Project Selection Process – Overall the process has improved over the one used in FY-06. Allowing the A-Team chair to participate in the final project ranking discussions gave some needed transparency to the process. Because the budget had not been finalized it was not possible to identify which projects would be funded and which would not. Instead the projects were placed into three categories (High, Medium and Low priorities). The A-Team chair was satisfied that input provided by the A-Team is being taken into consideration during these deliberations. The only additional improvement that was identified was to make the final rankings available to the A-Team at the October meeting. The A-Team recognized that providing these rankings before notifying PI's or the EMP-CC might be problematic, but felt that this would be a good final step in closing the feedback loop for this process. Therefore we formally request consideration by the EMP-CC to provide provisional rankings to the A-Team with the understanding that administrative processes and scheduling may alter final selection.

FY-08 APE Project Selection Process – Although the process has improved since it started in with the FY-05 project selections, there was considerable discussion regarding how to improve it for FY-08. A modified timeline is presented below.

<u>October</u> – APE process refinements, have PI's give technical presentations from previous year's projects at the A-Team meeting.
<u>November</u> – Establish criteria for project selection and focused questions.
<u>December</u> - Determine format for focused questions. Identify specific issues, scientific and management applications from cooperating agencies and partners.
<u>March</u> – Call for Letters of Intent (LOI)

April – Deadline for LOI is April 1. It was requested that LOI be made available as soon as possible before the April A-Team meeting.
May – Feedback and comment exchange on LOI.
June – PI's develop selected proposals
July – PI's continue work on proposals
August – Evaluate proposals, all partners evaluate the completed proposals, both the COE and USGS agreed to make their evaluations available at the August A-Team meeting.
September – Final rankings made.

There was considerable discussion regarding how to refine the theme areas that were defined for the FY-07 APE projects. General consensus was that the questions were too broad in scope and resulted in a wide array of projects. It was decided to work on developing a more refined set of questions for the FY-08 APE theme areas. There have been several efforts made at identifying key questions including the 2003 science planning process and previously submitted questions by various agencies that were distributed to the group. The group was to confer with their respective EMP-CC members as well as state and federal managers and work out their three highest priority questions. These questions were to be submitted to USGS by November 9.

Shifting the A-Team's duties to a more technical role – After the partnership unity meeting the previous day, it was becoming obvious that an evaluation of the A-Team's role was in order. General consensus among the group was that everyone would like to see the A-Team move away from as much of the administrative duties as possible and get back to doing more in the way of technical evaluation of the program. It was recognized that there will always be some degree of administrative work that will need to be done, but that it should be minimized. While all the partners supported this shift the FWS was particularly interested in seeing this happen. The FWS indicated that their level of interest in the program was directly related to how much they felt they could contribute and that as far as administrative matters were concerned, they didn't feel like they could contribute much. After much discussion regarding the best way to infuse more science into the A-Team meetings, it was decided to try to work a couple of short technical presentations into the April meeting, and eventually devote most of the October meeting to presentations about previous year APE projects.

A-team Meeting – La Crosse, WI – 4/11/07

1. Roll Call and Introductions
2. Approval of minutes from January 17, 2007 conference call
3. FY-08 Budget update
4. FY-08 APE project update – discuss letters of intent
5. Update on strategic planning process
6. Technical Presentations
a. The effect of a recently completed Habitat and Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project (HREP) on fish abundance in the La Grange reach of the Illinois River using Long Term Resource Monitoring Program (LTRMP) data. – Matt O'Hara
b. Status and Trends Report Update and discussion – Barry Johnson and Karen Hagerty
c. Ability of the Long Term Resource Monitoring Program to detect rare fish species – Terry Dukerschein, Andy Bartels, Mel Bowler, and Eric Sonnentag
d. Nutrient Dynamics, Oxygen Concentrations, and Ecosystem Metabolism in the Upper Mississippi River – Jeff Houser
7. Time and Place for next meeting
8. Adjourn

-Called to order 9:05 AM
In attendance: Maher, Sternberg, O'Hara, Rogala, Hansen, DeHaan, Hagerty, Sauer, Gaugush, Robinson, Kelly, Fisher, Yin, Johnson, Lubinski, Ickes, Jawson, Dukerschein, Hrabik, Chick, Sass, Staufer, Popp, Yaeger, Gray
-Approval of minutes – 1st Hansen, 2nd Fisher, passed

