

**LTRMP Analysis Team Meeting
Minutes
April 24, 2002**

Welcome

Chair Tom Boland began the meeting at 8:00 am, Wednesday, April 24, 2002 with a welcome and introduction of members and other attendees present. Those present are listed at the end of this document. There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

LTRMP PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Approve Minutes

January 17, 2002 A-Team Conference Call minutes were approved with the following change: Terry Dukerschein will be forwarding a minor editing change to Tom Boland for incorporation into the final minutes.

A-Team History and Focus

Tom Boland provided a summary of the A-Team's involvement with the LTRM program for the benefit of new team members (Dick Steinbach USFWS, John Sullivan WDNR, and Kevin Stauffer MDNR). He passed out a handout and explained that there is an ample paper trail to follow and plenty of history. The LTRMP began being strongly anchored in the Master Plan of the 1970's. A document published by UMRCC in May of 1980 described what an ideal monitoring program on the river should contain. Tom pointed out that while we cannot do all of it due to expense, we are presently doing a lot of what was originally described.

The first years of the LTRMP were spent getting expert staff on board, purchasing equipment, and getting the six field stations up and running. LTRMP has also gone through 3 different planning stages. Boland explained that the Operating Plan, which still gives the program its focus and direction, is a general document which has gone through several careful revisions. In the early 1990's, there was a need for more detailed programmatic direction and the program had to track products and get them out, so annual work plans which addressed more specific goals and products were implemented. These usually went through several drafts and supplements were also added. These annual work plans took substantial time to produce, revise, and track. Hundreds of documents were produced in various report series, but was it the best way to get the information out?

Several science reviews followed, and also management reviews, with the goal being to keep the program on track. The A-Team solicited various documents that attempted to compile lists of partner needs and expectations.

Strategic plans and Habitat Needs Assessment in the late 1990's helped build a road map for the LTRMP to follow. The program has now become one of the largest environmental programs based on habitat in the country, even the world. We have come a long way. Due to budgetary limitations and advances in technology, now we are in a period of not generating as much paper, Boland said, and he posed the question, "Are people accessing our on-line reports?"

Tom Boland also pointed out that the A-Team has changed over time, and that we seem to have lost our process for providing input on scopes of work, and reviewing annual products and milestones. He stated a need for the A-Team to get back into a routine of doing this and also to look at past accomplishments and be present at more LTRMP component meetings, which he said he finds very informative. Boland also suggested designating a spot on the UMESC website for the A-Team where supporting materials, minutes, and agendas could be posted that would enable the A-Team to return to a more structured review format similar to what the team used to do a few years ago. He asked for feedback.

Bill Bertrand thought an A-Team website could be very helpful if it could be accommodated.

Leslies Holland-Bartels commented that she agreed 99.9% with Tom Boland's comments. "I certainly would like a better process to take advantage of collective talents," she said. Many of the changes in communication had been budgetarily driven, she said. She stated that we need to define critical elements of communication and how we can best do it. The LTRMP website, although one of the most powerful websites in the natural resource field, has overgrown its format. She said anyway we could develop a better understanding of what partners will support would be helpful.

Linda Leake commented that the A-Team needs to prioritize needs.

Leslie Holland-Bartels stated that this is an iterative process and there will always be costs and tradeoffs to deal with—we need to figure out how best to meet our goals in the LTRMP context and in the larger context of the resources we have available which are external to the funded portion of our program.

Tom Boland said he would get a small group of A-Team members together to come up with a simple framework and process to better accomplish tracking the program in the 21st century. "When dollars increase or decrease, the A-Team needs to provide technical input on how the program can best proceed (realizing some decisions are not based on science)," he said.

John Sullivan said that A-Team members need to solicit input from agency staff, not only on the river, but external to the river. That might help support the program along the way. "Many of those folks have ties to money resources and would help if they understand the needs," he said.

Tom Boland added that at first the A-Team was composed of mostly fish experts and it had some difficulty getting other types of agency experts involved in the process. The program continues to need to figure out ways to get information out to those who can use it.

