

Table of Contents

[EMP LTRMP A-Team Report 23 October 2007](#)

[A-Team Conference Call Draft Minutes 26 January 2008](#)

[EMP LTRMP A-Team Report 26 January 2008](#)

[EMP LTRMP A-Team Report 23 April 2008](#)

[A-Team Conference Call Draft Meeting Summary August 1, 2008](#)

**LTRMP
Analysis Team Report
October 23-24, 2007 Meeting**

The Analysis Team met on October 23-24, 2007 in Bettendorf, Iowa. Twenty people participated in the meeting, with all five states, USFWS, COE, and USGS represented. EPA could not participate in the meeting, and provided input prior to the meeting. The objectives of this meeting were to: receive updates on Fiscal Year 2008 budget; discuss FY 2008 Additional Program Element (APE) projects and rankings; discuss outpool sampling as requested by the LTRMP strategic planning group; presentation and discussion on LiDAR and Asian carp; and to discuss other items as identified.

FY 2008 Budget: No change since July update. Senate has requested \$18 M, while the House request is approximately \$23.5 M. The House request parallels the president's budget. It is expected EMP will receive approximately \$20 M, similar to FY 2007, and therefore LTRMP would be operating under a budget similar to the current fiscal year's budget.

FY 2008 APE Proposals: Prior to the meeting, A-Team members received 15 proposals for review and ranking as High, Medium and Low priority. Using the five theme categories identified for APE studies to categorize project ideas, the proposed projects address: Connectivity – 5 proposals; Landscape Patterns – 1 proposal; Setting Management Objectives – 2 proposals; Native Mussels – 2 proposals; and Aquatic Vegetation – 5 proposals. Overall, members believed proposals were collaborative, well thought out, and very difficult to rank due to their high quality. A few comments however, indicated that additional information and questions to the principal investigator would help in ranking projects. The native mussel proposals and the aquatic vegetation proposals received the highest group rankings, followed by connectivity, setting management objectives proposals, and landscape pattern proposals. A-Team chairperson, Janet Sternburg, participated in the Nov. 8, 2007 conference call with USGS and COE staff, for further discussion on the rankings. Please refer to USGS' summary for final rankings.

FY 2008 Administrative APEs: Marvin Hubbell updated the A-Team on potential objectives that will be discussed at the EMP-CC. These include directing funds towards: hiring of a landscape ecologist; continuation of LiDAR project; land cover land use; equipment refresher; data serving; continuation of additional WQ and first period fish monitoring; and funding position to continue connecting LTRMP data to HREP planning. A plan is being developed to address bathymetric information needs, and it may be completed by November EMP-CC meeting. Tim Yager of USFWS mentioned the importance of bathymetric information to the Service and would like to see data collection continued.

Outpool Sampling: The LTRMP strategic planning group identified outpool sampling as a potential outcome for FY2010-2014. This was identified as some river managers note that they can't use LTRMP information as none exists for the pool in which they work. Barry Johnson is to lead an effort to determine what this outcome might entail if pursued. It was thought that a discussion at the A-Team meeting would help identify information needs, including data parameters, location, frequency and uses of the information, and was placed on the agenda, with Barry as the lead.

The A-Team devoted a few hours to addressing this question. Barry Johnson will summarize input from the meeting and from information submitted at a later date to describe data needs as presented by the partners.

Some of the items discussed at the A-Team include: What questions do managers want to answer? For what questions do they not have information? How would outpool information be used? What should be the scale of sampling? Is there a lack of understanding by managers on what information exists? Could EMAP data fill the gap? How can data be better shared with managers? Should additional information be gathered by geomorphic reach rather than by pool, concentrating in transition area thought to occur around Pools 18/19? Also discussed was how information can be used across pools.

This group did not come to a decision, recognizing the need for additional information. To aid in his summary and review of additional information needs of the partnership, Barry Johnson requested input on the following: purpose for outpool sampling and data that could be collected; use of information collected; if outpool sampling is not necessary and why; and other information needs that would be useful to the partnership and why.

