

ATTACHMENT A

Minutes of the EMP-CC Quarterly Meeting

February 11, 1997

**Annotated Minutes of the
Upper Mississippi River System
Environmental Management Program
Coordinating Committee**

DRAFT

**February 11, 1997
Winter Quarterly Meeting**

**Ramada Plaza Hotel O'Hare
Rosemont, Illinois**

The meeting was called to order at 12:40 p.m. on Tuesday, February 11, 1997 by John Blankenship of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Other EMP-CC members present were Larry Hiipakka (USACE), Bob Delaney (USGS), Al Ames (MARAD), Marvin Hubbell (IL DNR), Kevin Szcodronski (IA DNR), Steve Johnson (MN DNR), Gordon Farabee (MO DOC), and Terry Moe (WI DNR). A complete list of attendees is attached.

[Please note: These are the minutes of the regular business portion of a special two-day EMP-CC meeting. The minutes and attendees list do not document the special session on the Report to Congress.]

Minutes of the November Meeting

Terry Moe offered a correction to the previous meeting's minutes, noting that the first sentence in the second paragraph under Program Management should indicate that Congress appropriated \$16.694 million in FY 97, *not* FY 98, funds. With that correction, the minutes of the November 21, 1996 meeting were approved.

Program Management

Larry Hiipakka provided a brief overview of President Clinton's FY 98 budget request, noting that it is important to consider the Administration's \$14.0 million EMP request in the context of the Corps' overall budget. The President's FY 98 budget would fund 10 new starts in the Corps' construction general program, with a total cost of \$365 million. It would also fund 10 new reconnaissance studies, at \$100,000 per study. Hiipakka noted that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) had considered requesting no funding for construction starts. He also noted that the Administration's final request for the Corps of \$3.7 billion was lower than the Department of the Army's initial request, but higher than the OMB passback.

Hiipakka reported that the President's FY 98 budget projects flat funding for the Corps in FY 99-02. He said the Administration's willingness to flat-fund the Corps during years when the domestic discretionary budget as a whole will be reduced reflects recognition of the Corps' value to the nation.

Hiipakka explained that the Administration had adopted a new policy in formulating its FY 98 water resources budget. This policy calls for new construction projects to be funded entirely at the time they are initiated. Past policy, resources permitting, has been to fund construction projects on an annual incremental basis, providing approximately the amount of money each year that the project will be able to use that year. Of the \$365 million requested for the 10 FY 98 construction starts, the Corps estimates that the projects will be able to use only about \$41 million in FY 98. One of the 10 new projects is major rehabilitation for Lock and Dam 3 on the Upper Mississippi. Of the \$12.4 million requested for that project, approximately \$800,000 will be used in FY 98.

Nationwide, the Administration has also identified 10 high priority ongoing projects, for which it is seeking \$255 million in FY 98. The Chicago Shoreline project, for which the Administration is requesting \$10 million, is one of these high priorities. Hiipakka explained that the new policy of full funding for construction starts and the special emphasis on priority projects have combined to place significant constraints on NCD's remaining construction program. Setting aside the Lock and Dam 3 and Chicago Shoreline projects and using current outyear projections, the EMP will comprise the following portion of NCD's construction budget during the remainder of the program's current authorization:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>EMP as % of NCD Construction Budget</u>
FY 98	33.4
FY 99	26.7
FY 00	30.4
FY 01	36.0
FY 02	40.4

Hiipakka said he could not anticipate what impact the proposed division reorganization would have on the EMP's future budget.

Tom Hempfling provided details on what a \$14.0 million FY 98 budget would mean for the EMP. Assuming the funding were allocated between the HREP and LTRMP components based on the traditional 2/3 to 1/3 basis, Hempfling said construction would continue on eight projects, with four projects reaching completion in FY 98. The Corps would continue design on seven projects. In FY 97, the Corps has 14 HREPs in construction and is scheduled to complete work on six projects. Twelve HREPs are under design in FY 97.