Hank DeHaan – FY-08 Budget – in Hubbel's stead
-finishing touches on FY-07 Scope of Work
-FY-07 - $21.9 million, $20 million base, $1.9 HREP
- $0.5 million to administrative costs
-$21.351 million left (1/3, 2/3 split)
-LTRMP = $6.1 million, HREP = $15.247 million (St. Paul = $6 million, Rock Island = $5.3 million, St. Louis = $3.9 million)
-FY-08 Outlook = President's $23.46 million, Averaging $20 million per year

HREP/LTRMP data initiative
-$50,000 – one year pilot program
-Barry Johnson – holding meetings to evaluate HREP's
- One planned for each district – Jason will coordinate Project Delivery Team
-Planning, Delivery, and outcome of HREP projects

FY-07 Scope of Work
- MSP $4.0 million
- APE $1.1 million, $41 K APE management (Sauer)

- Equipment refreshment – $120 K
-Status and Trends - $195K
-Strategic Planning - $175K ($100K UMESC, $50K Corps, $25K LTRMP)
-Bathymetry - $42K
-GIS - $52K
-Cross Component Analysis - $170K (2-year commitment to post-doc)
-LIDAR - $240K
-MSP plus is now administrative APE's

Why justification for 3% when it is built into the program already?
-Justifications are required to maintain equity among field stations
-fuel costs, overhead rates, travel
-What ever happened to the 3% per year agreement?
-Program wide increase, not station wide increase
-If you need more than 3%, ask for it

FY-08 APE Project Update
-Current focus areas have been sent to A-team reps. (April 2)
-Schedule – potentially LOI sent out this week?
-Request for LOI sent out by April 23
-Full plates are delaying Status and Trends work
-Focus areas may be maintained for FY08 and FY09

Comments on Focus Areas – Discussion
-How strict are focus areas? For example, no invasive species
-This is an assignment, figure out proposal based on prescribed initiatives
-FY-08 and FY-09 only
-APE's will be discussed in FY-10 strategic plan
-Multi-agency, multi-field station, multi-year initiatives
-NEED, INTEREST, CAPABILITIES (Johnson) – for prioritizing APE's
-Lubinski – start thinking about 10 year plans
-Johnson – Left wide open that prior funding for APE's could be used for FY-08 and FY-09 APE's – year 2 of project
-Call for LOI FY-08 will include FY-07 additional funding
-Requests April 23 (LOI) – ASAP
-May 14th, pre-proposals due
-Selections by partners for full proposals (get done by late May)
-full proposals due in late June
-Rankings by partnership in August
-Final rankings in September
-Funding when budget is figured out
-Shall we send in an interest letter early to help develop collaborations? – Sounds like a yes

Sauer – APE's
1. Call for Letter of Interest (April 23)

2. Send out Letters of Interests to group (no screening)
3. Letters of Intent
4. Full proposals by November 1 and Scope of Work

Technical presentations

1. O'Hara – LTRMP data can be used to pick up trends in fish populations from HREP at local scale

2. Dukerschein – Detection of rare species; How important is it to collect/monitor listed fish?; How do listed fish influence species richness trends?; Fish life history database is coming soon – pending final approval from USGS/UMESC

3. Houser – Nutrient dynamics, oxygen concentrations, ecosystem metabolism in UMRS

4. Johnson – Status and Trends

Strategic Planning – Mike Jawson
-Use Status and Trends to revert back to what people care about (recreation, navigation, etc.), importance of program
-There is a strategic planning committee
-1st meeting, April 30-May 2, Stoney Creek, Moline (14 of 16 people can make it)
-In need of facilitator
-Conference call between Corps, UMESC, USRDA, other players (states)
-Strategy? What? How?
-Plan addresses what and how
-Do we still want to stick with APE's, MSP, MSP plus
-Last Friday and Monday – attempt to hash out 1st meetings agenda
-1st meeting – spend time thinking about whether breadth is similar – outcomes, outputs – goals, objectives (identification of goals and objectives)
-stuff done by October to allow for one year planning by partners
-DeHaan – standard format to have meeting and then present to EMPCC – perhaps feedback from groups in between
-NESP should not hinder our planning – hopeful to have monitoring built into wording (recognize NESP, not driven by it)
-How many APE's could be objectives for FY10-FY15?