Dick Steinbach asked if the 5 program goals listed on Boland's handout were in priority order, and Boland answered that they were not in any particular order. Dick Steinbach commented that he felt more time and attention had been given to 2, 4, and 5 than to 1 and 3 in general. Tom Boland agreed, but said that some of what might be lacking would be addressed today in the presentation on cross-component analysis.

A discussion ensued about whether or not people working at EMTC/UMESC should be telling river managers how to manage each particular little part of the system. Tom Boland speculated that early on, some river managers felt threatened by the idea of being told how to manage their jurisdiction by people who did not work on site with them. That fear caused EMTC/UMESC to back off and not spend as much time on management issues. He explained that now we are making strides with the Pool Planning Process and should be able to come up with a plan to manage the system collectively, which we need to do.

Tim Schlagenhoft said, "I think we're now at the point where we're starting to see a lot of that happen with cross-component analysis, etc. We'll spend more time talking about what this data is showing us and what it means for our management. We need to make sure the A-Team is seeing reports and presentations on what this stuff means and how it will help us manage."

Tom Boland assured those present that he would put together a team and within the next few months they would come up with suggestions and ideas.

UMESC—A Virtual Tour of the Center

Linda Leake showed video footage created last year for the center wide review by USGS that updated UMESC's growth and capabilities following the merger of EMTC and the French Island facilities. The video and handouts summarized staff profiles and organization, the Science Information System, and numerous Center capabilities available to support LTRMP missions and goals.

Linda Leake and Leslie Holland-Bartels stated their commitment to also facilitate the talents of USGS as a whole, since UMESC is one of 17 Science Centers with varied but related ecological missions.

Many interesting details in the presentation supported the idea that the Center has come a long way since its inception in 1959 to control carp, and referring to that single original mission, Leslie Holland-Bartels commented dryly; "Don't judge us by our past successes."

After the presentation, Leslie Holland-Bartels updated the A-Team on very recent additions to capability by announcing UMESC's newest staffing additions:

Dr. Pat Heglund, hired as Director of UMESC's Terrestrial Sciences Branch (to replace Carl Korschgen). Dr. Heglund formerly served as Science Advisor to the FWS Refuge System in Alaska.

Dr. Kurt Lommen, hired as UMESC's new Geospatial Head. Dr. Lommen formerly served as a Senior Science Advisor to the National Park Service in Alaska.

Dr. Walt Sadinsky, hired as UMESC's new Herpetologist. Dr. Sadinsky formerly worked for USFWS and the Nature Conservancy.

Leslie Holland-Bartels also reminded A-Team members that Mike Dewey (the Partnership Coordinator) was available to help direct them to the who to talk to if they needed assistance finding the right expert do a particular job or answer a question. She said copies of the virtual tour were available upon request.

Finally, Leslie Holland-Bartels explained that the lease on the building at East Campus would no longer be funded by DOI funds in FY03, but by the respective program budgets. To increase space efficiencies and reduce program overhead costs, they are constructing 40 offices in the West Campus facility this year with 1.5 million dollars secured from USGS building funds. They included office construction in some health and safety-related construction. More construction will be necessary, but the goal is to move everyone over to the West Campus in two years. The West Campus facility is currently office-poor and lab-rich, so construction must occur to accommodate the extra people. If the State of Wisconsin does not build a building for the Onalaska Field Station at the Mormon Coulee Road facility, Leslie Holland-Bartels said they would somehow accommodate the field station when they moved everything there or as soon after that as possible. She said the biggest issue for space at West Campus would be meeting facilities.

LTRMP FY02 Fiscal Performance

Linda Leake referred those present to the "milestones" file on UMESC web page under the "documents" menu on the LTRMP link. She pointed out that Milestones are posted quarterly and that we are in the 2nd quarter. Products were on schedule. Tom Boland observed that every year in the past 3 years the "Milestones" document has gotten thinner. Leslie Holland-Bartels indicated that as dollars decrease, so do products. Linda Leake said anyone who has trouble accessing the "Milestones" document should let her know and she will get them a copy. Leslie Holland-Bartels stressed that it was a useful effort to check progress quarterly so that they could make timely adjustments to complete products on schedule if such adjustments were needed. Sometimes because of unexpected technical elements, expectations are out of touch with reality, she said.