The A-Team briefly viewed LTRMP and USGS web pages to learn what information is available. There was a short discussion on how to serve data in a format more easily accessible to casual GIS users, perhaps via ArcIMS.

Presentations: Greg Sass gave an excellent presentation on Asian carp in the Illinois River. One objective of the study was to examine how well LTRMP is doing at sampling bighead and silver carps. LTRMP does not capture full size spectrum of bighead carps, missing the large bighead carps. This is due to equipment; trammel nets are needed for bighead carps. See Greg for additional information on the topic.

Hank DeHaan gave a very informative presentation on LiDAR technology. He described the technology, type of information produced, and how the information can be used. Current project will complete Pools 8-24, from bluff-top to bluff-top. It is thought that the entire system could be completed in 2-3 years. Technology looks to be very helpful for habitat planning

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be a conference call on either January 28 or 29, 2008.

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

A-Team Conference Call
Draft Minutes
January 26, 2008
1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

1. Roll call: Barry Johnson, Linda Leake, Jim Rogala, Tom Kelly, Jennie Sauer, Mike Jawson, Terry Dukerschein, Tim Yager, Jon Duyvejonck, Rob Maher, Greg Sass, Dave Bierman, Kirk Hansen, Janet Sternburg, Bob Hrabik, Marvin Hubbell, Hank deHahn, Dan Wilcox, Kevin Stauffer

2. Update on SOW and field station meeting: Linda Leake (SOW) Jennie Sauer later

Negotiations complete for MSP and will be delivered to Corps this week. SOW for entire program being developed now (APES, etc) and will be briefed at EMP-CC in February. High and High Medium APES are in package that goes to EMP-CC, with \$658K for APES. Status of restored monitoring proposal was received and revised budget submitted. This will be part of the package sent to EMP-CC for consideration and as one of the funding options for additional funds. Marvin said EMP-CC will be given a chance to consider the different funding alternatives.

3. FY 08 budget update: Marvin Hubbell

Last year's budget was \$22 million (2007 administration request was \$23.5 million.) Therefore used \$20 million as planning target for FY08, but that was optimistic as it turned out. FY08's budget is a reduction of almost \$5 million from last year. From yield perspective, it is \$3.2 million less than last year. FY07 budget resulted in \$6.1 million for LTRMP, while the FY08 budget will result in a hair over \$5.1 million. We still are above the MSP funding level, but by just less than \$1 million. At this level though, can not take advantage of a lot of other opportunities out there for the program. On project side, need is much greater than available funds. Janet asked about inflation and MSP and if it is included in the figures for MSP given. Linda Leake said that yes, the 3% inflationary increase was applied for MSP and there is still another million left.

4. LTRMP strategic planning update: Marvin Hubbell and other participants.

Barb Naramore's recent update is the outline to follow. The 4th meeting finished up Dec 17-19. The group made progress in narrowing focus to 6 key outcomes under consideration (equivalent to a goal statement). In the process of preparing for 5th meeting in mid-March. The group has found it useful to write explanatory text about each outcome and output statements for background in discussions on input and thought process in coming up with the outcomes and outputs. Also discussing focal research questions at this March meeting. (Short term focus) Also trying to get a document ready to share with A-Team and others. Seeking additional ways to engage program partners and stake holders in providing input to the draft plan between March meeting and July or August of summer, 2008. Janet Sternburg added that the group still has a lot of hard decisions to make on prioritizations and what the trade-offs will be for different portions of the program—not there yet. It will be difficult—have made good progress but lots more to do. The group recognizes that the program cannot do all 6 outcomes at once or meet all financial commitments. Jennie Sauer mentioned that four of the six outcomes are very close to what's already in the operating plan. Details and

prioritizing will be where more discussion will take place. Hank DeHaan agreed. Operation plan in 1992/93 was a good outline but it didn't address why the program focuses on certain areas. He indicated that whatever is selected to accomplish, we need to be very clear about why we are doing it and how it addresses what we need. If you have questions and/or concerns on the effort, please contact one of the strategic planning team members.