Jawson – LTRMP Department of Interior Cooperative Conservation Award
-pretty big deal – third one ever for USGS, first USGS in biology, we should receive plaques

Sauer – FY08 APE's revisited
-April 23-24 – call for letters of interests, capabilities on focus areas
-Send out with calls for letters of intent – due in July before A-team meeting
-Rest of schedule is tentative
-Final selections for full proposals made by November 1

-No range of dollar figures
-Project will be due a year after funded
-We will use theme areas for two years (best if made in one phase, will check with bosses on this)

-1st period monitoring – wording to make it an administrative APE
-No 3rd tier APE's funded

-July 26, 2007 – A-team meeting – conference call or meeting yet to be determined
-Janet Sternberg taking over as A-team rep.

-Meeting adjourned – 1st Jawson, 2nd Chick – Adjourned 4:40PM

EMP LTRMP Analysis Team Report
April 11, 2007
Radisson Hotel, LaCrosse, Wisconsin

The Analysis Team held a meeting on April 11, 2007 at the Radisson Hotel in LaCrosse, Wisconsin. Twenty-five people were present and all agencies, except EPA and NRCS, were represented. The objectives of this meeting were to: receive updates on and discuss FY 2007 and 2008 budgets; discuss FY 2008 Additional Program Element (APE) procedures; and to initiate scientific discussions on river science via technical presentations.

FY 2007 Budget and Scope of Work: EMP is operating under a $21.85 million budget, with LTRMP receiving $6.1 million, HREP receiving $15.25 million, and $0.5 million going to administrative costs. Scope of work includes the following:

MSP ($4.0 M)
APE projects ($1.14 M)
Equipment refreshment ($120 K)
Status and Trends Report ($195 K)
Bathymetry ($42 K)
GIS ($52 K)
LIDAR ($240 K)
Strategic planning ($175 K)
Cross component analysis through support of post-doc ($170 K)

There was a brief discussion on the need to justify a 3% increase in field stations budget, as believed this was already included as part of the 2004 program planning effort. Clarification was made to indicate that the 3% increase was for the entire program, not necessarily for each unit. Some units may require more than 3%. Desire is to maintain equity among field stations and therefore increases in proposed budgets must be justified.

FY 2007 APE Projects: USACOE approved funding of all high and medium ranked projects.

- Importance of the Upper Mississippi River forest corridor to neotropical migratory birds - Year 2
- Asian carp effects on zooplankton abundance and composition in backwater lakes
- Testing the fundamental assumption underlying the use of LTRMP fish data: Does variation in LTRMP CPUE data reflect variation in the abundance of fishes
- Analysis of waterbird data from the UMRS – Year 2
- Status and trends of floodplain forest on the Upper Mississippi River Year 2 - analyses and reporting
- Primary production and dissolved oxygen dynamics in contrasting aquatic areas of the UMRS
- Association between fish assemblage and off-channel area type in the impounded reach of the Upper Mississippi and Illinois rivers: implications for habitat restoration at management-relevant scales
- Restoration of 1st period fish sampling and WQ monitoring
- Development of sampling designs for estimating mussel abundances associated with HREPs
- Cumulative HREP effects on ecological characteristics of impounded regions of the Upper Mississippi River
- Aquatic vegetation and water quality response following two summers of water level management on Navigation Pool 5
- Ecological assessment of high quality UMRS floodplain forests
- Assessment of high-resolution digital imagery for UMRS vegetation mapping and software-based vegetation classification

LTRMP/HREP Data Initiative Pilot Project: We had a brief update on this initiative that is designed to improve incorporation of LTRMP data into HREP planning efforts. Planning meetings have been held in each USACOE District to determine which projects to include in this year's effort. One project from each district was selected. At the completion of the pilot study, effectiveness will be examined to determine future course of action.

FY 2008 Budget and APE Planning: The president's budget includes $23.46 M for next year. This is slightly lower than in previous years, but expectation is that appropriation will be similar to past years' average of $20 M.