John Sullivan asked about format and completion dates for the 2000/2001 LTRMP data summary report. He commented that the 1999 "Findings" report placed on the LTRM web site was a useful summary but somewhat dated. He also suggested they make this information available in a PDF file for easier printing. Their current web pages do not lend themselves for efficient printing, for example, sometimes titles print on separate pages from the associated figures. Leslie Holland-Bartels acknowledged this and said they will attempt to resolve this in their next update. She also requested that anyone who had additional comments or recommendations for format changes/improvements should let her know directly.

FY-03 Funding Update

Roger Perk, USCOE, indicated there have been letters sent to legislative representatives to increase what was initially proposed by the Administration (i.e. \$12.2 million). We won't have an idea of the range of possible outcomes in the Senate and the House until late June. Leslie Holland-Bartels said she plans to wait with work planning until she see what congress is proposing before considering possible LTRM program cuts or increases. She said she would be looking for input from the A-Team on any departures from the present funding levels. For example, if \$22-25 million is the possible range, should all our efforts be directed to progress on LCU and the bathymetry, or are there questions from applied science that we need to focus on? She said she firmly believed we need to focus on integration, which would be an overwhelming task for Brian Ickes to complete alone. John Chick's out pool sampling reports are nearly complete, and he'll have recommendations for "What's next?" as well. Leslie said bathymetry and LCU could consume every extra penny available if the A-Team determines that is the first priority. Leslie Holland-Bartels explained a process by which the large questions such as "Is habitat limiting for fisheries?" could be divided into the smaller, related sub-questions that were easier to address.

Fish Component Protocol Changes and Time Redirection Update

Leslie Holland-Bartels said that EMPCC approved changes proposed at the last A-Team meeting—eliminating seining, night electrofishing, and tandem sets with Fyke and mini-Fyke nets. She asked for suggestions from field stations as to how to redirect time. Based on comments received, she recommended using any time saved to compile a 1993-2001 fisheries report with the same standard format for every field station. She said Onalaska had already completed a similar 5-year report (1993-1997) and perhaps they could simply update as a chapter of this report. The ultimate goal is a single report that synthesizes trends systemically, with a single set of authors up front and various chapters. Brian Ickes has been working on formatting SAS modules as a basis for developing the format. He would work in conjunction with the field stations to define the format. Some of the Field Stations might help with analysis and synthesis. She said she hoped this would be close to finished by the end of Fiscal Year 2002, but she also realized that we wouldn't know how much time we have or whether it is enough of the right type of time saved to do analysis and reporting until the end of the summer. Tom Boland and others

present expressed concerns about whether such a comprehensive report could be completed piecemeal with bits of time saved here and there during the field season or whether more time would be required.

John Sullivan commented that he felt a report of this type was an excellent idea with great timing because the information synthesized could feed well into the up-coming Report to Congress required.

Leslie Holland-Bartels said this type of report was probably complicated enough to need a printed document format rather than a web-based format and that they would continue to publish such documents in hard copy when justifiable.

John Sullivan suggested that the **report (tables and figures)** be formatted in a way conducive to being updated.

Finally, Leslie Holland-Bartels emphasized they had not yet discussed redirection in FY03.

Cross Component Analysis Update

Brian Ickes gave a Powerpoint presentation and explained that his first approach to cross component analysis would be to examine broad scale variance decomposition. He would use variables and how they change coupled with ecological understanding to arrive at ideas of where the variation is coming from, which gets at explanatory variables. That in turn would help to develop spatially explicit models. He said this would involve much SAS code and “data wrestling”—that it would be an incredibly complex task that would require help from others to make significant progress. Results could be leveraged for the Report to Congress and 10-year reports. At the present time, he is still manipulating data. It takes time to set the data up, but once that is done it goes faster.

