

## **Table of Contents**

[A-Team Minutes November 2004](#)

[A-Team Minutes January 2005](#)

[A-Team Minutes April 2005](#)

[A-Team Minutes July 2005](#)

[A-Team Minutes August 2005](#)

## **A-Team Conference Call Minutes 11/04/04**

**Welcome and Introductions** Present: John Sullivan, Terry Dukerschien, Bob Hrabik, Valarie Barko, Janet Sternburg, TJ Miller, Mark Pegg, Kevin Stauffer, Walt Popp, Dan Kirby, John Pitlo, Mike Steuck, Dave Moller, Dan Wilcox, Hank De Hann, Roger Perk, Marvin Hubbell, Rob Mayher, John Chick, Mark Pegg, Linda Leake, Pat Hegland, Barry Johnson, Jennie Sauer, Bob Gaugush, Pete Redmon, Tim Yaeger

**Approve Minutes from July Meeting** Janet Sternburg moved we approve them as submitted. John Pitlo seconded. Pete Redmond asked for a copy and John Sullivan will send it.

**Update on LTRM Restructuring** Since last EMPCC meeting, Roger Perk sent out 3 separate e-mails including all the pieces we are working on. State reps from EMPCC have a conference call tomorrow and the Corps and UMESC will join in on the latter half (Roger Perk and Linda Leake) and discuss any concerns the states have. Roger knows nothing more about funding for FY05. There is a lot of pressure among large ecosystem programs throughout the country that we didn't have before. Corps needs input on APE list to recommend to EMPCC and the Status and Trends Outline—needs by next week to compile for EMPCC.

John Sullivan asked about the Oct. 29 e-mail package—what's meant by the 3<sup>rd</sup> period of fish sampling dropped. Roger said the recommendation was “no less than 2 periods.” Wording is incorrect—one of 3 periods will be dropped. Does Analysis Team need to make a recommendation on which period should be dropped? Barry Johnson said the staffing plan assumes 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> periods. Are field station leaders comfortable with that? WI, yes. Southern ones, not so comfortable—not able in analyses to find good evidence 1<sup>st</sup> time period more variable than others. Barry Johnson said we need to maintain continuity throughout program with same time periods. Iowa—and MN—common sense to drop 1<sup>st</sup> period because 1<sup>st</sup> period overlaps with intense vegetation and water quality sampling. John Chick asked if they would be allowed to do 3 periods if staff and time were available. Barry said 3 periods of fish for 3 lower field stations would require more money, but Mark Pegg pointed out not much of a cost difference.

There was consensus that A-Team should weigh in on the fish monitoring periods now. Field staffs are available, but will they be doing other works that have not been defined? Until we define what APE<sup>2</sup>s we'll be doing and what reports are planned, it's hard to say. What are we giving up as far as analyses? USGS indicated the staffing plan is based on the number of people to accomplish the desired task. Sullivan suggested A-Team provide a recommendation to keep the same 2 time periods system-wide, but explore further if we can get the first period back on the table for the lower field stations. Roger asked if it was added back, would it reduce analysis time?

John Chick indicated it depended on what else they would be asked to do. John Sullivan clarified that Roger was saying adding a third period had to come from APE dollars, not

MSP dollars. The baseline we're at right now is 2 fish sampling periods – 2nd and 3<sup>rd</sup>. Bob Hrabik thought with overhead and fringe it would cost \$10-\$11 K to add the first sampling period back in.

John Chick said once we have analyses in MSP and APE figured out, 3 lower field station team leaders will talk with a rep. from UMESC regarding including the 3<sup>rd</sup> period.

**LTRMP Budget for FY05** - In response to a question about the equipment refreshment of \$56K, the corps clarified that to balance the budget for this year, the equipment refreshment would come out of APE dollars.

