

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

**May 20, 2010
Quarterly Meeting**

**Ramada Mall of America
Bloomington, Minnesota**

Kevin Foerster of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. on May 20, 2010. Other EMP-CC representatives present were Charles Barton (USACE), Mike Jawson (USGS), Rick Mollahan (IL DNR), Bernie Hoyer (IA DNR), Kevin Stauffer (MN DNR), Janet Sternburg (MO DoC), Jim Fischer (WI DNR), and Bill Franz (US EPA). A complete list of attendees follows these minutes.

Minutes of the February 24, 2010 Meeting

Jim Fischer moved and Janet Sternburg seconded a motion to approve the draft minutes of the February 24, 2010 meeting as prepared. The motion carried unanimously.

Program Management

FY 10 Fiscal Update

Marv Hubbell reviewed EMP's FY 10 appropriation and allocations within the program, as follows:

- Total appropriation — \$16.47 million
 - Regional Management — \$626,000*
 - LTRMP — \$4,983,180
 - HREPs — \$10,886,820
 - Program Model Certification and Regional HREP Support — \$250,000
 - MVP — \$2,691,046**
 - MVR — \$5,254,728
 - MVS — \$2,691,046**

* Includes \$26,000 in carry-over funds.

** MVP and MVS are each receiving \$500,000 less than they would under the typical allocation formula in order to “repay” MVR for inter-district transfers from FY 09.

Hubbell noted that most categories within the regional management account were reduced from FY 09, except for increased spending related to the 2010 Report to Congress. LTRMP's FY 10 efforts include base monitoring and three research projects. Hubbell said the Corps is supporting 22 HREPs in FY 10, including initiating construction on two projects. In addition, the Corps anticipates beginning planning on three to four new projects this year.

Hubbell observed that EMP's FY 10 first and second quarter expenditure rates are typical. He said expenditure rates increase significantly in third and fourth quarters, during the prime construction season.

FY 11 Budget Request

Hubbell said the President's FY 11 budget request for the EMP is \$21.15 million. However, the House and Senate Energy and Water Subcommittees have not yet marked up their bills, and the final appropriation may not be determined until after the November elections. EMP staff are assuming \$21.15 million in FY 11 for planning purposes.

Public Involvement and Outreach

Hubbell said the Corps has distributed the 2010 spring edition of its *Our Mississippi* newsletter, which included several articles featuring EMP, and installed the first *Our Mississippi* kiosk at Upper St. Anthony Falls.

Mike Jawson said USGS recently showcased LTRMP's Strategic and Operational Plan in briefings with Congressional staff. One staffer was especially interested in the potential for using LTRMP data to analyze climate change.

Don Powell described several recent and planned outreach activities related to Pool 8 Islands, including an island naming contest, an open house scheduled for mid-June, and boat tours in late June or early July. Powell said USFWS will sponsor additional naming contests as more islands are constructed.

Mark Gorman announced that the Northeast-Midwest Institute, in coordination with the Upper Mississippi River Basin Congressional Task Force and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, hosted an April 15, 2010 briefing for Congressional staffers regarding federal programs in the Mississippi River Basin. USACE, NRCS, and US EPA participated in the briefing.

2010 Report to Congress

Revised Process and Timeline

Marv Hubbell reported that, with partner concurrence subsequent to the February 24, 2010 EMP-CC quarterly meeting, he modified the planned approach to developing the 2010 Report to Congress (RTC). The previous scope and schedule were no longer feasible because of competing demands and delays in finalizing a contract. Also, at the February EMP-CC meeting, partners identified many policy- and program implementation-related issues that do not require Congressional action, but that are of considerable interest to the partnership. Under this new approach, partners will develop:

- A streamlined RTC that will focus solely on meeting the requirements of EMP's authorization and will be submitted to MVD on December 1, 2010.
- An Implementation Issues Assessment (IIA) that will address policy and program implementation-issues that do not require Congressional action to resolve. The IIA will be finalized by September 15, 2011.

