

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

February 26, 2004
Winter Quarterly Meeting

Sheraton Westport Plaza Tower
St. Louis, Missouri

Charlie Wooley of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m. on Thursday, February 26, 2004. Other EMP-CC members present were Greg Ruff (USACE), Scott Stuewe (IL DNR), Diane Ford-Shivvers (IA DNR), Tim Schlagenhaft (MN DNR), Janet Sternburg (MO DOC), Gretchen Benjamin (WI DNR), Linda Leake (USGS), and Bob Goodwin (MARAD). A complete list of attendees is attached.

Minutes of the October Meeting

Diane Ford-Shivvers moved and Scott Stuewe seconded a motion to approve the draft minutes of the November 20, 2003 meeting as written. The motion carried unanimously.

Program Management

FY 04 Status

Roger Perk reported that the FY 04 energy and water appropriations bill signed by the President included \$19.0 million for the EMP. However, this appropriation was reduced by \$4.204 million (22.13%) in savings and slippage and by an additional \$113,000 (0.59%) rescission enacted as part of the FY 04 omnibus appropriations bill. This resulted in a FY 04 allocation for the EMP of \$14.683 million. Combined with \$61,000 in carry-in from FY 03, the EMP's scheduled FY 04 expenditures total \$14.744 million. This includes \$9.826 million for HREPs; \$4.497 million for the LTRMP; \$156,000 for the Report to Congress; \$34,000 for the Independent Technical Review Committee; and \$30,000 for public involvement.

Through December 31, 2003, the EMP's expenditures and obligations totaled \$1.642 million and \$1.985 million, respectively. Perk explained that, while first quarter expenditure and obligation rates are typically rather low, operating under a continuing resolution for several weeks slowed commitments more than usual during the first quarter of FY 04. Perk said that, within the next two months, the Corps will be determining what HREP contracts will be advertised and awarded in FY 04. He briefly reviewed the anticipated HREP work plans for each of the three districts.

Perk offered several corrections to the December 2003 spreadsheet included in the February meeting packet. [Note: a revised version of the spreadsheet was distributed with the Highlights and Action Items Summary from the February meeting.]

Determining Savings and Slippage

Noting that he had received several recent questions on the matter, Perk described how savings and slippage (S&S) rates for Corps programs are calculated. He explained that the sum of the funding amounts for individual projects (and programs) within a major account (e.g., Construction General, or CG) typically exceeds the amount Congress appropriates for that account. As a result, the projects within that account are reduced by a fixed percentage (i.e., the savings and slippage rate) to bring their total into alignment with the amount actually appropriated for that account. However, projects that are specifically earmarked in the appropriations bill are exempt from S&S reductions. Therefore, the S&S rate applied to the non-earmarked projects is actually higher than it would be if the rate were applied to all projects in the account.

Janet Sternburg asked when in the fiscal year the Corps starts trying to recover S&S for projects. Perk said this process can begin very early in the year, but observed that funding within CG has been extraordinarily tight over the past two years. As a result, the only opportunities to recover S&S recently have occurred very late in the fiscal year. Rich Worthington emphasized that the Corps does not receive a pot of money from Congress labeled “savings and slippage.” Rather, Congress reduces the individual projects it is funding within an account by a savings and slippage rate in order to have the total of the projects equal the sum of money that it is actually appropriating for that account—i.e., the S&S money does not exist as actual appropriated funds. Worthington further explained that the opportunity for a project to later “recover” S&S exists only if some other project within the Corps is unable to fully utilize its funding allocation for that year. In such an instance, the Corps has the authority to reprogram the unused funds to another priority project. In response to a question from Charlie Wooley, Worthington said he did not know if S&S was unique to the Corps, but said the Corps is unusual among federal agencies in having such a project-based budget. Because execution rates within the Corps’ CG account are consistently high nationwide, Worthington said the prospects for recovering savings and slippage to the EMP are quite limited in FY 04.