Janet Sternberg wondered why statistical support increased to 0.61 FTE in the final budget. Linda said stat support is 0.5 at UMESC (Pat Heglund was added as lead in Science support) and also at field stations. Linda Leake said they cut some science support and redistributed into a more appropriate area (moved from administration—it was like a team leader.) John Pitlo suggested decreasing this to 0.25 FTE and move the money saved to get 3<sup>rd</sup> period of fish. Linda Leake pointed out that it doesn't meet the objective as a program- a need for both analysis and monitoring. Roger Perk pointed out the program for several years had been criticized for not completing more reports and analyses. It's a high priority to have the analysis there at both UMESC and field stations. Sullivan indicated the previous A-Team discussion on this matter was to recommend .25-.5 FTE at UMESC (i.e. Brian Grey's position). Sullivan also thought that the report delays were more related to editorial staff reductions at UMESC. Linda Leake did not agree with this. ¶

John Pitlo recommended lowering statistical support at UMESC to 0.25 FTE. Jeff Houser commented that to the extent that if Brian Grey's participation is reduced it will reduce overall productivity towards analysis and publication. Most states suggested 0.25 FTE for stat support. Pete Redmon, EPA, agreed with states. Tim Yeager, USFWS, indicated that if we drop to 0.25, the savings be reflected in APE dollars rather than sampling. Yeager and Sullivan didn't believe 0.25 was enough and supported 0.5 FTE. Roger Perk said ~~in the a~~ criticism was that we lacked a statistician, so we asked UMESC to go out and get a good statistician. The corps feels that additional 0.25 FTE is well worth having.

Roger said \$3.64 million was locked in concrete for FY05 for the MSP as agreed at last EMPCC meeting. It would be indexed over 5 years with 4.1% inflation. There are hardly any APE \$ at the outset. Taking out the additional equipment refreshment was the last piece we needed to get to the \$3.64 million, Perk said. Perk suggested talking with your EMPCC member for the discussion tomorrow. From Analysis Team perspective, we don't have much control on the total budget and it needs to be raised to a higher level, Sullivan concluded. We won't know for a few months what the FY05 allocation is. John Chick asked why the budget for WQ at USGS in 02 was not as high as 05 when we have reduced. Linda Leake suggested she and John have a discussion. John Chick will send an e-mail around with the information and questions.

**Status and Trends Outline** Hank De Haan provided background information. Bob Gaugush covered some of the details and logistics. The report will update the status and trends of UMRS and also show how LTRMP is being used for adaptive management of the system. An important goal of the report will be to define endpoints (i.e. environmental indicators). The report will concentrate on LTRMP data, but will use hydrology and information on other major drivers. There will be a one-page discussion on each endpoint and the overall report will be about 100 pages in length. The last data increment will include monitoring data up through 2003. The 1998 S&T report concentrated on conditions for ecosystem health. This report will focus on endpoints that will show how LTRMP can be used to manage the system. It will be a multi-agency effort. The plan is to start with initial set of indicators identified by Nav Study Science Panel and expand/define from there. Recent indicators developed for the Great Lakes provide a useful reference for what is intended to be accomplished for the river. Bob is expecting to identify endpoints by early January 2005. The target completion date for the report is September 05. Hank will follow-up with QAA ([what are these](#)) and URLs to access the NAV Study document.

Bob Gaugush indicated the Great Lakes 2001 Report provides a good examples of the level of detail that is planned. He will provide the web link to this report. Bob and Hank indicated they plan to ask for A-Team and EMPCC input on the identification of the endpoints. John Sullivan asked that A-Team members provide their comments on the draft outline by November 12<sup>th</sup>. He then will compile and send them to UMESC and the Corps prior to the EMPCC meeting.

**Planned Additional Program Elements (APE) Work for FY 05** - The final version came out on November 1, 2004. The corps just got a last-minute request via UMESC from Missouri. The cost estimates are very rough. The A-Team was asked to prioritize these projects. Roger Perk reviewed the sideboards for how we look at these APE dollars. They need to support the status and trends report and reflect how LTRM has led to a better understanding of the river. The APEs need to relate to the operating plan and to provide a better linkage with HREP and river management needs. Lastly, priority projects or analyses identified in the 10-year reports should be considered.

Equipment refreshment is still in the loop. Combining water quality and vegetation does not look feasible. Water Quality Component and Macroinvertebrate Evaluation are in MSP. The 10-yr component reports are all in the editorial hopper right now. Linda Leake will share a schedule on those next week.