The partnership has been working to develop a set of focused questions to direct future APE efforts. USGS consolidated these questions with partner input and priority rankings. Five focus areas were identified with expectation these questions/areas will be used to direct APE activity for the next two fiscal years. Further discussion included: fiscal year 2008 process and call for proposals; use of these questions for prioritizing projects; additional considerations for project ranking (e.g., multi-agency, multi-field station, multi-year initiatives); consideration of retaining first period monitoring for fish and certain WQ parameter (will treat as administrative APE); and considerations of project proposals not addressing one of the five focus questions. In an effort to encourage and foster collaboration and coordination under the APE proposal process, a new step was added that seeks to identify areas of interest of the researchers. If interests of investigators overlap, scientists will be encouraged to develop proposals that seek to expand the breadth of knowledge and landscape of the project. The full request for proposals process involves:

1. Call for areas of interest: sent April 27, 2007
2. Submittal of areas of interest: Due COB May 18, 2007
3. Call for letters of intent: late-May 2007
4. Submittal of letters of intent: mid-July 2007
5. Request for full proposals from selected LOIs: late-August 2007
6. Final rankings of proposals: November 2007

First period fish sampling and selected water quality monitoring will be considered as an administrative APE for the next few years.

Strategic Planning Effort: Mike Jawson provided a description of the five year planning effort for fiscal years 2010 – 2015. Several members of the A-Team, from states and federal agencies, will be participating in this effort on the planning team. The EMP partnership has developed general guidelines to aid the planning effort to ensure all parties are working under the same assumptions. It is expected that A-Team members will provide feedback via respective agencies or may be asked to provide input as a unit. One item mentioned that several members believed that should be included in the strategic planning discussion is continuation of APEs or those funds beyond the MSP.

DOI Cooperative Conservation Award: The LTRMP was one of 11 recipients of this award. This is only the third time for a USGS program and the first for USGS in biology. This is a big honor for the program and should help reinforce its importance to headquarter level administrators.

Scientific Discussions: In October 2006 the A-Team agreed there was a need to begin shifting from an administrative to a more technical role. Including technical presentations in A-Team meetings to initiate greater discussion on specific topics or questions was considered a high priority for the group. Four presentations were made followed by lively discussion. Everyone appreciated the inclusion of these talks in the meeting.

a. The effect of a recently completed Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project (HREP) on fish abundance in the LaGrange reach of the Illinois River using Long Term Resource Monitoring Program (LTRMP) data – Matt O'Hara
b. Status and Trends Report update and discussion – Barry Johnson and Karen Hagerty
c. Ability of the Long Term Resource Monitoring Program to detect rare fish species – Terry Dukerschein, Andy Bartels, Mel Bowler and Eric Sonnentag
d. Nutrient dynamics, oxygen concentrations and ecosystem metabolism in the Upper Mississippi River – Jeff Houser

New A-Team Chair: Rob Maher stepped down as A-Team chair and Janet Sternburg assumed the role. The members thanked Rob for his excellent leadership over the last 2 years.

Next Meeting: A conference call is scheduled for July 26, 2007. If necessary, the meeting will be face-to-face in the Quad Cities.

Long Term Resource Monitoring Program
Additional Program Element Proposal Refinement - FY08 Focus Areas
(2 April 2007, to A-Team)

1) **Setting Management Objectives:** What are potential quantitative targets for management objectives and indicator levels for important resources within each of the four major floodplain reaches of the UMRS?
   a) What are current levels (means, ranges, variability) of resource indicators, or indicator groups, among reaches and what were levels previously?
      POTENTIAL APPROACH: The Status and Trends Report is a first step. Determine levels of indicators using LTRMP data, state data, Navigation Study data, other current and historic databases, data from other river systems, professional judgment, and ecological theory. For example, estimate relative abundance, standing stock, or annual production of fishes using LTRMP fish data, state fisheries data, and information on fish larvae density from the Navigation Study.
      i) Are indicator levels correlated with specific habitat types or features, or with areas considered "good" or "bad" (by professional judgment) for that indicator?
      ii) Can indicators of relative abundance be related to actual abundances of various resources?
      iii) How do indicator levels in the UMRS compare to other large rivers?
   b) What are the possible future levels of various indicators among UMRS reaches given underlying ecosystem conditions and the potential for management?