Hempfling distributed revised spreadsheets that reflect the outyear projections from the President's FY 98 budget. If the EMP is funded according to the Administration's projections through FY 02, then it would receive a total of \$217.3 million over its 15-year authorization. By contrast, receiving its full authorized funding level in FY 98-02, would bring the EMP to \$241.4 million in total funding over the same 15-year period. Hempfling noted that the spreadsheet assumes the traditional 1/3 to 2/3 allocation between the LTRMP and HREPs and allocates HREP funding among the districts using the historic river mile percentages. Hiipakka emphasized that the Corps will be seeking input from program partners on what the actual allocations between program components and among districts should be.

Deb Foley reported that construction has been completed on the Bussey Lake, Lansing Big Lake, and Polander Lake projects. Monitoring is continuing at Finger Lakes. This spring, construction will resume at Trempealeau Refuge and the final willow planting will be done on the East Channel project. Contracts have been awarded for the Rice Lake and Mississippi River Bank Stabilization projects and construction will begin in the spring. Plans and specifications are under development for the Pool 8 Phase II project, and a contract is scheduled for award in late September or October. The St. Paul District is soliciting comments on its preliminary draft definite project report (DPR) for the small scale drawdown project. Planning work is underway on the Spring Lake Islands, Pool Slough, Ambrough Slough, and Harpers Slough projects.

Foley said she had only a very short time to assess the impacts of the Administration's FY 98 budget request and outyear projections on the St. Paul District's HREP program. Based on previously expressed partner priorities, Foley determined that the Pool 8 Phase II project would advance by one year to begin in FY 98 and the Polander Lake project would advance by approximately eighteen months to begin in FY 99. However, completion of the Mississippi River Bank Stabilization project would be extended one year. Initiation of the Pool Slough and Ambrough Slough projects would be delayed by one and two years,

respectively. The scope of the Ambrough and Capoli Slough projects would also be reduced, and the Conway Lake project would be eliminated. Construction on Harpers Slough would begin as previously scheduled in FY 01. Foley said she would like to have a conference call with program partners soon to discuss these various changes.

Paul Kowalczyk said only minor items remain before the Andalusia and Peoria Lake projects are complete. Road repair work will be done on the Andalusia project this summer, and a rock closure structure is being built between two islands at Peoria Lake. Contractors are continuing with construction this winter on the Princeton and Spring Lake projects. The timber clearing contract for the Cottonwood Island project has been completed, and bids for the construction contract will be opened on February 12. The Rock Island District is waiting for Illinois to complete its review of the project cooperation agreement (PCA) and Section 215 agreement for the Banner Marsh project. Marvin Hubbell reported that Illinois expects to be signing the two agreements in the near future. Kowalczyk indicated that the Corps may want to make some relatively minor changes to the two agreements.

The Rock Island District is working with Illinois to resolve some issues regarding the Rice Lake project. Kowalczyk said the draft DPR for Rice Lake should be out for review shortly. In early March, the district is scheduled to have its final coordination meeting for the Pool 11 Islands project with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Wisconsin DNR, and Iowa DNR. The draft DPR for the Gardner Division project is scheduled for November. The second phase cultural resources assessment for the Lake Odessa project is nearing completion. However, Kowalczyk noted that no funding is programmed for the Lake Odessa or Pleasant Creek projects after FY 97 under current budget projections.

Kowalczyk explained that the decision on how to complete the Lake Chautauqua project will have a significant impact on the rest of the Rock Island District's habitat program through FY 02. If the gate is replaced and other repairs are done using the district's HREP funds, and if the Administration's current outyear EMP projections are realized, then Banner Marsh and Rice Lake would be delayed by one year, Gardner Division by six months, and Pool 11 Islands by two years. The Pleasant Creek and Lake Odessa projects would be eliminated.