Sullivan asked if members wished to prioritize the APEs – are we ready to proceed? MO and FWS had their priorities. MN had not ~~but would~~ prioritized, but would do so by tomorrow. EPA had not done it. IA would have med, low, and high done tomorrow. Illinois also. John Sullivan used a numerical prioritization process. He used the Corps sideboards as well as additional criteria. Sullivan asked if there were questions about specific APE projects.

Is this a living document? Based previous A-Team comments, Sullivan said Status and Trends Report and Bathymetry jumped out as high priority, but they cost so much they would consume all the APE dollars. Sullivan didn't think it would be our recommendation to spend all APE \$ on Bathymetry. Janet asked if ~~projects~~ ~~#~~ could be done over 2 or 3 years. Roger said at the end of one year, there has to be deliverable products. ~~at the end of one year~~. Pat Heglund added that the projects with asterisk were those that could be broken out over a number of years with separate products each year. Bathymetry is the total amount. Not broken out in individual paragraphs of what the accomplishments would be, but there is a footnote that ~~#~~ ~~projects~~ could be broken out over more than one year.

Janet asked if there were dollars associated with maintenance of the hydrology data. Barry Johnson said it is an additional increment. This project would automate the procedures used to collect hydro data. John Sullivan mentioned flow as an important factor for the water quality component, and it is not an item that has been identified as a need. Flow data needs to be incorporated into the LTRM WQ database. Barry said this proposal collects those data and it likely could be merged into the water quality database. The development of the automation is a one time deal, Pat Heglund clarified. Pete Redmon added it's really a critical thing to get the flow data incorporated somehow.

John Sullivan asked if Bathymetry always had to come out of LTRM funding if HREP uses it, too. Roger said for the most part it is considered a systemic issue and all those systemic things have been a part of LTRM. Janet Sternberg suggested ~~that~~ those projects ~~that we~~ might get assistance from our partners might be looked at as having higher priority. However, we don't know that now, John and Pete pointed out.

Sullivan indicated it was a rush to go through the APE prioritization and didn't have time to go through it with individual state managers.

Pete Redmon said invasives were of interest in EPA, but they were still at the very beginning of the process.

John Sullivan—does the corps feel Status and Trends Report is important, and if yes, why do we have to rank it? Perk, UMESC replied it is already going forward. Leake indicated the ~~east~~ ~~cost~~ estimate for this activity was very rough.

A-Team members were asked to finish their prioritization. Sullivan will send out a spreadsheet to all A-Team members to facilitate this process. He also asked that members provide a general description on what criteria were used to rank the projects. Sullivan will compile the responses and provide to UMESC and the ~~Crops~~ Corps for November EMPCC meeting

**Time/Place for next A-Team meeting**

Roger Perk suggested late January to provide more time between A-Team meeting and the February EMPCC meeting. It was suggested to meet during the 3<sup>rd</sup> week January. Sullivan will confirm date with future e-mail.

## A-Team meeting Conference Call January 24, 2005 - **Draft Minutes**

Welcome and Roll Call – Due to conference call number mix-up the meeting was delayed for about 20 minutes. Fred Kollmann, NRCS, was the only A-Team member who did not participate in the call. A list of attendees is attached below.

Minutes from November 4 conference call – The minutes were approved as amended by Janet Sternburg. The revised minutes will be distributed.

2005 Budget Status – Roger Perk provided a brief update on the FY 05 budget. It's not quite "final" but it looks to be about \$1 M more than FY 04. The total expected budget is \$17.5 M with \$4.7 M to LTRMP and \$10.3 M to HREP. Savings and slippage was substantially reduced (down to 11.2%) compared to the previous year and was the reason for the overall increase. Roger indicated they should see the President's FY 06 EMP budget on February 2.

A-Team Communications – John Sullivan and Janet Sternburg described past communication problems and expectations for the A-Team. Much of this discussion centered on the recent process for developing and approving Additional Program Element (APE) projects. There was concern that the A-Team was brought in too late on some issues and resulted in too little time to complete the needed review. There is also a need to clarify what group (A-Team, A-Team member, Field Station Leader) is expected to provide input on LTRM issues when review requests come from UMESC, USCOE or EMPCC. There was general agreement that all partners recognized a need for improved communications within and between agencies and to clarify the input needed from the A-Team. The A-Team does not wish to take an active planning role, but needs to be aware of pertinent technical issues early in order to provide sufficient time for their review.

