Analysis Team Meeting Minutes
April 23, 2014

Radisson Hotel, La Crosse Wisconsin
10:30am start

Attendance: Quinton Phelps (MDC), John West (MDC), Molly Sobotka (MDC), Janet Sternburg (MDC), Rob Maher (IL DNR), John Chick (INHS), Andy Casper (INHS), Dave Bierman (IA DNR), Scott Gritters (IA DNR), Sara Strassman (WI DNR), Walt Popp (MN DNR), Nick Schlesser (MN DNR) Stephen Winter (USFWS), Barry Johnson (USGS), Jennifer Dieck (USGS), Nathan DeJager (USGS), Jim Rogala (USGS), Jeff Houser (USGS), Marvin Hubbell (USCOE), Karen Hagerty (USCOE), Ken Barr (USCOE), David Potter (USCOE), Derek Ingvalson (USCOE)

Rob Maher: to start the meeting, I have two administrative items to consider, quorum & rotation of the chair.

Quorum: Last conference call, we wanted to vote on SOW for FY14 and could not define a quorum. What constitutes a quorum for us? Maher looked at the A-team charter and could find nothing that establishes quorum for the group. Robert's Rules suggests developing a tally of expected participants (to avoid being confounded by frequent non-attendees) to establish quorum. As a practical matter, EPA & NRCS very rarely attend. 5 states and USFWS are the remaining voting entities. 4 of 6 could be proposed quorum. Virtual attendance would be considered OK. As an advisory body to EMP-CC, the rules could be more liberal with regard to number to achieve consensus as well as rules regarding substitutions/stand-ins for the voting members. EMP-CC relies on the advisory guidance of the A-Team and therefore we do need to have rules that help us complete business actions or vote on contentious issues. We have in the past been asked to review budgets or make votes on operational issues. Ultimately, the decision lies with EMP-CC, but presenting our vote and the content of the dialogue around that vote is a valuable contribution to EMP-CC. For some states with reps who do not have much regular interaction with Miss River issues, A-team decisions and feedback are extremely important to making informed decisions. Sternburg adds that the strongest role for A-Team needs to be advisory and feed into EMP-CC making the final calls. Gritters presents a 3-part motion for 1) quorum at 4 of 6 participating voting members, 2) states have opportunity to provide a stand-in and 3) virtual participation and voting is acceptable. All voting members (6 in attendance) approved of that motion. The group also noted that in order to assign stand-ins and adequately prepare for votes, it is important that an agenda be developed early and that items likely to require votes be identified, whenever possible. Hubbell will evaluate the accepted [SS1]motion against the language in our charter to confirm that no quorum determination has already been made and will add the language regarding virtual participation and stand-in voters.

Rotation of the Chair: Maher: There has been some recent confusion over the order of rotation for the A-Team chair. John Sullivan (WI) switched Maher (for years 2003-04?). Gritters commented that the rotation was incorrect within the charter. Hagerty followed that the rotation in the charter has been corrected. In light of that correction and the past switches, it was determined that Wisconsin would be

the incoming chair. Maher proposes a policy that the incoming chair should be the designated secretary. When not available, the incoming chair would be responsible for identifying a replacement secretary. There was agreement that this structure does not preclude and would indeed be benefited by an additional recorder, as has occurred at the last 2 meetings with Sauer & Strassman both taking notes. The voting members approved the rotation and the secretarial policy, thus Strassman will record notes for this meeting and Wisconsin will be the next A-team chair. Hubbell will review the rotation in the charter and will make an addition that the incoming chair will serve as secretary or will designate a replacement meeting recorder, as needed.[SS2]