Sharon Cotner reported that construction on the Stump Lake project has been halted temporarily, but is expected to be completed this spring. Item 3 of the Swan Lake project is also scheduled for completion this spring. The St. Louis District is finishing the revised plans and specifications for Swan Lake's reduced Item 2 contract, which the district hopes to advertise in April. The Cuivre Island PCA is under review at Corps headquarters and plans and specifications are underway. The district hopes to award the Cuivre contract in FY 97. Cotner said final approval of the Batchtown and Calhoun Point DPRs is pending. The district anticipates that Calhoun Point will not be constructed under the current budget projections. However, Cotner explained that St. Louis is still anxious to get the Calhoun Point DPR approved so it would have a project in the pipeline if the EMP is extended. The final DPR for Stag Island is scheduled for November of this year. Under the current budget projections, the Norton Woods project would be eliminated; so the district will not be initiating the DPR and plans and specifications for that project.

In response to a question from Terry Moe, Hiipakka said he is not optimistic that the EMP will be able to obtain overtarget funding in FY 97. Hiipakka noted that NCD and two other divisions currently have shortfalls in their construction budgets. In addition, the Administration has proposed a \$50 million rescission in the Corps' FY 97 construction general account. He also cautioned that spring flooding may interfere with HREP construction to the extent that the EMP will have no overtarget capability. So far in FY 97, the Corps has already reprogrammed \$649,000 to HREPs from non-EMP projects. [NOTE: The Corps subsequently corrected this figure, reporting that \$999,000 in FY 97 funds have been reprogrammed to HREPs from non-EMP projects.]

Lake Chautauqua

Barb Kimler briefly reviewed the EMP project originally planned for Lake Chautauqua, a 4,200 to 4,500 acre backwater complex on the Illinois River surrounded by nine miles of perimeter levees. The Fish and Wildlife Service manages the area for migratory waterfowl. The EMP project was designed to address levee deterioration and sedimentation, with its resultant problems of turbidity and loss of water depth. The original design calls for the upper lake to be held at a stable three to four feet for diving ducks and fish, and the lower lake to be managed as a moist soil unit for dabbling ducks. The project design included levee enhancements and construction of a pump station, along with use of a 60-year-old radial gate originally constructed by the USDA.

Flooding in early June 1996 destroyed the radial gate and damaged the upper end levee. Through a subsequent engineering investigation, the Corps of Engineers has determined that the contractor appeared to exercise reasonable judgment in its management of the site and therefore cannot be held liable for the flood damages. In November, the Rock Island District estimated that it would cost approximately \$4.8 million to close the levee breach, replace the radial gate, complete the levee raise, and complete other originally planned work that was put on hold after the flood damage. Since November, the district has been working with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Illinois DNR to explore other design options. Kimler distributed a handout describing five alternative plans:

- Concrete tainter gate structure with 10-year level of protection —\$4.7 million
- Gated sheet pile cell structure with 10-year level of protection — \$3.7 million
- Gated sheet pile cell structure with 5-year level of protection — \$3.0 million
- Uncontrolled spillway with 2-year level of protection — \$2.7 million
- Abandon project — \$100,000

Kimler noted that the estimates for the two gated sheet pile alternatives reflect the contribution of surplus sheet pile from the St. Louis District. She said this free material would cost approximately \$1 million if it had to be purchased. She also explained that alternatives 1-4 all include about \$285,000 to complete originally planned, non-flood damaged portions of the project that were placed on hold after the flood. These first four alternatives vary in terms of their levee and gate repair costs. To-date, the Corps has spent approximately \$6.6 million on the Lake Chautauqua project.