APE selections for 2005 – Linda Leake provided an update to the selected APE projects for FY05. Thirteen projects have been selected pending further review (January 11 e-mail from Leake). Three projects are "earmarked" (Status and Trends, Bathymetry and Equipment Refreshment), but their budgets have not been finalized. Roughly \$1M is available for APE work in FY05. However, after discounting the earmarked projects, only about \$750 K (**is this number right???**) will be available for funding the remaining 10 APE projects. For the most part, the selected projects were those that ranked high on the A-Team prioritization completed in November.

John: In my notes, I reference \$998,000 of APE requests. But there is only \$750,000 available. Of this amount, \$250,000 for S&T, \$200,000 Bathymetry and \$57,000 for equipment refresher have already been determined. This leaves \$243,000 to spend. There is a possibility that S&T may come in closer to \$200,000, and there may be some left in bathymetry, depending on contracts that go out (likely not much though). So there may be a little more than \$243,000 left to spend. However, Linda mentioned that there was an additional 0.5 FTE identified as part of

APE since it didn't make it into the MSP to work on web tool development, though UMESC is seeking other sources to fund. I'm not sure of the cost here, can't find it in my notes, and may not have asked. But, say this is about \$50,000 (guess), that would leave \$193,000 left for the APE studies with study plans. I had asked to see all study plans submitted for projects, and with rounding dollars up, there are about \$380,000 requested for these studies. Obviously several projects will not get done, or be scaled back if possible.

APE review/selection process for 2006 – Linda Leake indicated that the FY 06 selection process will begin next month. The Corps will provide the initial criteria for project preparation. The goal would be to have the initial list of APE projects ready to be prioritized at the April A-Team meeting. Final study plans would be prepared by September. Individual A-Team members will have an opportunity to comment on specific study plans in areas where they have interest and expertise. A-Team members would identify that interest at April meeting. A-Team members believed this approach was reasonable. Linda Leake plans to work out a more formal schedule and discuss this with John Sullivan prior to the EMPCC meeting in February.

Questions were raised about APE projects that didn't make the cut for funding for FY 05 – would these be carried forward to FY 06? There was general agreement that these projects could be considered FY 06 if they were still relevant and important, but they would have to be re-prioritized with any new APEs proposed for FY 06. The plan is to place the full list of FY 05 projects on UMESC's LTRM web site so that anyone can refer to them as future APE projects are planned.

Status & Trends Report – Hank DeHann provided the status of the report and the indicator development. Substantial discussion has occurred on the indicator development since the November A-Team meeting. The review has primarily involved the UMESC, USCOE and field stations. Hank indicated there has been some concern expressed that the indicators are “too heavy” for the Upper River. He has also heard an interest in some form of “GAP” analysis and the development of trophic guilds for fish. Hank indicated that they would consider external data (outside LTRM) if the information was readily available and provided relevant information for indicator development. Hank directed ~~to~~ folks to consider the criteria for indicator development listed in the Navigation Study – Environmental Study Panel Report. These include policy & management relevance, technical merit and practicality. The emphasis has been to identify the indicators that should go into the S & T report. The actual “targets” for indicators will be developed later pending additional review and evaluation. However, they are accepting targets if sufficient justification and documentation is provided.

Sullivan wondered about the identification of indicators for invertebrates given that this component was dropped from the monitoring component in FY 05. Does this imply we should be reactivating this monitoring component in the future? Hank indicated that other agencies may collect data in the future so the indicator would



still have relevance. Sullivan also wondered if there were too many indicators. John Chick suggested that it may be possible to reduce the list if it was determined that some indicators were providing redundant information. Pete Redmon suggested that the UMRCC Water Quality Technical Section has recommended water quality targets (i.e. turbidity, TSS, transparency) to protect SAV. **Were their other comments that I missed? None that I can recall.**

Only a few A-Team members indicated they would be able to provide comments on the proposed indicators by tomorrow's deadline. As a result, the UMESC and the USCOE agreed to extend the comment period by one week. Comments should be provided to Bob Gaugush, UMESC, by February 1. A-Team members were asked to share their comments with other A-Team members.