5. Methods of product delivery – brainstorming ideas to meet partner needs: Linda Leake

Partnership has expressed a need to deliver some of the program results in a more timely basis—the journal publications take quite a bit of time to be published. Partners need results more quickly. If anyone has ideas or suggestions on how we might do that call or e-mail Linda Leake and share your ideas with her. Limiting factor with a journal article is you can't publish with another method and still have it in the journal. Rob Maher said the technical presentations at the A-Team meetings were useful and productive. Not broader partnership, but might be a good forum to draw others in to A-Team tech meetings. Nice to have both author and report when discussing results. Janet Sternburg mentioned opportunities at FWWG, FWIC, RRAT Tech meetings, as that is where the river managers gather. For PI's at UMESC and others, opportunity to present at other meetings is based on what work they have to do and also travel money. Meetings that are well-attended by managers are another potential venue. If we wish to go this route, need to discuss and then negotiate into annual work plan. Greg Sass asked about informal pre-transfer of manuscript and saying not to cite report. Could this be done more often? Internal distribution only. Concern is level of review and that it doesn't get published. What can't we do? We cannot put it in a form that's considered published. Janet Sternburg asked about the contract reports that are submitted to the Corps and that she understood there would be additional discussion at EMP-CC. Ideas are on the table for that. Laying out options for what can be done once it's a contract report.

ACTION ITEM: Forward additional ideas on product delivery to Linda Leake.

6. Additional geomorphic sampling: close loop on October discussion: Janet Sternburg initiated.

The discussion in October went more towards the group recognizing there are additional opportunities/questions that need to be answered for the river. We never resolved specifically why we want to do outpool sampling. Janet Asked Barry Johnson where we left off in October. Barry said he would be revising that goal and associated text for strategic planning meeting in March, and that the synopsis was correct: there is more interest in sampling for specific, strategic information rather than just going out and collecting information. Marvin Hubbell noted that the discussion topic was identified as geomorphic sampling as opposed to outpool sampling. Janet indicated she referenced geomorphic sampling today, vs October's outpool sampling since October's talk evolved more to discussion for additional work by geomorphic reach vs outpool. Marvin wondered where are we going with this? Barry said some of focal questions are best addressed from a geomorphic reach basis, and reach specific info and approaches are needed. This is a major reason to go to geomorphic rather than just outpool. Lower impounded has most need right now. Marvin looking at the approach, indicated it is a little different than how discussed last time. We still need to identify what all those questions are, Janet said, as part of strategic planning effort and in the future.

7. Updates on LiDAR project and HREP/LTRMP initiative: Hank deHaan

HREP/LTRMP initiative: FY07: wind-fetch/wave model reports and work completed for upper river efforts and projects. Reports/models are out with reviewers (Griffith, Janvrin). Brent Knights also finished long-term fish monitoring plan. FY08: St. Paul will expand on wind fetch/wave models to look at biotic (vegetation) response. Rock Island will expand WQ monitoring into P18, which is not a trend pool. Also see what WQ conditions can be determined for the pool using info currently collected by components. Hank deHaan said Jason and others currently working with St. Louis to determine what initiatives to work on in FY08. Janet Sternburg asked how the additional efforts might be shared out with greater partnership. Tim Yager referred to Dennis Andersen's model demo presented for Pool 5 at the FFWG. Good presentation for FWWG and could be rolled into list of desired presentation for A-Team meeting. Marvin said funding is short this year and that there is an ongoing evaluation as to whether this work (HREP/LTRMP initiative) should be funded this year. \$40k needed to continue. Marvin will use value as input when dividing funds with other two districts for various projects. LTRMP/HREP initiative—no questions on the efforts. LIDAR—Hank said we have made good progress—P8-13 were flown prior to snow. Have been able to get areas further south since then. Should do all P8-24 as expected. Getting a pilot chunk of data at the district at end of January. Then will distribute to IA to process and also to USGS which will explore different methods to best serve the information. With reduced funding not likely to expand beyond P8-24 at this point. Water levels can't get too high—when conditions are right, they get out there and get it done quickly.