August 26 Meeting Minutes: Concern was raised over the content of revisions to the meeting minutes from August 26, 2013 meeting that specifically describe the conversation held around the change in funding allocations from the historic 1/3:2/3 split. This concern was primarily focused around the potential for the minutes to be interpreted as a display of discontent within the partnership. There was agreement among participants that such a characterization would be incorrect, but also noted that the A-team will/has discussed issues that require vigorous debate. Sternburg noted that the wording of the revisions did not seem problematic. Hubbell provided an overview of the budget split issue that was discussed on Aug 26th and what additional information has been shared within the partnership since that meeting. The budget split is a change from the historic formula, but it does not account for additional investments in science that have been absorbed into other areas of the Corps budget, nor does it account for the $1.06M (for 2014) made available for additional research beyond base. USACE has also increased the amount of time spent on admin of program to help move toward integration. The $5.25M for base LTRM activities from this year's process may be indexed using rate of inflation to develop budget values for future years (this is anticipated, not set as process yet). The amount for this year ended up actually being closer to $5.4M with the carryover that came into this year's budget. Generally, there was discussion that it is important to record dialogue, include more contentious debates and it was reiterated that this group is advisory to the EMP-CC, which ultimately approves budgets and operational matters.
Schlesser moves to accept Aug 26 minutes as written. Sternburg seconds. All voting members concur.

Feb 21, 2014 minute approval:
Maher: have voting members reviewed the Feb 2014 draft minutes? Would we be in a position to vote on those notes at this meeting? Members responded that they had not received the draft minutes via email. Without sufficient copies for member review at the meeting and without advanced reviews, it was determined that the minutes should be tabled. Chick moves to table the Feb minutes until time for review. Sternberg seconds. Tabled.

FY15 Budget Update: Hubbell
President budget released in March, the UMRR program was in the budget for $33.17M. Last year at this time, we were planning for $15-17M under sequestered budget conditions. We are very fortunate to have had this support; it reflects the good work of the partnership. There was one recent letter from Congressman Kind (Walz & Bustos) which may focus some attention in DC on our program budget and internal operations. The letter questioned the move away from the 1/3:2/3 split. Hubbell will modify the

format for presentation of future budgets to make it easier to review the full investment for LTRMP since it is not as easy to determine at a glance if we aren't following the 2/3:1/3 calculation. The total science investment would include the LTRMP, plus other elements of science & research. The regional admin cost had been absorbed into regional budgets to offer more funds to science & research. Hubbell has the breakdowns by states, Congress districts, etc. to provide background on historical program investments and projected future amounts. Hubbell will share those state reports with interested parties (all states chimed in that they would be interested in seeing these reports). May EMP-CC meeting may have more information about what the FY15 projected budget will look like considering base costs, inflation costs, etc. Hubbell will receive a work plan through his chain of command that may differ from the Senate & House conferenced bill amounts.

Chick noted that he would welcome more information on the budget format for the future, particularly in relation to the $5.25-$5.4M amount and its prospective indexing. He stated that it is important to the partnership to be able to work through concerns over budgets and other sensitive matters in some forum without censorship so that issues can be raised and dealt with through constructive dialogue. While the partnership is grateful for and will responsibly steward the increased funds of this year, the shift from the historic split still requires some dialogue. For some, the historic split was the manifestation of a commitment to science in the partnership and a move away from that split requires a recalibration of the internal and/or assumed metrics that partners use to gage science investment and support. K. Hagerty mentioned that the LTRMP ad hoc committee was an example of one such place where budget dialogues could happen and that there may be a role for that group to discuss budget issues in the future. Sternburg noted that it would be valuable to roll that group and its topics into a structure that is not ad hoc and is able to more proactively tackle budgeting and operations issues.

Resume 1:20pm

UMRR Research Priorities topic: (Hubbell) In preparation for a new year's proposal and planning process, the Corps has generated a list of science priorities that does not include the outcome of the science coordination process, but sets out some of the Corps' FY15 interests. The list does reflect questions that came from OMB or from Strategic Planning (regarding measuring health and resilience). Some info came from the Ad Hoc Indicators recommendations as well. The Corps is considering hiring on a post-doc to research the "resiliency" component of the new SP vision. EMP-CC has been discussing the new generation of projects, HREP prioritization (accelerated planning & construction means we need more shovel ready projects, also want to demonstrate the scientific integration of the program elements and relate to health and resilience). Corps has a desire to utilize data derived by LTRMP and HREP projects to identify whether there are gaps in locations that need protection, restoration or a more equal geographic split of projects. In past, the project recommendations largely came up from the agencies, who then served as project sponsors. Moving forward, the Corps' aims to have a more data-driven decision process, but this will still require sponsors.