Hubbell reported that USACE finalized a contract with UMRBA on May 18, 2010 for services related to the 2010 RTC and IIA, including editing, graphics (RTC only), and printing, as well as writing some portions of both documents. He outlined the following major milestones of the revised RTC schedule:

- July 19, 2010: Authors submit drafts of their assignments to UMRBA
- August 23 – September 24: Partners review draft RTC
- October 18 – November 5: Partners review revised draft RTC
- December 1, 2010: MVR submits final RTC to MVD

Janet Sternburg asked if the RTC and IIA volunteer authors are still committed to their assignments under this modified approach. Barb Naramore said a RTC Team conference call is scheduled for May 27, 2010, on which authorship responsibilities will be reconfirmed. Thus far, she said none of the authors have indicated they will not be able to meet their commitment. In response to a question from Kevin Foerster, Hubbell said the RTC Team members will also be involved in the IIA report, and that lead authors have been confirmed. Hubbell expressed appreciation to the RTC and IIA Team members and authors for their time and efforts.

Hubbell acknowledged that there will be significant overlap among several ongoing and upcoming EMP activities, including the IIA, the HREP Strategic Plan, the proposed HREP workshop, and updates to the HREP design manual. He suggested that the August 4, 2010 EMP-CC meeting include a discussion of the relationship among these activities.

Bernie Hoyer encouraged the RTC Team to evaluate habitat project outcomes in the 2010 RTC, though he acknowledged the difficulty of doing so. Hubbell said he anticipates that the Corps will have evaluation results for several projects, including Pools 8, 9, and 11, and Swan Lake.

In response to a suggestion from Bill Franz, Hubbell confirmed the RTC will detail the EMP's 2009 stimulus-funded activities and accomplishments. Hubbell observed that the \$13.5 million in stimulus funding allowed EMP to advance several priorities. Jim Fischer also suggested that the RTC highlight EMP's abilities to execute at a higher funding level.

RTC and IIA Implementation Issues

Hubbell summarized the RTC and IIA implementation issues, which include:

- RTC: EMP/NESP Transition Plan
- IIA: a) NGOs as cost share partners, b) cost sharing, c) HREP operations and maintenance, d) delegated authority, e) land acquisition, f) LTRMP program implementation, g) HREP planning and prioritization, h) HREP evaluation, i) trends/emerging issues, and j) EMP's habitat project types.

EMP-CC members concurred that these issues should be addressed in some fashion. In response to a question from Walt Popp, Hubbell said the *EMP Habitat Project Types* issues relates to EMP's ability to implement pool-scale water level management tools, as well as other innovative ecosystem restoration tools.

Hoyer suggested that the IIA address opportunities for the Corps to provide uniform tools across its UMRS restoration programs. Hubbell noted that EMP's authorization simply directs EMP to implement projects that benefit fish and wildlife, potentially providing significant flexibility in restoration approaches.

In response to a question from Foerster, Hubbell explained that the IIA might be used in a variety of ways, depending on the nature and scope of a particular issue. In the IIA, partners can direct recommendations to the Administration, Corps, and/or partners on how to resolve EMP's policy or program issues. Sternburg noted that the IIA could also provide a foundation for seeking changes to EMP's authorization through a future Water Resources Development Act or appropriations bill. Naramore mentioned that, since the IIA will not be a formal report to Congress, it provides greater latitude than the RTC for partners to discuss issues and make recommendations. At the same time, the IIA can still be used to communicate informally with Congress.

Fischer suggested that the IIA also evaluate ways to alleviate restoration projects' increasing demands on limited state resources. He observed that demands on state staff for project planning and permitting are significant. Hubbell said the HREP Strategic Plan could also address this issue. He acknowledged that EMP relies heavily on the states' participation in project planning.

Long Term Resource Monitoring

Product Highlights

Mike Jawson said LTRMP staff have added the 2009 aquatic vegetation data to the graphical browser. Jawson described the LTRMP's vegetation sampling results in Pools 4, 8, and 13. He noted that the pools' percent frequency of submersed aquatic vegetation (SAV) has increased over the past few years. Jawson said LTRMP staff gave nine presentations at the April 22-23, 2010 Mississippi River Research Consortium conference. Barry Johnson announced that the four-page FY 10-14 LTRMP Strategic and Operational Plan Fact Sheet is available upon request.

2010 Land Cover/Land Use Accuracy Assessment

Marv Hubbell noted that USGS will collect land cover/land use (LC/LU) photography this summer, which will be used to produce a new systemic LC/LU coverage, updating the 1989 and 2000 systemic coverages. He said the 1989 and 2000 efforts did not include an accuracy assessment, but asked EMP-CC members to consider whether an accuracy assessment should be completed for the 2010 project. Hubbell emphasized the importance of knowing the data's accuracy when using it for many purposes, such as measuring EMP's progress toward its goals and objectives.