2) **Connectivity:** Does increased connectivity of the river with its floodplain increase biotic abundance and/or diversity?
   a) How do the features of connectivity (e.g., timing of flood, total area inundated, residence time, water depth, patch size, patch perimeter, connections among patches, and physical attributes of flooded habitats) change with different flood flows among pools and reaches of the UMRS?
      POTENTIAL APPROACH: Use flow models and floodplain elevations to predict distribution and movement of floodwaters and predict these features of connectivity at different flows.
      i) How have those measures changed from historical values?
      ii) Do measures of connectivity correlate with levels of biotic indicators or production among different areas or reaches of the UMRS?
         POTENTIAL APPROACH: Correlate levels of indicators [from question 1 above] with measures of connectivity.
   b) Does reconnection of a leveed area with the channel increase biotic production, abundance or diversity at local or larger scales?
      POTENTIAL APPROACH: Evaluate field experiments or rehabilitation projects that reconnect leveed areas to rest of the floodplain.

3) **Landscape Patterns:** How do landscape/habitat patterns within the UMRS floodplain relate to the abundance and diversity of biota?
   a) What are key habitat types, variables, or functions to be included in this analysis?
   b) What are the patterns and indicator metrics (e.g., total amount, patch size distribution, diversity, connectivity), for those key features at pool and reach scales within the UMRS over space and time?
      POTENTIAL APPROACH: Using software that generates landscape metrics (e.g., FRAGSTATS) conduct quantitative analyses of UMRS land/riverscape patterns and develop a classification of aquatic and floodplain habitat areas (to include the effects of changing water levels). Develop summary statistics for the patterns of habitat areas by river reach, navigation pool, and sub-area.
      i) How have these patterns or metrics changed over time?
   c) Are there associations between levels of important indicators (biotic or abiotic) and simple (e.g., amount of habitat) or complex (e.g., patch size, connectivity) landscape metrics?

POTENTIAL APPROACH: Use LTRMP or other data sets to generate indicator levels at appropriate scales (patch, pool, or reach) then correlate with habitat measures and landscape metrics.

4) **Aquatic Vegetation:** What factors control the abundance, diversity, and distribution of aquatic vegetation in the UMRS?
    i) How well do existing models predict vegetation distribution and abundance? POTENTIAL APPROACH: Apply existing models of vegetation growth and distribution [e.g., Y. Yin model, E. Best model, NAVSAV] to different areas of the UMRS to simulate past or present conditions, then check model predictions against observed levels of aquatic vegetation.
    b) What is the potential standing stock and annual production of SAV in different parts the UMRS given existing abiotic conditions?
        i) How do the conditions that allow for plant growth differ among different UMRS reaches and have they changed over time?
        ii) What are the factors that seem to limit or preclude SAV below Pool 13?
        iii) Under what conditions has SAV existed in Pool 19 historically?
    c) How can we create conditions that will establish SAV below Pool 13?
        POTENTIAL APPROACH: Design and evaluate mesocosm experiments or HREP's to address the critical factors for establishing SAV determined by modeling.

5) **Mussels:** How are mussels distributed, and in what abundances, within and among reaches of the UMRS? POTENTIAL APPROACH: Conduct field sampling at various scales, possibly stratified by potentially important habitat features.
    a) Are mussels generally more abundant in some of the 4 major floodplain reaches?
        i) Are distribution patterns at the pool-scale different among reaches?
    b) How are mussels distributed relative to potentially important habitat features?
        POTENTIAL APPROACH: Apply existing models to new pools/reaches that can be checked with appropriate large scale data, collected either pre- or post-modeling.
    c) What constitutes a "good" or "healthy" mussel population/bed?
        i) What are the population and recruitment dynamics of healthy mussel populations?
        ii) How variable is year class strength and can it be related to hypothesized biotic or abiotic drivers?
            POTENTIAL APPROACH: Age mussels from new or historic collections to determine and compare year class strengths.
    d) Are there sampling designs or techniques that can provide quick and low cost assessment of mussel distribution and/or abundance (including tools like quadrate sampling, dredges, sleds, remote sensing)?
        i) How do data from qualitative and semi-quantitative sampling methods relate to mussel abundance determined by quantitative sampling?