Tim Schlagenhaft asked whether the S&S rate is the same nationwide within the Corps. Perk explained that the same rate in a given year is applied to all non-earmarked projects and programs within the same major account, but that the rates are different for each major account—i.e., the rates for Construction General, Operation and Maintenance (O&M), and General Investigations (GI) are not the same. Schlagenhaft observed that the LTRMP does not resemble a construction program. Perk replied that the EMP would likely fair worse in the O&M account, where projects that fall below a cut-off line are not funded at all. Moreover, Greg Ruff noted that the FY 04 S&S rate for GI is 35 percent, compared with the 22 percent rate for CG.

Barb Naramore asked whether the Administration also plays a role in establishing the final S&S rates, noting that the rates are typically slightly higher than those identified in the final

conference report for the energy and water appropriations bill. Perk said the Administration does make some minor adjustments based on priority projects.

FY 05 Outlook

Perk reported that the President's FY 05 budget request for the EMP is \$28 million. However, for planning purposes, the Corps will assume FY 05 appropriations of approximately \$20 million and a 22 percent savings and slippage rate. Perk said it is quite possible that the S&S rate will actually be higher. In developing the districts' FY 05 work plans, the Corps will seek to identify HREP work that could be added if the FY 05 appropriation comes in above \$20 million, or if the savings and slippage rate is lower than 22 percent. Perk said the district HREP managers will consult with the EMP partners regarding sequencing and priorities as they develop these plans.

Perk said he understands that March 19 is the deadline for Members of Congress to submit their energy and water funding requests to the subcommittees. Holly Stoerker said she will want information from Perk regarding the additional work that would be possible under a \$28 million EMP in FY 05. She said that these details are important in preparing the UMRBA's budget testimony.

Public Involvement and Program Advocacy

Gretchen Benjamin requested input on the draft EMP brochure included with the February meeting packet. She explained that the brochure is designed to apply to the entire system and noted that area-specific inserts could be developed to provide more local details. Benjamin noted that two versions were included in the agenda packet. Roger Perk said the Corps objects to the Mark Twain quote used in one of the versions.

Benjamin said she is striving to create a concise brochure appropriate for a broad public audience. She asked EMP partners to provide input regarding the draft's content, format, and points of contact by March 12. Wisconsin DNR will then prepare and distribute a revised version based on the comments received, with the goal of completing the brochure in time for use at the Navigation Study public meetings in June. In response to a question from Benjamin, Perk said the Corps would use EMP public involvement funds to print the brochure. He estimated that there would be a 2-3 week turnaround time for printing, and said he would consult further with Benjamin regarding the quantity to be printed.

Don Hultman distributed an EMP outreach plan developed by the interagency work group formed at the November 2003 EMP-CC meeting. Hultman explained that the plan is designed to help EMP supporters act proactively on behalf of the program by identifying key milestones that occur at predictable times each year. Goals include enabling program supporters to communicate more effectively with the Administration and members of Congress. Hultman said an e-mail alert system could be quite effective in fostering this communication and asked EMP partners to identify entities that might be willing and able to develop and operate such a system. Possibilities suggested included the Mississippi River Citizen Commission and various state conservation networks. Dan McGuinness offered to provide e-mail addresses of interested Audubon members to whomever operates the e-mail alert system.

Holly Stoerker noted that, in the past, the partner agencies have deliberately chosen not to highlight state and district project breakdowns. However, she said that more locally tailored messages from stakeholders might well be more effective in making the case to individual Members of Congress. Regarding the proposed calendar's reference to a joint Governors' letter, Stoerker cautioned that such letters require a long time to execute. She suggested that efforts to get separate letters from the individual Governors might be more successful, though by no means easy.

HREP Planning and Sequencing

Roger Perk said he has incorporated the final modification to the HREP Planning and Sequencing Framework requested by the EMP-CC at its November 2003 meeting. Perk said he would distribute the final framework, as endorsed by the EMP-CC. [Note: the framework was distributed with the Highlights and Action Items summary of the February EMP-CC meeting.]