Tom Boland stated we’ve waited for this for a long time and are very interested in what’s being done. Brian Ickes added that these analyses would help identify the limits of our understanding. Leslie Holland-Bartels commented that a lot of the work Brian is doing now could also be used in an integrated way to create something extremely valuable to the greater scientific community out there. She used the example of how USGS has leveraged funds and the water quality database to study nutrient-induced problems in the Gulf of Mexico. “An integrated database will generate a lot of interest in what we have,” she said.

Gary Christoff asked if UMESC was attempting a type of GAP analysis and Brian Ickes responded with “No.” He explained this analysis would deal more with habitat linkages, issues of scale, and whether or not certain issues were systemic or different for every pool. “We’re looking at greater detail than any of the terrestrial GAP analyses,” Leslie Holland-Bartels said.

Dick Steinbach stated the process or concept didn't seem to have an endpoint and asked what we would get first to look at.

Brian Ickes said first he would try to identify the spatial extent of variance in such things as abundance for species "a" in strata "b" of Pool "x". He would look at how it varies across space and time.

When asked to describe products, Leslie Holland-Bartels said the first products would be tables and graphs. As data in those gets synthesized, reports and publications will result.

John Sullivan asked if it would be easier to use information from just one pool at first, and **wondered** if Yao Yin and Dave Soballe **are planning something similar** down the road.

Leslie Holland-Bartels replied that the answer to all three questions was yes, and that her interest was to create an integration team. "Yao has done a great deal of this kind of analysis already," she said, adding that it is a very complex task requiring sifting down, and she did not yet know what the first priority would be.

Eric Laux said, "As you sift, forward it to these folks and bounce your ideas off them on a regular basis."

Brian Ickes suggested an informative monthly letter report like Bob Hrabik does might be a way to report progress and bring more people into the process.

Barry Johnson added that as of 3 days ago, Brian Ickes became a permanent federal employee, so we could expect to have him around to do this.

Water Quality Review Update

Dave Soballe indicated an LTRM-directed external review of this component would be conducted over the next few months. He requested that John Sullivan and others with subject expertise participate in this review. He gave a Powerpoint presentation that outlined some possible examples of who would participate and what they would be reviewing—emphasizing that it would be a broad sweep evaluation with no single expert able to address all portions of it. Priority would be given to those efforts that support LTRMP goals, could detect change, and could explain biotic phenomena. Leslie Holland-Bartels asked A-Team members to consider seeking input from other water quality management folks in their agencies. Specifically, she wanted those on the A-Team who feel they are not experts on specific water quality issues to identify someone in their state who is and who could serve as expert advisor to them and as a contact for the review team to interact with during the review process. She said water quality is very expensive to do and needs the same level of scrutiny that fisheries got, which might mean augmenting the A-Team's collective expertise.

Tom Boland asked how much time these experts would be expected to commit to the review process. Leslie Holland-Bartels said they would not be expected to be present for the first five days of the workshop, but would need to be present for one briefing. She stressed that unlike prior advisory panels, the experts would need to work towards review goals that were possible to implement within the context/limitations of the LTRMP system. John Sullivan suggested some possible experts for those in other states to contact. Each agency will contact their own. Dave Soballe agreed to send out a short e-mail to the A-Team stating his expectations.

Bill Bertrand and Tom Boland thanked Dave Soballe for the excellent presentation he made at AFS meeting on the Centrarchid Winter Habitat Work, and Dave Soballe said they partnered up with John Pitlo and the work had proved to be exciting work.

Dick Steinbach asked if the review addressed key pool efforts only. Dave Soballe replied that it was a global review and the issue of how urgent out pool need is would be addressed. Steinbach then asked about the conditions in Pool 19 and Soballe replied that many previous reviews had pinpointed that issue as a big one.

Leslie Holland-Bartels explained that it was a technical review that would address what we are doing now and also whether there were still important things that needed to be done. The question was a good question, she said, and similar to the out pool fish sampling question.

Dick Steinbach said he would continue to look for "What are we doing?" And John Sullivan added, "Also, why are we doing it? Should we be concentrating on a particular type of information?"