According to Kimler, the interagency work group evaluated the alternatives in terms of the following objectives:

- Protect the upper lake levee from catastrophic overtopping
- Provide a level of flood protection suitable for the upper lake management plan
- Allow for fish passage
- Allow for incremental water level control

The work group concluded that the Lake Chautauqua project still has merit and rejected alternative 5, under which the Corps would simply correct site safety problems and abandon the project. The group also rejected alternatives 1 and 2, leaving alternatives 3 and 4 for further consideration. Kimler directed EMP-CC members' attention to a side-by-side comparison of alternatives 3 and 4 contained in her handout. Alternative 3 would provide open water habitat in the upper lake, consistent with the Service's original management plan for the project. It would also provide flexibility, allowing the upper lake to be operated as a moist soil unit in low water years. Alternative 4 would provide moist soil habitat only. According to Kimler, the work group's recommendation is to implement alternative 3.

With regard to a potential implementation schedule, Kimler said the soonest a contract could be awarded would be early June. This would assume that work on plans and specifications begins in February. Under this optimistic schedule, the construction would be completed in the fall of 1998.

Marvin Hubbell confirmed that all biologists on the work group support alternative 3. He emphasized, however, that there was not yet agreement on how the work should be funded. Hubbell and John Blankenship reported that Illinois DNR and the Service have written to the Corps requesting that it use non-EMP funds to restore and complete the project.

Larry Hiipakka said he does not believe there is any non-EMP authority under which the Corps could budget for the Lake Chautauqua repair. Hiipakka said the basic options appear to be to use regular EMP funds or to seek reprogrammed funds. He emphasized that reprogrammed funds are currently in very short supply within the Corps' construction program, leaving regular EMP appropriations as the most likely source of money for Lake Chautauqua. Hubbell said he would like the principal agencies to meet after the Corps explores its funding options. Hiipakka said the Corps would certainly be willing to have such a meeting. Hiipakka also reminded EMP-CC members that Colonel Van Epps will receive a recommendation from Colonel Cox regarding Lake Chautauqua, but would also like to have EMP-CC input.

In response to a question from Terry Moe, Kimler said the Corps has not conducted an incremental analysis of the proposed project repairs. Given the short timeframe, the Corps has relied on the professional judgments of program partners. Moe asked whether Corps headquarters would ultimately require an incremental analysis. Hiipakka said headquarters approval would not be required for the project repair because it does not involve changes to the approved project purposes. He noted that headquarters approval would be required for any reprogramming of funds.

Andy French emphasized that Lake Chautauqua is widely recognized as an important habitat area. He said alternative 3 would provide the benefits of the original project, as well as some additional benefits associated with the flexibility to operate the upper lake as a moist soil unit. According to French, the hydrology of the Illinois River is such that a 10-year levee would offer no meaningful margin of protection over the five-year levee.

Kevin Szcodronski asked what other HREPs would be affected if EMP funds are used to implement alternative 3. Paul Kowalczyk said no decisions have yet been made. He noted that Lake Odessa, with its \$3 to 4 million cost estimate and potential cultural resource problems, might well be a candidate for elimination. Szcodronski said he would like to see some effort to reprioritize the district's remaining projects, similar to what was done originally by the Fish and Wildlife Interagency Committee (FWIC), to determine whether Lake Chautauqua is the best project on which to spend an additional \$3 million. He stressed the importance of optimizing remaining HREP expenditures. Keith Beseke emphasized that the HREPs list had not been reprioritized in the past when projects such as Bussey Lake had cost overruns. Moe said Wisconsin has been very patient with past delays on the Pool 11 Islands project, but would be very disappointed if it were delayed, or potentially eliminated, in order to repair Lake Chautauqua.

Gordon Farabee said the disposition of the Lake Chautauqua project should primarily be a matter for the more directly affected program partners, but suggested that some type of incremental analysis should be conducted. Doyle McCully said any incremental analysis should treat previous expenditures on Lake Chautauqua as sunk costs and focus on the marginal benefits to be gained through the additional investment. Szcodronski noted that the project in its current state is producing benefits in the lower lake.

Jim Fisher stressed the high visibility of Lake Chautauqua and said it would be a mistake to walk away from it at the same time program partners are trying to build public and Congressional support for the program.