8. Ecosystem goals and objectives: briefing of Jan. 9-10 workshop and upcoming objective setting workshops and discussion on LTRMP participation: Marvin Hubbell, Hank deHaan

Marvin Hubbell summarized January 9th and 10th workshop on ecosystem goals and objectives. There was a huge representation at multiple levels (EMP-CC, NECC, others) from multiple agencies. They agreed to a framework of how to establish ecosystem goals and objectives for the river, and what the goals should be. Consensus reached on goals and need to set objectives at the 12 geomorphic reach levels. The thought is that the 12 reach levels can be rolled into floodplain reaches or be used for more specific projects. Proposal still needs to be ratified at EMP-CC and NECC in February 2008 meeting. With the development of these goals and objectives, LTRMP then has a vision and goals with project site objectives—to inform for indicators both overall monitoring and for site specific objectives. The five ecosystem goals, or EECS as Marvin referred to them are the five ecosystem characteristics, or the primary drivers identified. These include geomorphology, hydrology, biota, habitats, etc. Look at habitat, composition, function, and process (timeframe on function). Last fall there was a lot of discussion on setting objectives based on habitat types; this workshop is the result of those discussions.

How is this effort relevant to the LTRMP? A series of workshops starting in April or May will try and work through how we set objectives and inform the process. The first workshop will be a pilot effort in Pool 5. Hank deHaan said that the workshops are building on the 2002 workshops and environmental pool plans. Linking processes with biological landscape will be key. He stressed that this will offer better coordination among ecosystem restoration programs on the rivers (EMP, NESP, Illinois 519, MMRP)

as they set goals and objectives. Not necessarily meant to replace say MMRP planning effort but to help further inform it. He sees three primary uses of this effort: 1) establishment of common ecosystem goals and objectives among the programs for better coordination of ecosystem restoration efforts; 2) inform sequencing of future restoration projects (SET work, 519, etc); and 3) information will be used to structure management and indicator efforts. Information will help refine and coordinate between multiple programs. Currently determining types of information needed for these workshops to get beyond what we've done already. Science Panel indicated need to leave open-ended, so as to not constrict objective planning. However there is a desire to build on past efforts. First workshop will be in late April/early May and for geomorphic reach 3 (pools 5-9 in the Upper Impounded Reach). There was a question on whether LTRMP folks invited to the meeting? Janet mentioned it is important not to forget scientists during this effort. Hank indicated currently working on the invite list. Plan is to work closely with the FWWG (or equivalent by reach) but recognize need to invite more. FWWG chair will host the pilot study. Need to identify an appropriate facilitator for the effort. Once pilot reach has been completed with lessons learned and structure determined, will try to do one more one geomorphic reach this fiscal year (1 of 4 planned.) Thinking of July time frame for the second workshop and continuing into next fiscal year if funding allows. Desire is to keep momentum going. Marvin noted that LTRMP fits into monitoring efforts with indicators, and that there is opportunity to integrate monitoring, projects, and program management aspects tasks we've been looking to accomplish.

Mike Jawson mentioned another topic discussed at the meeting. None of the goals specifically mention bringing in learning opportunities for adaptive management or meeting needs of human users/issues. Discussed how these concerns could be brought into the goals, and if additional goals should be developed, or instead bring them in as guiding principals. Marvin said current thinking is they would fall under program goals but be clearly articulated, not necessarily as one of the five ecosystem goals.