A USACE representative asked, "What do we need to do to get at Dick's question?"

Leslie Holland-Bartels said, "We need to fund that kind of investigative analysis at a bigger scale. Brian Ickes can only do so much."

Roger Perk said, "We keep running into lots of funding questions. Is there a way with efficiencies to free up some of those dollars? How can we get to those bigger questions? What kind of choices need to be made?"

More discussion ensued. Leslie Holland-Bartels pointed out that the vegetation component is a good example of what Roger Perk is getting at. "We've eliminated the transect information, and Yao's demonstrated models that we can possibly predict and apply broadly for testing. We are working towards knowing whether we can apply information more broadly."

Statistical Model for Mayfly Densities

Brian Gray gave a PowerPoint presentation on work which he, Roger Haro (UW-La Crosse) and Jennie Sauer had collaborated on. He acknowledged that Roger Haro had

played a critical role early on and helped with the literature work involved in setting up the analyses. He went on to explain that possible predictors were picked *a priori* from the literature. Substrate particle size was a promising predictor in the literature. Coarse estimates of substrates were planned in and measured early on the LTRMP vegetation and invertebrate components. Results of these analyses and in the literature showed models that do not include substrate are dramatically inferior to models that do. Once you've explained substrate, there's a lot less to explain. Sediment moisture has also been measured in the LTRMP and was used in the models as a surrogate for particle size. Sediment moisture, however, was not measured in Main Channel Border Habitats, which are often primarily sand. Temporal and spatial autocorrelation was not detected in the analyses; therefore no samples can be dropped. In FY03 they plan to test the model in Pool 4. It would be nice to have a systemic approach if we can demonstrate trends at the pool scale and larger than pool scale, Gray said.

The analyses raised several questions as we evaluate the invertebrate component. Would improving the sediment information we collect in FY03 be cost-effective? (The tighter the inference, the more you can rely on it.) Should we add more observations per site in FY03 so that we have, for example, 3 replicate observations per boat stop? How should we sample fingernail clams in FY03? These questions and others will be discussed at the fall invertebrate workshop.

Dave Soballe commented that they figured out 10 years ago that sediment characteristics are highly predictable from bathymetry and water velocities. He suggested overlaying output on the mayfly data. If conditions are stable, they could possibly accumulate ad hoc information with water quality SRS data.

Brian Gray said velocity was good, but only if given a sediment surrogate to use with it. Related suggestions followed. John Sullivan mentioned that there are other sources of mayfly data in Pools 2, 3, etc. associated with fall FWS Refuge sampling that has been going on for 5 years.

Tom Boland asked about Brian Gray's workload and time available to do more work on this project. Leslie Holland-Bartels explained that about 25% of Brian's time is for this type of work, 25% is for helping others at UMESC with study design. The hope is that his work can be broad and scope and that he can work with other components as well.

Macroinvertebrate Workshop

Jennie Sauer gave a PowerPoint presentation about workshop goals and handed out a printout of the slides in the presentation. She asked those present to fill out an online survey (example on slide) to provide input for the workshop and the invertebrate sampling design. She also asked for suggestions for additional people that should be involved in the workshop besides A-Team members, Fisheries staff, River Managers, university people, and other people who use the data. The workshop will be 1.5 to 2 days long and will take place sometime the week of September 9, 2002. It is open to all

suggested participants and field station staff currently involved with the LTRMP invertebrate component.

Leslie Holland-Bartels said they would send e-mail out to A-Team members to ask for participation in the survey in the next few weeks, far enough in advance to plan the workshop. A goal would be to figure out whether we can sample differently or more effectively.

Tim Schlangehoft made the point that macroinvertebrates are extremely important ecologically, but we don't presently manage for them, although we need to keep looking at them.

Leslie Holland-Bartels pointed out that an invertebrate program at the scale of the present fish and water quality programs would be close to impossible to implement due to costliness and logistics. The goal is simply to answer certain questions. "What are your questions and can we get at them within the present context of the monitoring program?" she asked.

Tom Boland asked if LTRMP would be doing the same sort of evaluation for the vegetation component.