Steve Johnson said Minnesota believes the project needs to be fixed, but urged that other funding sources, including Fish and Wildlife Service money, be fully explored. If alternative funding is not available, Johnson said Minnesota would not have a position on how to fund the work within the Rock Island District's HREP program because Minnesota's projects would not be affected. Blankenship said the Service will not seek funds for the Lake Chautauqua repair until the Corps answers the Illinois DNR and Service's correspondence urging the Corps to fund the work with non-EMP money.

Moe agreed the program partners should not abandon the project if non-EMP funds cannot be found, but said he does not necessarily agree that Lake Chautauqua repairs should be the Rock Island District's top priority. He asked whether it would be possible to stage the repairs so that the risk of "falling off the table" if the EMP is not extended does not rest entirely on other projects. Hiipakka noted that staging the repairs would increase their total costs.

Szcodronski said Iowa would not take a position on the Lake Chautauqua repairs without an interstate biological review of pending projects. Tom Hempfling expressed concern with how such a review would be conducted, noting that it would be difficult to confine it to anything less than a full review of all pending projects in all districts. Blankenship suggested that revisiting the FWIC priorities would represent a significant departure from the process previously agreed to by the program partners.

Hiipakka said the Corps will prepare an incremental analysis of the Lake Chautauqua project repair options. He noted that the relevant without project condition for this analysis is the current, flood-damaged condition, which is actually worse than the original without project condition. Moe said he requested, but has not received, a good description of how the Lake Chautauqua project would contribute to the overall habitat needs on the Illinois River. Blankenship promised to provide this information.

Long Term Resource Monitoring Program

Bob Delaney reported that the EMTC and field stations, with the Corps' concurrence, had prepared an abbreviated annual work plan for FY 97. He explained that LTRMP personnel devoted considerable time in FY 96 to exploring alternative budget scenarios when they ordinarily would have been preparing the FY 97 work plan. The A-Team will be meeting next week to review the FY 97 plan.

Delaney said the work plan identifies the following areas of concentration for the LTRMP in FY 97:

- Complete a science review of the program by the LTRMP's Science Review Committee and develop a strategy for incorporating its recommendations.
- Complete a management review of the LTRMP initiated during FY 96 and incorporate appropriate recommendations.
- Continue providing support to the Report to Congress.
- Complete the LTRMP-sponsored Upper Mississippi River Public Expectations Survey and report results.

- Finalize and publish the systemic status and trends report.
- Complete the analysis of LTRMP resource data to increase efficiencies in sampling design.
- Complete the LTRMP strategic planning process initiated in FY 96.
- Update the LTRMP conceptual model based on Science Review Committee recommendations.
- Increase emphasis on acquiring and incorporating historical data in analysis and reporting.
- Support Summit work teams' data needs.
- Continue technical assistance to water level management alternative development.
- Increase EMTC staff modeling and reporting capabilities.
- Increase coordination of LTRMP floodplain activities with basin scale initiatives.
- Facilitate more effective communication with natural resource managers at technical section meetings of the Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee.
- Develop a strategy for linking LTRMP with appropriate social and economic forces affecting the UMR.
- Continue to emphasize the production of LTRMP reports and related publications.
- Continue to emphasize the sharing of program results and achievements with partners and grassroots organizations.
- Continue to expand electronic access to LTRMP data, reports, and related publications.
- Complete the analysis of historic changes in landscape structure for six UMR river reaches and the analysis of spatial differences in landscape structure along the entire length of the UMR.

Delaney reported that the status and trends report is nearing completion, with one or two chapters remaining to be drafted. The entire draft report should be out for review by mid-March.