Draft Minutes/Summary of the Analysis Team Conference Call
July 26, 2007

Participants: Kevin Stauffer (MN DNR), Kip Runyan (St. Louis District COE), Marvin Hubbell (Rock Island District COE), Hank DeHann (Rock Island District COE), Sandra Brewer (Rock Island District COE), Kirk Hansen (IA DNR), Barry Johnson (USGS-UMESC), Jennie Sauer (USGS-UMESC), Brian Gray (USGS-UMESC), Rob Maher (IL DNR), Jim Fischer (WI DNR), Greg Sass (INHS Havana), Bob Hrabik (MDC), Janet Sternburg (MDC), Terry Dukerschein (WI DNR)

1. Meeting was called to order by Janet Sternburg, new chairperson. Roll call and introductions were made.

2. April 11, 2007 minutes approved as presented.

3. LiDAR project: Hank DeHann provided an update on the cooperative effort with Iowa DNR. Iowa is doing most of the processing. The area being evaluated includes the floodplains from bluff-to-bluff and from Pools 8 to 24. If funding is sufficient, Pools 8 and 24 will be included. The project will produce a coverage at 2 foot contour accuracy. Flying will occur in fall during low water and leaf off period. He is aiming for a March 2008 completion date. The goal is to complete the rest of the system at a later date. Cost per square mile is about $350 to $400, and would expect the same price for the other areas. Some visual examples will be provided at the October 2007 meeting.

4. Letters-of-Intent (LOI): Jennie Sauer sent out a package of 22 LOIs earlier the previous week. Projects in each theme category: Connectivity – 8 letters; Landscape Patter – 1 letter; Setting Management Objectives – 4 letters; Native Mussels – 4 letters; and Aquatic Vegetation – 5 letters. A-Team was asked to provide a "yes" or "no" on each project for further development. Comments are welcome, especially for those receiving a "no" to move forward. Also reviewers are asked to identify similar projects and if they see opportunity for collaboration. Each agency will send in combined comments to A-Team chair (Janet S.) by close of business on August 6. Janet will combine and send forward, as in previous years. Hank DeHann noted that he thought the APEs were well thought out this year and perhaps this is due to greater understanding of the process. It also seems the projects are more collaborative than in previous years. In response to a question on how much was spent on technical APEs in 2007, it was noted that $1.06 M was sent to 13 APEs.

5. Fiscal year 2008 budget: Marvin Hubbell noted that the Senate has EMP at $18 M, and the House at approx. $23.5 M. House request parallels the president's budget. Senate request is usually higher, and House request is usually lower. If expect $20 M (similar to FY 07) this will yield $6.0 M to $6.1 M for LTRMP. With MSP (approx. $4.1 M) and using cost indexing as in current budget year, amount expected for all APEs (technical and administrative) is $1.9 M to $2.0 M.

6. LTRMP strategic planning: Marvin Hubbell asked if all members have had the opportunity to provide input to their representative on the strategic planning effort and if they had questions on the process. Marvin wanted to emphasis that the process is iterative and transparent, and there is a desire to communicate with everyone. Jim Fischer said he thought the approach for seeking input was adequate, and that we need to make sure that private citizens have opportunity for participation. No one else on the A-Team expressed concern or stated that their input was not requested.

   The strategic planning group has narrowed down the effort to 6 Outcome statements that need further refinement. Additionally, there is some concern that not all Outputs

identified would fit under the 6 Outcome statements. The Outcome statements will be sent out to the EMP partnership and others following further refinement, and prior to the EMP-CC August 2007 meeting.

Marvin also mentioned that lack of goals and objectives was discussed by the strategic planning group. It recognized that without identified goals, indicators could not easily be identified and established by LTRMP. Hank and Marvin noted that they will attempt to pull together existing efforts to see what has been developed. They recognized that there are two levels of goals, such as river goals and LTRMP programmatic goals.

Barry Johnson noted that prioritizing goals will be difficult. The UMRCC river goals are at a broad level and very good, but not at project level. Something in the middle is required. The Illinois River 519 program has pulled together a good list of goals for that system. Hank DeHann noted that some of the reach objectives from the 2002 meetings on the river are similar to those identified for the Illinois River.