Leslie Holland-Bartels replied that LTRMP has just implemented major changes in the vegetation component, explaining how transects have been dropped on SRS was just expanded to some out-pools on a trial basis this year. She said she wanted to give it awhile, but that vegetation would be next in line when it was time.

Tom Boland asked if the A-Team could participate in the invertebrate workshop. Jennie Sauer replied that either A-Team members could participate or they could designate someone else who is technically involved or has a strong need to be there.

OTHER BUSINESS

Update on the Report To Congress

Roger Perk explained Report to Congress (RTC) workshops are taking place quarterly in conjunction with the scheduled quarterly EMPCC meetings. There will be another RTC workshop on May 16 following the EMPCC meeting in the Quad Cities. At the first RTC workshop, they identified issues and will be presenting an issue paper at this next workshop. EMPCC members will be mailed those issue papers in advance so they can prepare to discuss them at the RTC workshop. Perk suggested that those present should talk with their EMPCC representatives if they wanted to see the issue papers and provide comments. Issues are grouped according to whether they need legislative action in WRDA 2004, whether they are a policy change, or whether they are management type issues. The schedule of the RTC has been moved up to accommodate the WRDA 2004 schedule. Roger Perk said there were not too many issues requiring legislative action,

there were more policy changes and changes in direction. The RTC will stress good things the EMP has done and outline future progression of this landmark program.

EMP Workshop Lessons Learned

Eric Laux explained he had been delegated to cover lessons learned, but was relying on information he had been given because he was ill and unable to attend the workshop. 79 people attended from various agencies--the majority was from USACE. The workshop covered planning, design, and construction of HREP's. Discussion pace and potential oral interaction was slowed down because of the need to write out comments on cards to carefully document them. Many engineers found the fish passage talks especially interesting. Notes and proceedings are being compiled and there will be a CD produced that contains the presentations, questions, and comments.

Roger Perk added that this was the 3rd such workshop and that they are done every 2-3 years, rotating among USACE Districts. The two previous ones were more geared to engineering. This was the first one with a broader focus. It integrated biological issues and brought in more partners. The focus was on building bridges. There were presentations ranging from tree planting to water level elevation as management tools. He commented there still is a long way to go and they want to continue to build on their successes in the future.

Eric Laux commented that it would be useful to have folks from outside the EMP attend these workshops as well.

John Sullivan asked if there was much discussion at the workshops on the project performance in terms of meeting project objectives.

Roger Perk said that each presenter was supposed to have some discussions--some went into detail, but not all did. "It's an area I feel we should do more in," he said. The three districts vary on the degree of local monitoring and evaluation they do, and it needs to be more uniform, he explained.

Barry Johnson said he would like to see even more integration of biology and engineering at the workshops and that the discussions on fish passages were good examples of what could take place for other subjects such as control structures. A critical topic he mentioned is what are engineering concerns with drawdowns?

Gary Christoff suggested adding some land managers to participate in the workshops because they are the people who often end up managing the projects once they are built and might have good suggestions for improving the projects.

Leslie Holland-Bartels encouraged opening up participation from the science side of the house--she said a workshop context with provision for casual interaction where they can participate (rather than a lecture) is especially productive.

John Sullivan asked about opening the workshops up to the public. Roger Perk said they could, but the workshops started as forums where engineers could work on technical issues and they didn't want it to become too general. The public, however, is not excluded.

John Sullivan suggested involving the public might be a good way to get support for the program and its projects.

EMP Customer Survey

USFWS and USGS had a lot of problems with the survey and complained to the Corps about it. Mark Cornish apologized for the survey and indicated that there should have been more input from the agencies and possibly outside help from professionals in designing this survey. He said they would try to improve on that in the future. Leslie Holland-Bartels said the concept of a survey was healthy and useful and stressed that to be most useful it needs to be done by professional survey people who know how to ask survey questions. Cornish replied that the USACE has professionals like that and they would consider involving them in future surveys, but that they would need to plan ahead and allow 3 years lead time to do that.