Perk reported that he has drafted a list of potential candidates for the System Ecological Team (SET) called for under the Planning and Sequencing Framework. The SET will have approximately 6 members, who will need to cover a broad range of expertise. Perk said he has shared his draft list informally with EMP-CC partners and requested any further input regarding SET candidates by March 19. In response to questions from Charlie Wooley, Perk explained that the SET is charged with considering each of the District Ecological Team's prioritized project lists from a system perspective and recommending an overall project sequence. He emphasized that there will continue to be active HREP work in each of the districts. Perk plans to consult further with the EMP-CC members in narrowing his SET list to approximately 10 to 15 names and will then begin contacting candidates. He said the Corps plans to begin implementing the Planning and Sequencing Framework in FY 05. After initial start-up, Perk said he anticipates the SET will meet approximately once per year. In response to a question from Barry Johnson, Perk said any potential role for the SET in implementing ecosystem measures recommended in the Navigation Study will be addressed only after authorization and funding of such measures.

Scott Stuewe asked about the status of the Independent Technical Review Committee (ITRC), and in particular whether the nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that had advocated for the ITRC's formation have identified candidates to serve on the group. Greg Ruff said American Rivers submitted some potential names to him a couple of years ago. Ruff and Perk asked EMP partners to provide any further input regarding ITRC candidates to Perk by March 19. The Corps will then consult further with the EMP-CC as it narrows the list and begins to contact candidates. The ITRC will consist of 5 to 6 members, with implementation slated for the beginning of FY 05. Ruff said he expects the ITRC will meet a couple of times initially, then annually thereafter. Holly Stoerker asked about the linkage between the EMP-CC and ITRC. Ruff confirmed that the EMP-CC will have input regarding the questions the ITRC is asked to address.

Long Term Resource Monitoring Program

Cost Structure

Linda Leake explained that OMB-mandated changes in USGS business practices have resulted in separate line items for common services, facilities, and admin/info costs. These three categories were previously combined in a single line item. The new categories led some partners to conclude that there were new types of costs and that total overhead-related costs were increasing. However, in reality, total costs for these elements actually declined by 8 percent from FY 02 to FY 04, according to Leake. Common services and facilities costs represent 22 percent of LTRMP spending at UMESC. These same categories average almost 26 percent of the field stations' budgets, with the numbers at individual field stations ranging from 16 to 37 percent. Leake emphasized that UMESC and the field stations continue to look for opportunities to reduce or avoid increases in overhead costs. Gretchen Benjamin thanked Leake for her explanation, saying that this information has enhanced the partners' understanding of the program's cost structure.

FY 04 Scope of Work and Budget

Leake recounted Leslie Holland-Bartels' November 2003 statement regarding the LTRMP's FY 04 scope of work (SOW) — i.e., assuming a proportional share of a \$20 million EMP appropriation and 16 percent savings and slippage, the LTRMP can just squeeze by without a major program restructuring in FY 04. However, this stopgap approach would leave the question of the program's long term future unaddressed. Leake noted that the EMP appropriation was lower and the S&S rate was higher than the working assumptions reflected in Holland-Bartels' November statement, thereby exacerbating the situation. The LTRMP's \$4.398 million allocation combines with \$193,600 in "overdistributed" funds to provide the LTRMP with \$4.592 million in FY 04. This compares with \$5.2 million in FY 02 and \$3.9 million in FY 03. Leake said the overdistributed funds consist of money previously transferred to Illinois and Missouri but not yet expended or obligated due to a variety of factors, including early staff departures.

Leake explained that, in developing the FY 04 SOW, USGS made the following assumptions:

- maintain permanent federal staff
- do not close any field stations
- build off of A-Team input

At its February 2004 meeting, the A-Team recommended a SOW that maintains the standard monitoring protocol, to the maximum extent possible, while acknowledging that approach would require significant reductions in other areas. More specifically, the SOW favored by the A-Team would implement the standard protocols for vegetation, fisheries, and macroinvertebrate monitoring; and a modified water quality sampling regime. Leake emphasized that this SOW requires substantial reduction or curtailment of activity in all other program areas, including land cover/land use, bathymetry, the Science Planning Process, data management, equipment repair and replacement, and editorial assistance. She noted that the Status and Trends Report will not be completed in FY 04 under this SOW.