9. Field station meeting: Jennie Sauer

Thinking about having a field station meeting this year to talk about what we're doing and review procedures. She was thinking of having it before the MRRC meeting, but that week is when WQ sampling begins. Last week May/early June is next thought. Jennie would like to find one spot that everyone can make it to. There will be funding for travel. Kibbe currently doesn't fit timeframe. Also hope to use opportunity to collect some data and review procedures as we do it. Barry is thinking of lower impounded area to address questions in that part of the river. Need another place in that vicinity. Terry Dukerschein mentioned a longer time frame than the normal 4-6 weeks advance notice is needed to get out-of-state travel permission, because Wisconsin just froze out-of-state travel. Janet Sternburg mentioned that the River Resources Action Team Tech (RRAT Tech is FWWG of the south) has a boat trip meeting every June, though time frame not yet selected. Do not want to overlap. Perhaps could have someone from program also on that trip. Janet Sternburg said Bob Hrabik usually attends. Rob Maher volunteered John Chick.

ACTION ITEM: If you have ideas for locations, send to Jennie and Barry.

10. Preparation for April meeting: desired presentations (see list of completed APEs for consideration)

April 2008 meeting will be held on Wednesday (April 23) the day before the MRRC in Dubuque. We have opportunity to continue reporting findings, as was done last year. Discussed list of completed APES and which ones people might like to learn more about. Topics that pop out: Greg Sass wanted a progress report on CPUE and block estimates of abundance (#9 in attached table). He wondered if this was related to project #20. Others also expressed interest in learning more about this project. Rob Maher said he didn't know how far along they are. Chad is working on it right now, and has a huge volume of data to examine, and still has many fish to identify. Need to touch base with John Chick to see if this is a possible presentation, as this is only the first of a two year project. Janet will contact John to see if presentation is feasible.

Rob Maher mentioned that the wind fetch model sounds interesting. Jason Rohweder developed the model, and Dennis Andersen gave the talk from running it on pool 5—more specific. Perhaps a team presentation if possible. A question was asked on papers being presented at the MRRC. Brian Ickes said there will be a conference call later this week and he will forward list of title to Jennie.

Tim Yager suggested #21 (Status and Trends of Floodplain Forests on the UMR) by Yao Yin and also Eileen Kirsch's study on Importance of the UMR Forest Corridor to Neotropical Migratory Birds (#15). Several people mentioned an interest in #5, (Asian Carp in the Mississippi River: their Impact on Native Fish Species and Predicted Dispersal within the System). Bob Hrabik mentioned that the PI, Valerie Barko, is planning on attending MRRC and will present there. Another topic mentioned was the Pool 5 evaluation of drawdown effects (#2). Hank deHaan wondered if there were any quantitative results ready to share from the drawdown. Another idea was presentation of one of the HREP/LTRMP initiative studies.

Kevin Stauffer wondered if there might be anything in upcoming round of APES to discuss, such as design, or group proposal. Or an opportunity to put a proposal in front of the team for review.

ACTION ITEMS: All: Send additional presentation interests to Janet by February 18. Also if you have a study you would like to share, please let Janet know.

ACTION ITEM: Jennie: send Janet list of MRRC presentations. May deliberately seek duplication on some topics if dual attendance to two meetings is not great for LTRMP folks.

ACTION ITEM: Janet: contact PIs late Feb/early March to get on schedule.

11. Additional items: None

12. Time and place for next meeting: suggested and agreed upon: Wed. April 23, prior to MRRC in Dubuque.

Janet Sternburg thanked everyone for calling in and participating. Call was completed Around 2:10.

Long Term Resource Monitoring Program Analysis Team Report

January 26, 2008 - Conference Call

The Analysis Team (A-Team) held a conference call on January 26, 2008. Nineteen people participated in the call, with all five states, COE, USFWS and USGS represented. The objectives of this conference call were to: receive updates on Fiscal Year 2008 budget, strategic planning, LiDAR and HREP/LTRMP initiatives, and NESP ecosystem goals and objectives planning; identify future scientific discussion and presentation topics on river science; and to discuss other items as identified.