The "list" recommendations: 1) will be reflected in analysis under base for some things on the list; 2) will factor in to the next round of proposals; 3) may include bringing researchers to PDTs for project formulation (mussels as an example), (funding will come through HREP side?) to help bring these scientists in at the project scale. The researchers will benefit from a matrix of projects (complete and in

process) that would match objectives and design features with projects & locations to allow for hypothesis generation & testing

Hagerty: Upcoming deadlines for A-Team to be aware of, may be engaged in: SOW needs to be approved by end of Sept, she's hoping to get A-team feedback on that SOW by late June and send out RFP before August.

The Corps' Research Priorities List:

-Indicators of ecosystem health & resiliency (to meet both mgmt. needs and science questions)
-Completing 2010 LC/LU
-Completing seamless data bathymetry & LiDAR
-Continuation of some FY14 follow-on activities (these would be priorities, such as Pool 12 overwintering)
-Reinforce the role of Research Frameworks as pre-vetted research ideas (overwintering—included; mussels, landscape, veg)
-Science-driven project identification for next round of HREPs
-models for plan formulation and linkages
-providing standardization of monitoring protocols for HREPs (would like to adapt an HREP-response monitoring to a format that allows for analysis against trend pool data)

Corps is working to update their models to pair outputs with an ecological response that could be monitored for—going beyond making predictions. Gritters noted that the amount spent on models and planning is a concern. Hubbell confirmed that model certification is a costly item, but that the investment could be amortized over the number of subsequent planning processes supported such that the price per project may drop to $10-20k.

Hubbell: In order for Corps to be responsive to questions about how projects are achieving their objectives, we must adopt standardized protocols & data collection processes that can enter back into plan formulation model assumptions. Because the restoration program does not utilize BCA to justify projects, habitat units from models provide the currency for justification of project costs. USFWS Blue Books and Missouri's natural resource value guides were two sources that were grandfathered in to the Corps program.

Example of overwintering fish questions: initial "success" was demonstrated by more ice fishermen, then moved into trying to assess CPUE attributed to these areas to get at impacts to standing stock, now moving into Pool 12 study, with each increment leading to more rigorous evaluation of success.

Science Coordination Meeting & 3-yr plan: B Johnson

B Johnson has input from most USGS contributors to develop the first draft. Most of the projects being included were discussed/presented at that meeting, most of the projects are very collaborative in nature, a few deal directly with HREP science. His goal is to have a draft before the EMP-CC meeting for review, he is also preparing a summary of the science meeting and the results of the poll conducted post meeting. He is also working on the critical questions; Sternburg asks how/if the science plan will reflect the priorities from the frameworks—Johnson replies that it was the role of the framework authors to

identify and put forward the most important questions in their response to his request. Johnson's question to the group is: how much effort should be put into the plan itself for 3 years?

Barr: For science coordination, it might be appropriate to include the Corps PDT staff along with the PIs. Also, there is a joint meeting of FWWG/FWIC/RRAT-Tec/IL WG for prioritizing upcoming HREPs and discuss EMP Strategic Plan that would be a good opportunity for all partners to connect on both science and operational issues. That meeting is scheduled for the afternoon of May 28th.

Standardized Monitoring Protocols: Ken Barr
Kat is near to finalizing the monitoring protocols, states should review and send comments specifically to Kat within the next 30 days (copy Ken Barr given Kat's upcoming maternity leave); they are also accepting ideas for other standardized protocols for fish, submersed veg, etc.