Leake said the FY 04 SOW requires difficult choices on everyone's part. She acknowledged that USGS had previously said it would not again support a stopgap approach in place of addressing the program's fundamental structural problems. However, she explained, USGS was reversing this position in the spirit of partnership and is willing to support the A-Team's preferred approach, assuming a thorough program reassessment is conducted in FY 04. Leake said USGS is seeking two specific actions from the EMP-CC at today's meeting:

- 1) input on the LTRMP's FY 04 SOW — i.e., does the EMP-CC support the A-Team's recommendation?
- 2) concurrence with USGS's position that any additional funds that become available in FY 04 should be directed to analysis — e.g., EMAP work may free additional resources within the LTRMP that could support analysis

A-Team Report

Janet Sternburg summarized the A-Team's discussions concerning the LTRMP's FY 04 SOW. At its February meeting, the A-Team recommended using HREP funds to help address a \$175,000 difference between available funds and UMESC's and the field stations' proposed budgets. Sternburg explained that Corps staff rejected this approach. As an alternative, state A-Team members then suggested that UMESC and the field stations all reduce their proposed budgets by 4 percent. Following the meeting, USGS and the states reviewed their work programs and determined what adjustments would be required under this approach. According to Sternburg, the SOW outlined by Leake reflects these adjustments.

At the February meeting, A-Team members were also asked to rank their monitoring priorities. The majority of program partners identified fisheries sampling as their top priority. Sternburg attributed this, in part, to the fact that the fisheries protocol has been thoroughly analyzed and efficiencies have been realized. Before making any further modifications to fisheries monitoring, the other components should be subject to similar reviews.

Regarding the pending LTRM Program Assessment, Sternburg said A-Team members have emphasized the importance of making science-based decisions and avoiding funding-driven disruptions to data continuity. Noting the LTRMP's recurring budget difficulties, Sternburg offered her personal perspective that the program must be restructured. In particular, she cited the LTRMP's high level of fixed costs.

10-Year Component Reports

Barry Johnson reported that A-Team members have been asked to coordinate their agencies' comments on the draft 10-year component reports. Comments on the draft fisheries, vegetation, and macroinvertebrate reports are due March 12. Final drafts of these 3 reports are scheduled for the end of April. The water quality component report has been delayed due to staff changes, and the first draft is scheduled for March 15.

Tim Schlagenhaft and Gretchen Benjamin stressed the importance of completing the 10-year reports in a timely manner and expressed their hope that the reports will help inform LTRMP restructuring decisions. Johnson said the timeframe for completing the reports depends in large part on the extent of the partners' comments. He said the reports should yield some valuable insights, but noted that they are designed to summarize 10 years of monitoring, not specifically to answer restructuring questions. According to Johnson, the restructuring effort may require additional information. Pat Heglund concurred, explaining that the reports will assess the efficiency and efficacy of protocols that have been employed for the various components, but will not evaluate various potential modifications. She noted that a statistician could explore such questions, such as the implications of changing spatial scope, but cautioned that such analyses are expensive and that there is no single perfect approach for all purposes.

Planning for a Funding-Limited LTRMP

Heglund briefly described the LTRMP's evolution since its inception, stressing that it began as a well-balanced program but has gradually degraded to the point where it is essentially gathering and warehousing data. As available funds declined in inflation-adjusted terms, focused studies and efforts to characterize sedimentation patterns were among the first activities curtailed. More recently, data and analysis products, technical support, and bathymetry work have been cut substantially. After years of incremental reductions, Heglund emphasized that it is now time to step back and consider the program's future direction more comprehensively. She stressed USGS's perspective that the LTRMP needs to be a balanced program that combines data collection, data serving, focused studies, analysis, products, technical support, systemic platforms, and science leadership.

Heglund reported that the USGS and the Corps have formed a LTRM Program Assessment Team consisting of Heglund, Marvin Hubbell, and Rick Frietsche. The team is charged with gathering information, documenting partner perspectives, and identifying a range of options for implementing a funding-limited LTRMP. She emphasized that the team members will be neutral fact finders and facilitators, not advocates for their programs or agencies. The team will rely on EMP-CC members as its central points of contact, with the expectation that the EMP-CC members will actively engage their A-Team members and others within their state/agency. After gathering input and information, the Assessment Team will then identify a range of alternatives and prepare a report for the USGS and Corps. These two agencies will then consult further with the other program partners concerning options and next steps.