EMP 5-Year Strategic Management Plan - Roger indicated they have received considerable comments on the plan and have decided to extend the completion date. They now plan to have it endorsed at the May EMPCC meeting. Due to limited time, we were not able to discuss this plan. John Sullivan suggested that if A-Team members have comments, they should be directed to their agency's EMPCC representative.

Time and Place for next meeting – April 20(?) at La Crosse. This precedes the Mississippi River Consortium meeting. The time place will be determined later.

**John, I had April 28, 29 for the meeting date. However, this is a Thursday/Friday. Does that work out to be the right dates for the river consortium meeting? I usually don't go to that meeting.**

Pete Redmon announced that he will be retiring on April 1 – no fooling! He is working on finding an A-Team replacement from EPA. Pete has been with the A-Team for at least 10 years. We will be sorry to see you go Pete!

Prepared by: John Sullivan, A-Team Chair

Conference Call Participants –

John Sullivan, WDNR  
Janet Sternburg, MoDOC  
Kevin Stauffer, MN  
John Pitlo, IA  
Mike Steuck, IA  
Rob Mayher, IL

Pete Redmon, EPA  
Tim Jaeger, USFWS  
Roger Perk, USCOE

Hank DeHaan, USCOE  
Sandra Brewer, USCOE  
Dan Wilcox, USCOE  
T.J. Miller, USCOE  
Linda Leake, USGS  
Pat Heglund, USGS  
Barry Johnson, USGS  
Jennie Sauer, USGS  
Jeff Houser, USGS

Terry Dukerschein, WDNR  
Robert Hrabik, MoDOC  
Walt Popp, MNDNR  
John Chick, ILNHS  
Mark Pegg, ILNHS  
Pete Redmon, EPA  
Tim Jaeger, USFWS

**LTRMP Analysis Team Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)**  
**April 27, 2005**  
**USFWS La Crosse District Office**  
**Onalaska, WI**

Welcome and Roll Call – The meeting was chaired by John Sullivan, WDNR. A-Team members Tim Yeager, USFWS, and Fred Kolmann, NRCS, were absent. A listing of attendees is included below.

EMP -FY 06 Budget Update – Roger Perk, USCOE, indicated that there was not much to report on next year's budget. They are expecting EMP to be funded at 18-20M in FY06. This would be similar to **what** we have seen in the recent past. John Pitlo, IDNR, asked for clarification on **how** LTRM was funded and how "extra" money would be spent if EMP received appropriations approach the authorized level. Roger indicated the LTRMP receives approximately 30% of EMP funding and any additional money received beyond the Minimal Sustainable Program (MSP) and Additional Program Elements (APE), currently about \$4.6M, would be through funding more APE projects.

A-Team Minutes – Motions were made to accept and approve the minutes from January 24, 2005 conference call. John Sullivan reported that he received a request **from** Jennie Sauer, UMESC, to provide minutes of the previous A-Team meetings for the A-Team Web site hosted by UMESC. John will identify which minutes are missing and provide them to Jennie.

LTRMP FY 05 Activities/Product Update – Linda Leake, UMESC, provided a copy of second quarter LTRMP milestones to A-Team members. These milestones are also posted on the UMESC Web site (see A-Team Corner). Ten-year reports for vegetation, invertebrate and water quality monitoring components were recently completed. Linda provided hard copy reports to attendees. A limited number of bound copies will be available (contact Linda). UMESC is planning on posting electronic copies of older LTRMP reports on their Web site.

John Sullivan thanked Linda for their efforts in producing these products. John also had a question regarding one of the milestones concerning installing the HNA Query Tool at Field Stations (2005APE19). He wondered how this would benefit river managers. Linda explained that many river managers don't have capability (hardware and software) to run this application. It was hoped that providing the field stations with this software would provide opportunities for the field stations to run this application for their respective managers. The long term goal is to serve up this software in a Web-based GIS format.