EMP Strategic Plan: Hubbell
How SP will affect future of our program, Hubbell sees 3 primary changes to consider:
1) Integrating the science & restoration side is in the long-term best interest of the program (the program is intended to be one element, the HREP work should be viewed as "living laboratory" as a method for restoration and an opportunity for scientists to evaluate concepts). The challenge to consider is how we apply the results of the monitoring/research to feed back into future project selection. We have struggled with integration in the past, including writing a paper on what integration did NOT mean for the partnership. In light of the vision for health & resiliency, it gives focus and direction, but with latitude, it allows a unifying theme. Manifests as scientist engagement in PDTs for HREPs (including budgeted time for them), they are especially looking into risk analysis, uncertainty and development of adaptive management approaches.

B Johnson: There is not a plan to do an entire implementation plan for the SP, but how do we drill in to do more detail in the areas that require it? The area of integration is one place where info is needed.
Hubbell: we need to figure out how to tap into the large base of LTRMP data to feed the projects. It's no one individual's responsibility to do this, it's everyone's responsibility.
Strassman: we would need to figure out ways of communicating effectively and efficiently across all the folks who want to engage on integration, we know that there are some communication breakdowns in the chain between HREP projects, planning and monitoring data, for instance
Hubbell: yes, and we're looking for opportunities and ideas, currently Corps has internal monthly meetings as well as using EMP-CC and A-Team as venues, where else can we do this?
John Chick: Communications—do we want to reinforce a commitment to peer review for the science-based documents? We currently do peer-review many LTRM products, but then can we create a distinction for the written dissemination that is specifically for the lay audience? Chick suggests potentially modifying one of the communication strategy bullets within the draft plan to reflect the distinct need for lay audience communication as well as peer-review of science-based documents. Chick will provide his specific suggestion for language to Hubbell.
Hubbell: To the point about peer-review and science documents, the Project Evaluation Report is the science-based report to summarize the close-out of an HREP project. Would the Corps want to consider conducting peer reviews of those documents? Are any of the existing reviews of those plans considered

peer reviews?
General response: No the PERs in their current format are not equivalent to peer-reviewed science. At present, the reviews primarily come from the sponsor and partner agencies who have participated in the monitoring work.
B Johnson: If scientists are getting engaged in an HREP project, they would be engaged at the outset to develop a design & evaluation plan that is tailored to answering a specific question through rigorous evaluation. He sees the more routine practices of HREPs and their PERs to be a softer evaluation, with their scientific value primarily tied to the opportunity for stimulation of hypotheses down the road.

2) Vision (Hubbell): We have had a vision articulated by Congress declared to significant ecosystem & nav system. That links us to doing restoration associated with a navigation system. NESP ended up working with partners to develop some concepts around integrated navigation & restoration, but didn't end up being authorized. The new vision in the SP includes "health" and "resiliency", which must be defined so that we can measure success toward that end. The vision is a unifying concept with purpose for monitoring. It has implications for development of indicators that should feed in to the types of projects that are conducted. Hubbell sees that this vision statement makes the program more relevant overall to the DC-HQ level crowd, largely because it addresses the health and resiliency of the Mississippi River in the context of nav & ecosystem. How would researchers tackle questions about resiliency at a system scale? This needs to be tied to the manner in which this information is reported. New vision would characterize a restoration vision for a large managed river, in essence.
Gritters: In the new vision statement, I would remove the part about supporting/sustaining the multiple uses of the river, since it isn't the charge of this group to support the health and resilience of other uses. As an example, the navigation plans do not include statements/commitments to sustaining ecological uses of the river. He suggests something like "A healthier and more resilient Upper Mississippi River ecosystem and a knowledge base that supports healthier, more resilient choices" or "sustainable choices". These words are perfect, but making a more explicit connection to the science driving decision-making on multiple scales.
Gritters: why is it a 10yr plan rather than a working document? This requires us to revisit the plan in 10 yrs. This should be a long-term plan and a living document that could be modified, rather than fully revised at some expiration date.