7. Brainstorming session on future presentations: Continuing with the effort to increase science related discussions at A-Team meetings, presentation ideas were requested. One or more of these topics will be included in the October meeting. Suggestions discussed include:
   a) Revisit invertebrate monitoring, including macro inverts and freshwater mussels. Perhaps have presentation by UMRCC Mussel Ad-hoc Committee. Several mussel studies have been done in Pool 5 over the last few years and a summary of what was learned; future efforts; and what the studies can and can't say would be helpful.
   b) LiDAR results.
   c) Presentation by Science Panel (NESP) on setting goals and objectives by geomorphic reach.
   d) Results of APE technical projects to close the loop.
   e) First period fish sampling in the north portion of the river was dropped a few years ago. Some would like to discuss importance of reinstating this period of sampling; examine how forage (small) fish are processed; what is purpose of measuring them, etc. Decided this would be better topic for fish component people to discuss rather than A-Team.
   f) Bathymetry. What is its value; need for systemic data; how it is used? Hank DeHann mentioned that funds for bathymetry were reduced. Recognized need to develop a strategy for bathymetry, which is being developed.
   g) EMAP. Summarize project and results. Identify where and how this program could contribute to the river.
   h) Summarize, describe biological and physical indicators.

8. Component meetings: Jennie Sauer mentioned that they are going to try to build in more component meetings in FY 2008. Jim Fischer thought this was a good idea. Terry Dukerschein said this will help foster more collaboration.

9. Status and Trends: Barry Johnson noted that he is working on the revision and responding to all comments received. We should expect to receive something in a few weeks.

10. New Position: Barry Johnson and Jennie Sauer announced that UMESC is seeking a post-doc ecologist to work on cross component analyses. This is a two year position.

11. Next meeting is scheduled for October 23-24, 2007 in the Quad City area.

12. Conference call was terminated at 10:30.

LTRMP
Analysis Team Report
July 26, 2007, Conference Call

The Analysis Team held a conference call on July 26, 2007. Fifteen people participated in the call, with all five states, COE, and USGS represented. The objectives of this conference call were to: receive updates on Fiscal Year 2008 budget; discuss FY 2008 Letters-of-Intent for Additional Program Element (APE) projects; identify future scientific discussion and presentation topics on river science; and to discuss other items as identified.

FY 2008 Budget: Senate has requested $18 M, while the House request is approximately $23.5 M. The House request parallels the president's budget. It is expected EMP will receive approximately $20 M, similar to FY 2007, and therefore LTRMP would be operating under a budget similar to the current fiscal year's budget.

FY 2008 APE Letters-of-Intent: Twenty-two project ideas were submitted and shared with the Analysis Team. Using the five theme categories identified for APE studies to categorize project ideas, the proposed projects address: Connectivity – 8 letters; Landscape Patterns – 1 letter; Setting Management Objectives – 4 letters; Native Mussels – 4 letters; and Aquatic Vegetation – 5 letters. Members believed there was additional collaboration this year, and that the project ideas were well thought out. Member agencies of the A-Team are to identify which projects should go to the next stage for full proposal development. A-Team will submit input by August 8. The next step will be a review of full proposals in October 2007 with project rankings completed in early November.

Strategic Planning Effort: Marvin Hubbell summarized strategic planning efforts to date. A-Team members were asked if they had opportunity to provide input and if they were satisfied with their inclusion in the effort to date. There was general agreement that members were satisfied with their level of participation and opportunity to provide input. One comment was made noting the need to ensure opportunities by private citizens to provide input to the process.

There was a short discussion on the need to develop goals and objectives in order to prioritize monitoring and research needs. The Corps of Engineers is going to examine some of the existing documents and projects that identify river goals to aid in the strategic planning effort's discussion.

Scientific Discussions: In October 2006 the A-Team agreed there was a need to begin shifting from an administrative to a more technical role. A brainstorming session on future presentations to the A-Team included topics such as: invertebrate monitoring; Science Panel presentation on setting goals and objectives by geomorphic reach; results of APE technical projects; LiDAR project results; EMAP evaluation with regards to LTRMP monitoring; and bathymetry needs and uses. Topics will be selected and presenters recruited for the October meeting.

Other Items: Additional component specialists' meetings are proposed for next year. UMESC is seeking a 2-year post-doc ecologist to work on cross component analyses for LTRMP.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for October 23-24, 2007, in the Quad Cities.

For questions or comments, please contact your A-Team representative or Janet Sternburg (573-522-4115, ext 3372).