Additional Program Elements for FY 06 – Linda described the process for APE development and approval for this year. This was previously presented at the EMPCC meeting in February. The proposed APE projects (37 total) were electronically sent to the A-Team and other program partners on April 22. Linda and Roger requested the A-Team prioritize these projects as high, medium or low and provide this response by May

10th. The Corps and UMESC will also develop their own prioritization. The Corps and UMESC will consider the A-Team's input and their own priorities in identifying a "selected subset" of APEs that will advance for more formal review and evaluation. Linda indicated they would like to have at least 3 reviewers for each of the selected APEs. A-Team members would have an opportunity to provide review comments on specific projects that interest them. A call out for reviewers is planned for June.

Roger indicated that they reserve the right to ask for additional APEs (second call) should they feel that some of the "sideboards" for proposal were not being adequately covered (example: enhanced linkage of LTRMP to HREP). He also indicated that they would expect to fund bathymetry work, LTRMP use/application workshop, equipment refreshment, and finalization of the Status and Trends report with APE dollars in FY 06. These four "add-ons" were not originally included with the initial APE list.

The LTRMP workshop is new and is an item that was raised at the last EMPCC meeting. Roger indicated he wanted to get input from the A-Team on the value of this workshop. John Sullivan mentioned that he suggested this idea at the February EMPCC meeting. The intention of this workshop was to demonstrate how LTRMP data was being used to make management decisions. John Chick, INHS, suggested that the planned International Conference on Rivers and Civilization (June 25-28 2006 in La Crosse) might be an outlet for this activity.

There was consensus that each agency would rate the four additional APEs in a similar fashion to the original 37 APEs. Roger and Linda indicated the following approximate cost to the additional APEs:

APE 38 - Bathymetry – 200K  
APE 39 - LTRMP Workshop – 30K  
APE 40 - Equipment Refreshment – 57K  
APE 41 - Status and Trends Report – 41K

Pete Redmon, EPA, suggested future APE projects should consider an evaluation of LTRMP vs EMAP monitoring efforts. John Chick suggested this review could also be sponsored by EMAP and this has received some consideration from the EMAP planning committee.

Rob Maher, ILDNR, agreed to compile prioritization responses from all A-Team members. The approach will follow the same procedure that was used to prioritize the FY05 APEs. Linda and Roger indicated they would need the A-Team's collective prioritization response by May 10.

#### Status & Trends Report

Bob Gaugush, UMESC, provided a handout summarizing the status of this activity. The report will primarily focus on LTRM data with the exception of the hydrology section, which will rely on external sources – flow data. An outline has been prepared and

writing assignments have been given to LTRMP principal investigators and others. Bob indicated they may be reducing the number of proposed indicators based on their initial evaluations. Bob will be drafting the hydrology indicator/chapter that will serve as a template for the other indicators. The plans are to use the same software for generating the figures so that it will facilitate publishing the work next year.

John Pitlo suggested that there are other external sources of information that should be considered when discussing the indicator results. Bob agreed and indicated that authors of the report will need to be aware of important historical information to place some perspective on the LTRMP data.

Bob indicated they are on track to have a rough draft completed by September 30<sup>th</sup> 2005. External reviews will commence after this time. The report will be finalized and released next year.

### EMP Strategic Plan

Roger indicated that he has asked the EMP partnership to identify their top priority issues. They will then consider preparing “white papers” or strategic plans on these issues. This activity is important for the COE’s long range planning. There was general consensus from the A-Team that the primary concern was ensuring the LTRMP remains a ~~variable~~ viable, sustainable program in the future. There was considerable discussion on this and resulted in the following recommendation for EMPCC consideration: LTRMP should be factored into any plans for NESP and that LTRMP be expanded to fill identified gaps in coverage in the UMR system. The recommendation was approved by the A-Team and will be presented to the EMPCC at the May meeting.

### Institutional Arrangements

The UMR Science Panel was meeting in an adjacent room during the morning. We invited Ken Bar and Chuck ~~Spitzack~~ Fitzpatrick, USCOE, to talk about institutional arrangements and Science Panel activities/responsibilities. There was uncertainty on where the A-Team will “fit-in” if the future if Navigation Environmental Sustainability Program (NESP) continues to be authorized or replaces EMP. The A-Team reports to EMPCC, but that group will likely be changing in the future under the proposed institutional arrangement plan.