FY 2008 Budget: Environmental Management Program's FY08 budget is \$16.851 million. In FY07, EMP received \$21.894 million. LTRMP will receive a little over \$5.1 million in 2008, which is about \$1 million less than in FY07. However the FY 2008 program is still over the basic minimum sustainable program (MSP) level by almost \$1 million. Due to a smaller budget than expected, fewer additional work items can be completed in FY08. Several alternative spending scenarios for the non-MSP funds will be proposed to the EMP-CC at the February meeting.

Strategic Planning Effort: Marvin Hubbell provided an update on the strategic planning effort. None of the A-Team members had questions for Marvin or other A-Team members serving on the strategic planning committee. The members recognize that the difficult task of prioritizing program elements has not yet occurred, but it will be addressed in the near future.

Product Delivery: Due to a recognized need, Linda Leake led a discussion on ways to share program results in a timelier manner, while still allowing journal publication of results. Some suggestions included presentations at A-Team, FWWG, FWIC, RRAT Tech meetings; and project fact sheets. Better sharing of contract reports was also identified as an option. Additional information and discussion is scheduled for the February EMP-CC meeting.

Scientific Discussions: None presented during conference call. Members identified several projects to include in the April meeting, which will be primarily devoted to presenting project results.

LiDAR Project: Hank deHaan provided an update, noting that all Pools 8 to 24 will be completed as expected. Data will be processed by Iowa staff and USGS will determine best way to serve the information.

HREP/LTRMP Initiative: Hank deHaan provided an update on the wind-fetch/wave model efforts in the St. Paul District; and expansion of water quality efforts in Pool 18 by Rock Island District. So far for FY08, a project has not yet been identified in St. Louis District. Not sure to what extent this effort will be funded, given the smaller appropriation than expected.

Additional Sampling Effort Discussion: Attempted to close loop on October discussion that sought to identify additional monitoring needs for the strategic planning effort. October discussion revealed that there was some interest in sampling for specific, strategic information, and less interest in adding additional monitoring, unless there was a specific question that could be answered by such information. Specific information needs and questions still need to be developed.

Ecosystem Goals and Objectives: A-Team heard about NESP planning effort to identify ecosystem goals and objectives. Goals of this effort are to: 1) identify common ecosystem goals and objectives among the river restoration programs; 2) inform sequencing of future restoration projects, and 3) use and develop information to structure management and indicator efforts. This effort will be accomplished by geomorphic reach. LTRMP fits into monitoring efforts with indicators. As goals and objectives are developed, indicators will need to be established. It seems the LTRMP staff should participate in the objective setting workshops, which will be led using the various fish and wildlife work groups out of each COE District (FWWG, FWIC, and RRAT Tech).

Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for April 23, 2008 in Dubuque Iowa. The meeting would be held the day before the Mississippi River Research Consortium meeting.

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

Long Term Resource Monitoring Program
Analysis Team Report
April 23, 2008 Meeting

The Analysis Team (A-Team) met in Dubuque, Iowa, on April 23, 2008. Nineteen people participated in the meeting, with all five states, COE, USFWS and USGS represented. The primary objective of this meeting was to share information on additional program element studies and other efforts beyond standard monitoring efforts. Additional discussion items included updates on program planning efforts and staffing changes.

Staff Recognition: Tom Kelly of USGS was recognized for his many years of service to the LTRMP. Tom has worked with the LTRMP since the program's inception and has provided important support and coordination in program administration. Tom will be retiring soon and we all wish him the best.

Staffing Changes: Linda Leake and Hank DeHaan have taken new positions within USGS and COE, respectively, and both will no longer participate in LTRMP. Karen Hagerty will fill in for Hank until the position is filled. Kat McCain was recently hired by MO Dept. of Conservation to replace Valerie Barko.

Strategic Planning Effort: Karen Hagerty shared that a draft strategic plan would be sent out in early May for additional input and comment. Mike Jawson shared that the strategic planning group also developed an outreach strategy for the plan and that this was everyone's opportunity to provide input if there are other people who should have an opportunity to review the plan.