Janet Sternburg questioned the feasibility of the LTRM Program Assessment's schedule, which includes presentation of the Assessment Team's findings at the May EMP-CC meeting. Heglund acknowledged that the schedule is ambitious, but stressed the need to address the program's structure and scope prior to the start of FY 05. Sternburg asked about the scope and specificity of the assessment. Hubbell said the size of the program's base must be identified. Heglund said the assessment will focus on the big picture questions of what the partner agencies really value, not the technical aspects of sampling design and other more detailed issues.

Tim Schlagenhaft suggested adding a state agency representative to the Program Assessment Team, observing that this could help the team in formulating questions and communicating about the process. Heglund stressed that the team members will not be acting as representatives of their agencies, but rather will be serving as neutral facilitators. According to Heglund, Tom Boland declined the opportunity to participate on the team, due to the time commitment required, but has offered to provide the Assessment Team with historical information from his many years on the A-Team.

Hubbell offered EMP-CC members the Program Assessment Team's assistance in coordinating with others in their state/agency. For example, Hubbell suggested, the Assessment Team is willing to facilitate workshops for the partner agencies if that would be helpful. Gretchen Benjamin expressed interest in a facilitated workshop. Heglund noted that the EMP-CC members may want to take a variety of approaches and stressed the Assessment Team's willingness to assist in whatever way possible.

In response to a question from Holly Stoerker, Heglund said the alternatives that the Assessment Team presents may be state- or agency-specific. Stoerker urged the team to package the alternatives based on cohesive ways of meeting different needs, rather than according to agency. Sternburg said she anticipates the partners' priority needs will exceed available resources and asked how this situation will be handled. Heglund said it is important to document the partner agencies' priorities, even if some of them are prohibitively expensive. While costly priorities may not fit into the alternatives for the baseline restructured program, they should be identified as future opportunities, according to Heglund.

Schlagenhaft and Greg Ruff asked how the current LTRM Program Assessment compares with previous efforts to determine the program's scope and focus. Roger Perk said the Corps has reviewed those previous efforts and found the partners have consistently expressed the same priorities over time. Perk emphasized the need to restructure the LTRMP so that the base program is executable at realistic funding levels. He said it is not acceptable to be several months into a fiscal year and still be discussing how to fit the annual SOW within available funds. In order to avoid this in the future, Perk said the partners must define a modest program that can be maintained at the funding levels Congress is providing, with additional work structured as add-ons.

EMP-CC Action

EMP-CC members endorsed the FY 04 SOW as presented by Leake. They also endorsed USGS's recommendation that any additional FY 04 funds that come into the LTRMP be directed to analysis. In response to a question from Schlagenhaft, Leake and Heglund said priority will be given to analyses that would help in examining future program options. Examples include assessment of water quality monitoring options and modeling different spatial options for data collection. Benjamin asked whether the decision to allocate overtarget funds to analysis would affect the schedule for completion of the Status and Trends Report. Leake said the report will be delayed from FY 04 to FY 05 due to the decision to prioritize monitoring in FY 04. This revised schedule will not be affected by any overtarget funding — i.e., the Status and Trends report will remain deferred until next year and any current year overtarget funds will be directed to analytical efforts that support

program restructuring. Bob Goodwin suggested the possibility of coordinating with tow boat crews to collect water samples and also recommended surveying crews concerning trends they are seeing.

Report to Congress

Cost-Sharing/HREPs on Public Lands

Marvin Hubbell reported that, because the cost-sharing issue was not fully resolved at the November EMP-CC meeting, the Corps elected to delay release of the Report to Congress (RTC) public review draft. He explained that the Corps hopes to achieve partner consensus on cost-sharing at today's meeting and then initiate the public review period in mid-March. Outstanding cost-sharing questions include eligibility of General Plan (GP) lands for 100 percent federal HREPs, the extent of floodplain landownership by federal agencies other than the Corps and Fish and Wildlife Service, and the potential eligibility of these other federal lands for 100 percent federal HREPs.

Referencing the summary included in the EMP-CC agenda packet, Hubbell said MVR's counsel has concluded that all Corps GP lands that are not specifically reserved by the Corps for some other management use are considered to be managed as a national wildlife refuge for the purpose of Section 906(e) of the 1986 Water Resources Development Act. Thus, HREPs may be constructed with 100 percent federal EMP funds on GP lands managed by the Fish and Wildlife Service or by a state. Responsibility for operation and maintenance of such HREPs rests entirely with the agency managing the land. Hubbell said the Corps' review of past projects indicates that this interpretation has been consistently applied from the EMP's inception. Regarding the Bussey Lake HREP, which had been cited as a possible exception, Hubbell explained that Iowa cost shared a portion of this project because the state asserted ownership on part of the project lands.