Linda Leake asked if NESP has considered the LTRMP expertise in data serving and data management. Ken indicated they were starting to consider this. It is likely that UMESC will continue to serve as the “clearing house” of environmental data on the river.

John Sullivan suggested that the USCOE consider asking the A-Team chair or a representative from the A-Team to participate with the Science Panel to facilitate communication and coordination between these two groups.

## A-Team Chair

Rob Maher, ILDNR, has agreed to take on the leadership for the A-Team. John Sullivan thanked everyone for their support and help during his tenure. John will be replaced by Jeff Janvrin and indicated that he would likely attend the next meeting or two to help with the transition.

## Agency Reports –

Mark Pegg, INHS, reported that he will be leaving to take a position at the University of Nebraska. We will be sorry to see you leave Mark!

Bill Franz, UEPA, indicated that Pete Redmon, is retiring and will be replaced by Bill Franz. Good luck Pete!

Terry Dukershein, WNDR, reported that Gretchen Benjamin, is the new River Unit Leader (replaces Terry Moe).

John Chick, INHS, reported that the Great Rivers Research Center has received a \$1.4 M grant to help with site development. They are still in need of more money to get this center running.

With the conclusion of the agency reports the meeting was adjourned.

## A-Team Attendance

John Sullivan, WDNR  
Janet Sternburg, MoDOC  
Kevin Stauffer, MN  
John Pitlo, IA  
Mike Steuck, IA  
Rob Maher, IL

Pete Redmon, EPA-Retired  
Bill Franz, EPA  
Jon Duyvejonck, USFWS  
Roger Perk, USCOE  
Hank DeHaan, USCOE  
Sandra Brewer, USCOE  
Dan Wilcox, USCOE  
T.J. Miller, USCOE  
Linda Leake, USGS  
Pat Heglund, USGS  
Jennie Sauer, USGS  
Jeff Houser, USGS

Terry Dukerschein, WDNR

Walt Popp, MNDNR  
John Chick, INHS  
Mark Pegg, INHS  
Matt O'Hara, INHS  
Dan Kirby, IADNR  
Mike Steuck, IADNR

A-Team Conference Call Agenda  
July 26, 2005 – 1:00pm – 3:00pm

1). Roll Call

2). Approval of April 27, 2005 Meeting minutes - Group

3). Budget and WRDA update – Roger Perk

House at \$33 mil, Senate at \$20 mil, conference sometime in September

4). Update on LTRMP strategic planning priorities – Roger Perk

Roger pulling all comments together and will present to EMPCC and discuss next steps.

5). Update on Roles and Responsibilities for the A-Team – Roger Perk

Everyone OK, though John Sullivan wasn't sure what "guidance" the EMPCC was to provide. I thought basically EMPCC guidance to A-Team would be when it asks A-Team to provide review on certain issues, technical concerns, etc. such as last year's review of what would happen to data sets if cut. Others thought same, though Linda Leake will revise to clarify.

6). FY-06 APE project selection update – Linda Leake

Long discussion on this one. Mainly on Jeff Janvrin's idea to have an APE conduct 2002 compliment of monitoring. Seems folks thought had been submitted and rated highly, but what actually happened is that full sampling of vegetation in one pool was proposed as a project idea. It was not moved to next pile for review as it didn't hit all the sideboards, though the author was told that it could be revised to do so, if desired. Misscommunication somewhere on this one. Then long weird discussion on Janvrin's proposal, especially since he wasn't there to share what he wished to do. To make long story short, Linda and Roger are open to an APE project that, by component, adds back dropped sampling, as long as sideboards are met. They are willing to review and provide guidance to help meet these sideboards. Thought is that Jeff J. will take lead and contact field stations/component leaders to develop such a project. This has to be done, probably ASAP or by end of August at latest for consideration this year. If not this year, can consider for next year. Not saying will get done, but willing to consider. **Expect Jeff J. to be in touch with you.**

7). Development of LTRMP workshop as a FY-07 APE project – Group

Another long discussion on this. No one willing to take the lead. Determined though that each state should send in comments on Sullivan's outline on what they would like to



see in a workshop, more specific than last time, and then Linda and Roger will take from there. Workshop would be further developed by feds, with whatever assistance states can provide.