Delaney reviewed the 16 recommendations of the Science Review Committee (SRC), the full text of which was provided in the agenda packet. He reported that EMTC staff concurs with 15 of the 16 recommendations and is withholding judgment on the other one pending clarification. The recommendation in question is for a "NAWQA-type [National Water Quality Assessment] approach to long-term monitoring that will sample pools intensively for 3-5 years each on a rotational basis, with an ultimate focus on systemic conditions." EMTC staff has also identified potential FY 97 implementation activities for 13 of the 16 recommendations. No FY 97 activities have been identified for the recommendations to adopt a NAWQA approach to monitoring, to use volunteers for data collection, or to reconvene the SRC in 18 months.

Don Williams said he was concerned with the potential impact of some of the SRC's recommendations. In particular, he noted that the recommendation for increased emphasis on systemic scale work could involve a major shift from the LTRMP's key pool approach. Delaney and Williams reported that there will likely be a workshop at which program partners can discuss the SRC's recommendations and their implications for the LTRMP's conceptual model. Delaney said plans for the workshop are not yet complete, but that it will likely include field station leaders, EMTC staff, and external scientists. He stressed that program partners will be kept informed of implementation activities through the A-Team and EMP-CC.

In response to a question from Holly Stoerker, Delaney reported that the SRC had declined requests to consider how to respond to potential budget cuts. Given their reluctance to address budget issues, Stoerker asked how the SRC's recommendations can be linked to the budget decisions the program partners will need to make. Delaney said this will have to be done by those involved in the discussions on implementing the SRC's recommendations. He noted that there may be savings through increased efficiency associated with some of the SRC's monitoring recommendations. In addition, Delaney suggested that there may be some data products for which it would be appropriate to assess fees because the customers are so limited.

Kevin Szcodronski stressed that program partners agreed to shield the LTRMP from substantial budget cuts in FY 97, anticipating that the science and management reviews would provide insights into how future savings could be achieved with the least damage to the program. Szcodronski emphasized that this was a one-year strategy and that program partners will be disappointed if there are no insights provided by the science and management reviews. Delaney said that perspectives on how best to reduce the LTRMP's budget will emerge when field station team leaders, EMTC staff, and regional scientists are brought together to discuss how to implement the reviewers' recommendations. Delaney assured EMP-CC members that the EMTC staff and A-Team members will explore a range of FY 98 budget scenarios, including a proportional cut under a \$14.0 million funding scenario.

Szcodronski observed that there will be some hard decisions to make. He urged A-Team and EMP-CC members not to serve merely as sounding boards, but instead to be actively involved in making these decisions. Gordon Farabee urged improved communications between the A-Team and EMP-CC, particularly on an interstate basis. He noted that the two groups tend to function independently. Farabee stressed the importance of having the EMP-CC give clear guidance to the A-Team. Marvin Hubbell expressed his agreement with Szcodronski and Farabee and reported that the Management Review Committee (MRC) will be making a recommendation to address these very concerns.

Dudley Hanson provided an overview of the MRC's programmatic review of the LTRMP and the committee's forthcoming recommendations. He noted that the MRC included representatives of the Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, Illinois DNR, Iowa DNR, Minnesota DNR, **[Wisconsin DNR,]** and U.S. Geological Survey. Among its review efforts, the MRC surveyed both EMTC staff and LTRMP partners and customers. According to Hanson, the MRC has made the following general findings:

- The LTRMP and EMTC provide many benefits.
- The EMTC has evolved with increased non-LTRMP activity.
- There is increased need for clear vision, communication, and accountability.

Hanson reviewed the MRC's draft recommendations in five categories:

General:

- The LTRMP should continue beyond FY 02 with a long-term authorization and appropriation.
- The SRC recommendations should be pursued in coordination with the program partners.

Strategic Planning:

- Develop a strategic plan for the EMTC in coordination with the river community.

Program Focus:

- Program priorities should focus on monitoring, analysis, and research.
- The EMTC should enhance its accountability for LTRMP and non-LTRMP efforts.

Administration:

- EMP-CC should strengthen its oversight role for LTRMP performance.
- Utilize the National Performance Review to increase participatory management of the EMTC.
- Financial tracking and reporting efforts should be expanded.
- A technical career path should be available to scientific staff.