Product Delivery: Jennie Sauer and Karen Hagerty are working on a strategy to share completion reports within the partnership. Completion reports are submitted to the COE for certain studies. Results from many of the studies are eventually published in peer reviewed journals and thus available for broad review. Results from some studies requiring completion reports as final products are never published. Efforts to share completion report results of these non-published studies will be made in the future, once a process has been developed. COE completions reports submitted since 2005 will be summarized in a list. A question to the EMP-CC will be made to determine how far back that these reports should be summarized.

LiDAR Project: Karen Hagerty mentioned that she was working on a plan to complete the effort based on current and expected budgets. The FY08 budget was lower than expected and the COE is unsure what FY09 budget will entail. Questions were raised on when information will be available and how the information will be served. Both are currently unknown.

Post Doctorate Position Update: Barry Johnson identified that the landscape ecologist post doc position was offered to a candidate, but as of April 23rd, the applicant had not yet accepted. This is a two year position that may be extended, based on an evaluation of the position's output.

Additional Sampling Effort Discussion: Attempted to close loop on October discussion that sought to identify additional monitoring needs for the strategic planning effort. October discussion revealed that there was some interest in sampling for specific, strategic information, and less interest in adding additional monitoring, unless there was a specific question that could be answered by such information. Specific information needs and questions still need to be developed.

Scientific Discussions (contact the presenter for more information on each topic):

- 1) Pool 12 HREP Work and Adaptive Management: Barry Johnson
- 2) New Taxonomy of the Mimic and Channel Shiner Complex (*Notropis volucellus* and *N. wickliffi*, respectively): Bob Hrabik
- 3) Importance of the UMR Forest Corridor to Neotropical Migratory Birds: Eileen Kirsch
- 4) Asian Carp Heuristic Modeling: Bob Hrabik
- 5) HREP/LTRMP Coordination and Lessons Learned: Jason Rohweder
- 6) Additional Water Quality Monitoring Effort: Jim Fischer
- 7) Testing the Fundamental Assumption Underlying the Use of LTRMP Fish Data: Does Variation in LTRMP CPUE Data Reflect Variation in the Abundance of Fishes: John Chick

FY09 Additional Program Element Projects: Request for letters of intent will come out in May with a July 15 due date. If proposal was submitted for FY08 and not funded, it will have to be resubmitted for FY09.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be a conference call. It is scheduled for August 1, 2008 from 10-12 AM.

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

**A-Team Conference Call
August 1, 2008, 10 AM to 11:15
Draft Meeting Summary**

Participants: Kevin Stauffer and Walt Popp (MN DNR), Terry Dukerschein (WI DNR) Barry Johnson and Jennie Sauer (USGS-UMESC), Marvin Hubbell and Karen Hagerty (Rock Island District COE), Kirk Hansen and Dave Bierman (IA DNR), Rob Maher (IL DNR), John Chick and Greg Sass (INHS), Kip Runyun (St. Louis District COE), Bob Hrabik and Current A-Team Chairperson Janet Sternburg (MDC).

The conference call started at 10 AM and the roll call was taken. Although Janet Sternburg did not mention it during the call, due to the nature of the April meeting, which consisted primarily of presentations and discussions, with no action items or decisions made, minutes were not summarized. However, the meeting summary presented to the EMP-CC is attached to this meeting summary.

Letters-of-Intent (LOI): Jennie Sauer sent out a package of 27 LOIs earlier in July. Projects in each theme category: Connectivity – 5 letters; Landscape Patterns – 5 letters; Setting Management Objectives – 11 letters; Native Mussels – 2 letters; and Aquatic Vegetation – 4 letters. A-Team was asked to provide a “yes” or “no” on each project for full proposal development. Comments are welcome, especially for those receiving a “no” to move forward. Reviewers are asked to identify similar projects and if they see opportunity for collaboration. Each agency will send in combined comments to A-Team chair (Sternburg) by close of business on August 18. Sternburg will combine agency input and send forward, as in previous years. A discussion between UMESC/COE/A-Team chair on the proposals will occur during the last week of August.