Please review Sullivan's outline again (see attached), and let me know by August 9<sup>th</sup> which items would be most important for the following groups:

Existing users of information

New users/awareness of information

Not sure yet if would be stand alone meeting, or tag on. Linda said thought it would be important for program to share and get the word out, so I think looking broader. I'll send you my thoughts as from someone who doesn't work with the program on a day to day basis.

8). Development of a FY-07 APE project to conduct a full compliment of LTRM sampling (FY-02 level of effort) - Jeff Janvrin and Group

See No. 6.

Next meeting scheduled for October 19 in Moline.

Adjourn

**EMP LTRMP Analysis Team Report**  
**August 17, 2005**  
**Davenport, Iowa**

The Analysis-Team held a conference call on July 26, 2005. The objectives of the call were to discuss the FY-06 APE project selection process, restoration of monitoring activities above and beyond the Minimum Sustainable Program (MSP) and development of a LTRMP workshop. Four A-Team members (Fred Kollmann, NRCS, Walt Popp, MNDNR, Bill Franz, USEPA and Tim Yager, USFWS) were not present for the call.

**FY-06 APE project selection process** – At least two reviewers volunteered for each project on the “short list” of projects (15) that were identified as high priority by the A-team, USGS and ACOE. There were 9 additional projects (long list) that were identified as high priority that were in need of additional work. Once the additional work is completed, these projects would go out for review. In the event that additional funding above and beyond what is needed to fund the MSP and APE projects that were placed on the short list becomes available, development of projects on the long list would proceed. In addition to projects on the short list, there were four additional projects that were not on the original list – bathymetry, LTRM workshop proposal, equipment refreshment and finishing the S&T report that are still under consideration and will be reviewed separately.

**Restoration of Monitoring activities** – There was considerable discussion regarding restoration of monitoring activities during FY-06 in the event of additional monies becoming available. Restoration of some monitoring activities would be considered by the USGS and ACOE if benefits to the program are clearly identified i.e. how these activities would aid in analysis and detection of trends, as long as a proposal was formulated soon.

**LTRMP Workshop** – There was general consensus among the group that there was too much work that needed to be done to fit this workshop into a FY-06 project. The A-Team supports the idea of a workshop, but felt that there simply was not enough time to pull it all together for FY-06. John Sullivan had produced an outline for the proposed workshop that the group agreed was a good place to start. Rob Maher agreed to circulate John’s outline and compile input from the partners to help move this idea along as an FY-07 project. Based on input received from several A-Team members the following components of John Sullivan’s original outline were identified as those of high priority for inclusion in a LTRMP workshop.

- A description of the LTMP – Including a brief history of why EMP and LTRMP were initiated.
- What information has been collected, where and how long – A display of LTRMP products including reports, manuscripts etc., could be presented potentially in the form of a poster gallery.
- A discussion of statistical design – Temporal vs. spatial, annual vs. long term change detection capability.
- Strata – What do they represent? How can they be used to evaluate habitat/species relationships?

- A demonstration of Data Query Products and Procedures including the web site browser, spatial Query tool etc. Exposing managers to these tools was identified as a high priority.
- Describe scientific data evaluations using examples based on fisheries, inverts, vegetation, water quality or LCLU.
- Describe use of LTRMP data outside “core” EMP program. Examples include: Clean Water Act Reporting and WQ Assessment Work (305b & 33d), Spread and impacts of Invasive Species, Threatened and Endangered Species Management.

### **A-Team and Field Station Information**

Jim Fischer (WDNR) will be replacing Jeff Janvrin as Wisconsin’s A-Team representative. Fred Kollmann has retired as the NRCS representative and his replacement has yet to be named. Mark Pegg, ILNHS, Field Station Leader has taken a position with the University of Nebraska and has been replaced by Matt O’Hara.

### **Next Meeting**

Our next meeting has tentatively been for October 19, 2005 at the Holiday Inn in Moline Illinois.

Rob Maher, IDNR – Analysis Team Chair  
August 17, 2005