Customer Focus and Satisfaction:

- Provide an annual non-technical health of the river report.
- The annual component reports should be released in a timely fashion.
- Improve partners' ability to use LTRMP products.
- Increase use of information bulletins to expedite sharing of data and results.

Hanson explained that the MRC will be meeting with Delaney to discuss its recommendations. In addition, the MRC will be formally requesting the EMTC and USGS to follow-up on its recommendations and will be asking the EMP-CC and the Corps of Engineers to increase their oversight roles in the LTRMP.

George Garklavs noted the low (11 %) response rate to the MRC's survey of LTRMP partners and customers and questioned whether the results should be used as a basis for recommending changes to the program. Hanson explained that the recommendation for the EMTC to develop a strategic plan in conjunction with the river community is in part designed to initiate a dialog and obtain additional perspectives. Hubbell observed that the response rate to the survey was depressed by its broad distribution, which included many people who have had limited exposure to the LTRMP. According to Hubbell, the response rate was much higher among program partners and active users of LTRMP information.

Moe said the MRC will not be making recommendations regarding the specifics of an LTRMP extension, such as what agency should fund the program. The MRC concluded that such issues were beyond its directive and should be left to the program partnership. Moe also noted that the MRC has tried to coordinate its review with a routine administrative review of LTRMP being done by the USGS's new Biological Resources Division.

Moe suggested that the MRC's recommendation regarding an enhanced EMP-CC oversight role be discussed further at a future EMP-CC meeting. John Blankenship agreed that this should be done. Hubbell suggested that EMP-CC members consider the following three questions in advance of such a discussion:

- Who has the authority to empower the EMP-CC to take on an enhanced oversight role?
- Are the EMP-CC members prepared to assume this increased role?
- What do program partners think of this proposal?

Other Business

Before adjournment of the regular business meeting, Marvin Hubbell requested time on the following day for the states to describe the guidance they would like the EMP-CC to give the A-Team regarding alternative FY 98 budget scenarios.

With no further business, the EMP-CC's regular business meeting adjourned for the day at 4:40 p.m.

February 12, 1997 Additional Business Items

During the course of the special Report to Congress session on Wednesday, February 12, 1997, two regular business items from the previous day were revisited. Those discussions are documented below.

Lake Chautauqua

Larry Hiipakka acknowledged Kevin Szcodronski's request for a biological review and priority assessment of pending HREPs in the Rock Island District. Hiipakka explained that the Corps is reluctant to undertake such a review because such reassessments have not been done in the past and because there would be pressure to extend any such assessment to all pending HREPs. Tom Hempfling noted that the Fish and Wildlife Interagency Committee's original work had been to identify and rank the needs for various measures at certain sites in the Rock Island District. But the FWIC did not consider project costs in making its assessment, as Szcodronski is now suggesting be done. According to Hempfling, while such a process is ultimately desirable, it does not appear to be possible to complete such an analysis in a timely fashion for the Lake Chautauqua project.

Hiipakka said the Corps will do an incremental analysis for Lake Chautauqua, using the current condition as the without project condition. The analysis will be done with and without consideration of sunk costs, though Hiipakka stressed the Corps' position that future investment decisions for Lake Chautauqua must exclude sunk project costs. This analysis should be completed by June.

Hiipakka stressed that he is not optimistic that the Corps will identify a non-EMP source of funds for the repairs. He also noted that the EMP does not currently have the \$700,000 that could be obligated in FY 97 to initiate project repairs. If funds do become available prior to completion of the revised incremental analysis, Hiipakka said he would consult with the EMP-CC. He reminded EMP-CC members that Colonel Cox will be submitting his recommendation on how to proceed to Colonel Van Epps, who will also be seeking input from the EMP-CC.