3) Name change to UMRR (Hubbell): we have been budgeted under UMRR-EMP, but Congress knows us as UMRR, so the committee recommended that we phase out EMP and UMRR-EMP and just shift to UMRR. We also seek to de-emphasize the LTRMP and HREP monikers, since this has always been one program. The current SP describes activities, but is not aligned by programs. We also recognize that we need to provide access to databases; for past 3 budget cycles, we've presented the program as the unified entity rather than as separate elements, the SP team made the most progress when the difficult conversations were held and folks let down identities and ties to specific programs and talked more broadly about the overall UMRR structure

Sternburg—While she supports the desire to unify the program for efficiency, she raises the example of the Missouri River and the changes that happened when the bi-op and the bank stabilization mitigation

got incorporated into one "MRRP". That facilitated an umbrella structure that now channels money primarily to meeting the needs of the bi-op portion because the identity of the initial mitigation program for Missouri River recovery was lost through the unification. To our end, we don't want to see UMRR funds funneled through to addressing the bi-ops that exist for the middle miss and upper miss (winged mapleleaf and Higgin's eye) to the detriment of the additional, larger vision of a comprehensive restoration/rehabilitation program for the Mississippi River.

Hubbell: Yes, we share the concern over large programmatic needs, such as invasive species or T&E species, taking over the structure of the program and diverting projects and science away from the unique UMRR obligations we're aiming to achieve. We've tried to address this by clearly defining the role of UMRR to identify the baseline conditions of the ecological health of the river

Hubbell: May 30th deadline for feedback on Strategic Plan, please compile comments within each agency and then provide feedback

Time & place for our next A-Team meeting: July (Karen will do a Doodle poll), the agenda may include SOW and pre-proposal elements

Agency Updates:
WI—priority fill for John Sullivan's position, Heidi Langrehr is undergoing more chemo, we are working to pilot a portion of the UMRBA coordinated WQ monitoring plan—which we'll be wrapping in to our DNR WQ strategy, non-river big issues include frac sand & CAFOs/groundwater wells

USGS—Jennie Sauer was invited to Brownsville, TX to present on UMRR to the Rio Grande restoration effort, Mike Jawson's position will be filled and will not be in combo with another center, Kevin is acting, LTRMP Technical Report on weed shiner, Jeff Stoner is retiring in May and had also been participating EMP-SP as a stand-in when Jawson retired

USFWS—Staffing shifts that have occurred since Kevin Forester left: Tim Yager acting on Kevin's part, Mary Stefanski is acting on Tim's part and Curt McMurl is acting on Mary's part

IA—Denny Wiess will retire & be missed, good public meeting at Clinton for HREP-public was engaged with good questions, Gritters doing northern pike telemetry for habitat use and evaluating paddlefish diets in winter (eating bluegills, orange spotted sunfish, and burrowing mayflies—hanging out in 80' water), will do some sturgeon work in Cedar & Des Moines Rivers; working on permit system for mussels (how to avoid, minimize, restore & pay for damages)

USACE-Rock Island—IA House NR committee presentation from Hubbell to demonstrate the program successes and upcoming opportunities, including economic analysis, if anyone is interested, Hubbell would be happy to give similar talks in other states, Hagerty preparing an outline for the invasive species strategy as part of read-ahead for EMP-CC, holding public meetings for HREPs

IL—Blake Bushman and technician Justin Woodlow have moved over to Asian Carp program at IL DNR, but have staff to backfill those positions, field station will partner with the Corps to evaluate the Peoria 519 prjoect, NGRREC is investing in automated GREONs (6 add'l sites, possibility of placing 1-2 in Pool 8),

looking for partners for placement on Ohio R and Missouri R, burgeoning desire in IL to commercially harvest Asian carp

MO—tentative date for RRAT float trip July 22-24, Lower Miss Conservation mtg May 15-16

Meeting adjourned at 4pm
Recorded by S. Strassman