John Sullivan commented that he was confused when he first heard there were problems with the survey--Scot Whitney had sent it out for comments but had not received much feedback. Sullivan was not quite sure when they should go ahead and fill it out, but he sent it out to colleagues in WDNR and they filled it out. He asked if anyone else had filled it out.

Various agency representatives (Boland, Steinbach) replied there were some perception and wording problems and they had not asked their agency people to fill it out.

Agency Updates

Iowa- Tom Boland commented that rumors of his impending retirement were overly exaggerated and that he would serve as A-Team chairman.

USACE Rock Island- Roger Perk explained that Scott Whitney was not able to attend the A-Team meeting due to a temporary reassignment to navigation related activities. Roger will be filling for Scott in on the funding side of the EMP and Mark Cornish will fill in on the technical side.

FWS-Dick Steinbach said an upper Mississippi Project Leader position and a middle Mississippi one would soon be filled. The middle Ms. one would fill in some gaps in that chunk of the river. The middle Ms. comprehensive plan has been completed for a while. The Upper Ms. is just starting theirs. All agencies will be involved.

USACE St. Louis District-Eric Laux reported the Shinemmon Chute EA is in its first draft and they are in early planning stages of other HREPS. They are also busy with the Nav. Study and with Missouri River issues involving flow changes.

Illinois-Bill Bertrand reported they are experiencing budget constraints and will have possible travel restrictions. A hiring freeze is now on. Mark Pegg reported that Jeff Arnold had left for a job in Yellowstone Park and that Eric Haus, an LTRMP technician with Water Quality experience, replaced him. Their field station has received Sea Grant funding and has been working on invasive species issues such as Big Head Carp. They have been participating in the assessment of the barrier in the IL shipping canal. John Chick thanked Barry Johnson and others for reviewing his draft on out pool data analysis. He reported that funding has been garnered to start building the new River Resources Center, the first part constructed will be a new field station for them.

EPA- Pete Redmon summarized a recent E-Map conference in Kansas City and said funding had been reduced to 5 million for the Great Rivers and they were in the process of changing the design to accommodate that. He said the UMR and Missouri Rivers were likely test beds and alerted those present to keep in touch with the people in their agencies and states who channel EPA funding. He said it would be important to try to work out funding paths that would be able to utilize LTRMP expertise with large river monitoring. Decisions would be made in early summer about where to test the program. State LTRMP Field Stations were logical candidates to do the work if the appropriate funding mechanisms can be established.

Minnesota-Tim Schlangenhof introduced Kevin Stauffer as Minnesota's new A-Team representative. Walt Popp mentioned they had a hiring freeze so strict that their field station will have to get special permission to hire their needed summer interns.

Missouri- Bob Hrabik is sending or e-mailing electronic information that highlights their work on 4 manuscripts produced this year and other things. He got 4 different grants this year to total \$110K, which really helped out with funding. He said his staff would be growing as they take on more work and its associated funding. Valarie is assigned strictly to LTRMP work. They will be hiring new people to get the outside work done.

Wisconsin- John Sullivan commented Wisconsin has travel restrictions because of budget problems. Terry Dukerschein commented they collected a record 99 thousand fish in FYO1 and 3/3 of these were small and worked up in the lab. She said they were preparing for WQ SRS sampling in spring high water conditions and that the airboat had been recovered following an accident in February.

USGS- Barry Johnson reported on a productive exchange between UMESC and a group of Brazilian scientists who are starting a monitoring program with the help of the Nature Conservancy. Linda Leake reported she would be sending an e-mail to ask for volunteers willing to test the newly revised HNA tool. She informed those present that Mary Tauer had retired and would not be replaced in the near future--her duties are being juggled and reassigned to others.

Wrap-up

Tom Boland will put together a team with old and new folks to develop a process for technical review of LTRMP priorities, scopes and products. He also said he would be attending the May 15 EMPCC meeting as the A-Team representative. EMPCC meets again in St. Louis on August 8, 2002. The next A-Team conference call was scheduled for July 24, 2002 at 10 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Dukerschein
5-1-2002 (v2)