2010-2014 LTRMP Strategic Plan Approval Process: Marvin Hubbell noted that in mid- July, the strategic planning committee completed the plan and approved sending it forward to the August 2008 EMP-CC for approval. All members of the planning committee said that they support the plan as written. It is hoped that the plan will be quickly adopted.

2010-2014 LTRMP Operational Plan (OP): Marvin Hubbell described the operational plan as a five year blue print on how to allocate funds within the program. A Scope of Work will be developed every year to implement the OP. A sub-group of the strategic planning committee was tasked with drafting a strawdog of the OP to share with the full planning committee. The full planning committee will review the OP to determine if it meets the intent of the strategic plan. A goal of the OP is to provide flexibility within the program so that it can address different funding streams. This will allow the program to more easily take advantage of additional funding opportunities that may arise in certain fiscal years.

Additional Item: Program management staff from UMESC and the COE began meetings with each of the states and federal agencies. Meeting objectives include getting to know program staff, discussion about the program in general, and discussion on the operational plan being developed. So far, Mike Jawson, Barry Johnson, Marvin Hubbell and Karen Hagerty have met with Illinois and Missouri staffs. Hubbell said the meetings have been very interesting. Each state has brought a different focus to the meeting. At the Illinois meeting, one discussion focused on using LTRMP data to help define types of restoration projects. In Missouri, one highlight was noting that the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC), due to agency reorganization a few years ago, has begun formally integrating scientists and managers in project development and discussion.

Development of Indicators and Benchmarks: Sternburg began the discussion noting that several LTRMP staff brought up the need to begin discussions on the development of indicators. Since the A-Team consists of both scientists and resource managers, it was thought to be a good forum on which to begin identifying indicators that are relevant and useful to river managers. Sternburg proposed that this topic be a primary topic at the October A-Team meeting.

Greg Sass shared that he is working on an APE with Brian Ickes and John Chick to help develop fisheries indicators. Brian Ickes has offered to give a presentation of the proposal at the UMRCC Fisheries Technical Section meeting in September in the hopes of reaching a large number of the fisheries biologists. Greg volunteered to do the same for the A-Team in October.

John Chick volunteered that the project is trying to address one of the limitations of the Status and Trends report. For example, he stated that it is difficult to state what is a "good" level of an indicator.

Barry Johnson clarified a statement by Sternburg that indicated the Science Panel is not currently working on the topic.

A request was made to see if the fish component specialists and other state fisheries managers could attend the October meeting. Haggerty mentioned possibility of having the new landscape ecologist attend the meeting. It was also noted that indicators would need to include other areas of focus and not just fisheries.

Overall the partners agreed that this is a worthwhile and appropriate topic for the A-Team to begin discussing. Sternburg will work with Sass, Hubbell and Johnson to develop the topic for the October A-Team meeting.

Content of October Meeting: Sternburg requested additional topics for the October meeting. Marvin suggested a discussion on using Status and Trends report information and how illustrating how those data might inform or provide input to restoration project needs and design. Dukerschein offered the possibility of some of Wisconsin's staff sharing their work on indicators, although they may not be far enough along to share.

Johnson suggested a longer meeting might be appropriate. He suggested an 9-5 and 8-12 schedule that would require two nights for most people. Everyone seemed amenable to this possibility.

October Meeting Date: The week of October 13 seems to work for most staff. Sternburg will check with the people who could not participate today to see if this week would work for them. She will then propose dates and send out to the group for consideration.

Other Items: Hubbell formally announced that the COE is advertising for a LTRMP project manager. The announcement will come out on August 4th and the position will be open for three weeks. He said to call him if you need additional information or are interested in the position.

Hubbell also mentioned that due to high water levels there are funds available from some delayed construction projects. He will propose to the EMP-CC that these funds go to completing the LiDAR work for the open portions of the Middle Mississippi River. He learned last week that the Middle Mississippi River Partnership has developed a hydrogeomorphic

methodology for the river that could readily take advantage of the information for terrestrial habitat restoration efforts.