Noting that the Forest Service owns 33,000 acres on the Open River, an area with very little public land, Janet Sternburg said it would be helpful if Forest Service lands could qualify for 100 percent federal HREPs. Roger Perk said the Corps is willing to consider such projects on a case-by-case basis, but would not support pursuing a modification to the EMP authority. After some further discussion, EMP-CC members reconfirmed their November 2003 agreement that Forest Service and National Park Service holdings on the UMRS, which total less than 34,000 acres, are not sufficiently large to warrant seeking a change to the EMP authority. Instead, they agreed that construction funding for any specific projects proposed on Forest Service or Park Service lands should be addressed on a case-by-case basis. EMP-CC members further concurred that the RTC should articulate the partners' common understanding regarding cost-sharing on GP lands and the potential for projects on Forest Service or Park Service lands, but should not include any specific recommendations.

Finalizing the RTC

Hubbell explained that the Corps still plans a 45-day public review period, commencing in mid-March and concluding by the end of April. If any major issues are identified in the comments, these will be considered at the May EMP-CC meeting. The Corps will address more minor comments without further consultation. Hubbell said the Rock Island District's

goal is to complete the RTC as soon as possible after the May meeting and forward it to the MVD Commander. Hubbell also alerted EMP-CC members that each partner agency will be asked to provide a letter of endorsement for inclusion in the RTC that is submitted to MVD. He said MVR will need these endorsement letters by the end of May, but recognized that the partners will presumably want to wait to finalize their letters until after the May meeting, when the public review comments will be discussed. This will leave partners with a fairly narrow window in which to finalize their letters, and Hubbell urged EMP-CC members to initiate the letter drafting process prior to the May meeting.

Sternburg urged that the RTC clearly demonstrate the value of LTRMP information. Perk, Hubbell, and Linda Leake said they would strive to ensure that the report makes a compelling case for the LTRMP.

Other Business

Greg Ruff reported that, as part of the Corps' 2012 reorganization, Steve Cobb is now leading MVD's New Orleans District Support Team and thus will no longer co-chair the EMP-CC. According to Ruff, the as-yet-unnamed leader of MVD's St. Paul and Rock Island District Support Team will likely assume the EMP-CC co-chair role. Ruff also reported that Bill Dawson of Corps Headquarters will lead the MVD Regional Integration Team. Rich Worthington will be on this team and will continue to serve as the Headquarters contact on many UMRS projects. Holly Stoerker urged MVD to ensure that it maintains connections among the three UMRS Districts, which are divided between two different Support Teams under MVD's reorganization. Ruff said MVD is aware of this concern from the upper river and will strive to maintain integration among the three Districts.

Barb Naramore announced that the upcoming quarterly meeting schedule includes meetings on May 20, 2004 in St. Paul; August 12, 2004 in the Quad Cities; and November 18, 2004 in La Crosse. [Note: The November meeting location was subsequently shifted to St. Louis.]

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

**EMP-CC Attendance List
February 26, 2004**

Greg Ruff	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVD
Charlie Wooley	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3
Linda Leake	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Scott Stuewe	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Diane Ford-Shivvers	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Tim Schlagenhaft	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Janet Sternburg	Missouri Department of Conservation
Gretchen Benjamin	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Bob Goodwin	Maritime Administration
Rich Worthington	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters
Mike Thompson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVS
Tim George	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVS
Dan Erickson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVS
Roger Perk	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Marvin Hubbell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Tim Yager	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3
Don Hultman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, UMR Refuge
Dick Steinbach	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mark Twain
Karen Westphall	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mark Twain
Joyce Collins	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Barry Johnson	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Pat Heglund	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
John Chick	Illinois Natural History Survey
Mike McGhee	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Mike Wells	Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Gary Wooten	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Dan McGuinness	National Audubon Society
Holly Stoerker	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association
Barb Naramore	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association