Long Term Resource Monitoring

Holly Stoerker emphasized that the states will be working to increase the FY 98 appropriation for the EMP beyond the President's \$14.0 million request. However, the states also believe it is important at the same time to consider the potential impacts of such a drastic cut. She reminded EMP-CC members that the states' recommendation to shield the LTRMP from anything greater than a 10 percent cut in FY 97 was based partly on the expectation that the science and management reviews would provide insights into how to make deeper cuts should they prove necessary in subsequent years. With the results of those reviews now available and the EMP facing a potentially larger cut, Stoerker explained that the states would like the A-Team to explore the following FY 98 budget scenarios for the LTRMP:

- Full funding
- A proportional share of a \$14.0 million budget
- A proportional share of a \$16.7 million budget

In exploring those scenarios, the states want the A-Team to shield field data collection efforts to the extent possible and to consider the recommendations of the Science and Management Review Committees. The state EMP-CC members clarified that, in conducting this analysis, the A-Team should assume a 5 percent savings and slippage rate will be assessed against the LTRMP. Bob Delaney stressed his belief that the LTRMP, as a non-construction program, should be exempt from savings and slippage. Larry Hiipakka emphasized that savings and slippage is not unique to Corps construction projects and is in fact assessed against all its major accounts and activities, including research, operation and maintenance, and general investigations.

Kevin Szcodronski asked the Corps to assess the HREP program under the same three budget scenarios that the states have asked the A-Team to explore. Hiipakka said the Corps already has information on the full funding and \$14.0 million scenarios and can provide an analysis of the \$16.7 million scenario.

**EMP-CC Attendance List
February 11, 1997**

Larry Hiipakka	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NCD	312-353-6356
John Blankenship	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3	612-725-3536x201
Bob Delaney	U.S. Geological Survey, EMTC	608-783-7550x51
Al Ames	U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration	847-298-4535
Marvin Hubbell	Illinois Department of Natural Resources	217-785-8287
Kevin Szcodronski	Iowa Department of Natural Resources	515-281-8674
Steve Johnson	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	612-296-4802
Gordon Farabee	Missouri Department of Conservation	314-751-4115x353
Terry Moe	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	608-785-9004
Tom Hempfling	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NCD	312-353-6351
Joan Albert	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NCD	312-353-1279
Don Williams	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NCD	312-886-5470
Buddy Arnold	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, LMVD	601-634-5836
Deb Foley	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul	612-290-5726
Don Powell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul	612-290-5402
Dudley Hanson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5260
Doyle McCully	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5461
Paul Kowalczyk	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5210
Jerry Skalak	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5605
Barb Kimler	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5643
Brad Thompson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5256
Charlene Carmack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5570
Frank Monfeli	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island	309-794-5640
Sharon Cotner	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis	314-331-8045
Mike Thompson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis	314-331-8039
John Barko	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, WES	601-634-3654
Cyndi Perry	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3	612-725-3536
Rick Nelson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, RIFO	309-793-5800
Jon Duyvejonck	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, RIFO	309-793-5800
Jim Fisher	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, UMR NWR	507-452-4232
Keith Beseke	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, UMR NWR	507-452-4232
Ross Adams	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mark Twain NWR	217-224-8580
Dick Steinbach	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mark Twain NWR	217-224-8580
Andy French	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, IL River Refuges	309-535-2290
George Garklavs	U.S. Geological Survey	612-783-3106
Norm Hildrum	U.S. Geological Survey, EMTC	608-783-7550
Gary Clark	Illinois Department of Natural Resources	317-785-3334
Dan McGuinness	MN-WI Boundary Area Commission	715-386-9444
Jonathan Ela	Sierra Club	608-257-4994
Chris Brescia	MARC 2000	314-436-7303
Al Behm	Friends of Banner Marsh	630-971-1954
Tom Edwards	River Rescue	309-681-9069
Chuck Theiling	Consultant	314-830-1010
Holly Stoerker	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association	612-224-2880
Barb Naramore	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association	612-224-2880