Barry Johnson said USGS will collect about 10,000 aerial photographs for the 2010 LC/LU project using the same methods, boundaries, classes, and interpreters as the 2000 project, thereby enhancing comparability. Johnson explained that an accuracy assessment would attempt to answer whether 1) the locations are accurately mapped and 2) the classes are correctly identified.

Johnson said USGS is confident in its ability to accurately delineate borders and identify the appropriate cover classes, given its state-of-the-art equipment and well-defined quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) protocols. Contributing to the anticipated accuracy, the digital camera will directly incorporate GPS data into each photograph; computers will automatically create the geographical LC boundaries from the digital images; USGS will photograph during optimal light conditions; and a second interpreter reviews all classes and borders for each map. He suggested that the real question is whether the accuracy of the 2010 LC/LU project should be quantified.

Johnson compared two potential methods for a 2010 LC/LU accuracy assessment, as follows:

Field-Based Accuracy Assessment	Map-Based Validation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-person team compares map classes with vegetation in the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-person team compares map classes with another interpretation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team generates random sampling points (1 ha) based on area of natural/semi-natural map classes (~ 15,187 points in the UMRS or ~ 63 to 629 per pool/reach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team generates random sampling points (1 ha) based on area of all map classes (~ 20,397 points in the UMRS or ~ 123 to 784 per pool/reach)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team assigns a class for the existing vegetation at each sampling point in the field, then identifies inconsistencies with the original LC map. This is a two-step approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team assigns a class at each sampling point using the photographs, and simultaneously identifies inconsistencies. This is a one-step approach.

Field-Based Accuracy Assessment	Map-Based Validation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team analyzes associated error with any mismatches – i.e., field or mapping error 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team analyzes associated error with any mismatches and verifies in the field, if needed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require purchasing or borrowing additional field equipment, and receiving permission to access private property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional equipment needed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be completed in two or three years, after the original LC/LU project is finalized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be completed within one year, after original LC/LU project is finalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total estimated cost is about \$3,330,000 (\$27,490 to \$132,729 per pool/reach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total estimated cost is about \$1,090,000 (\$12,020 to \$37,263 per pool/reach)

Johnson said less expensive options include:

- Employing one of the options above in one or two representative pools in each floodplain reach
- Testing in some (or all) trend pools (4, 8, 13, 26, Open River, and La Grange), likely minimizing the need for field verification since LTRMP staff already have extensive knowledge of the local vegetation
 - A trend pool accuracy assessment would cost about \$600,000
 - A trend pool map validation would cost about \$190,000
- Analyzing some combination of trend and other pools
- Employing some combination of field assessment and map validation
- Assessing or validating a few pools, and then evaluating the need for further analysis

Johnson noted that it is more critical to stratify sampling based on complexity and inclusion of critical cover classes than spatially.

Jawson observed that UMESC is known for providing high-quality LC/LU photography, and has done extensive work for the National Park Service. Jim Fischer said UMESC’s emphasis on QA/QC is one of its strengths. He emphasized the value of having quantified confidence levels associated with LTRMP’s data, and said this should be a priority in the 2010 LC/LU project. Fischer suggested that a combination of field-based assessment and map validation methods would be the most appropriate, given the associated cost and confidence considerations.

In response to a question from Rick Mollahan, Johnson and Chuck Theiling explained that the coverage will extend laterally within the 500-year floodplain. Not all terraces and areas up in the valleys will be captured.

Bernie Hoyer endorsed Fischer’s recommendation for a hybrid assessment approach. He also suggested that USGS stratify its random sampling parameters, regardless of method, to increase sampling in significant land classes, such as those serving as important indicators. Johnson said USGS’s LC/LU protocols typically involve statistically-valid methods to stratify sampling by class and area.

Hubbell summarized that, as a next step, USGS will develop a draft accuracy assessment plan for the EMP-CC’s review. This kind of plan will involve some sampling approach. Barb Naramore noted that some of the more intensive accuracy assessments could cost more than the actual data acquisition. Hubbell said that could be true, especially for field-based assessments. He said the estimated data acquisition cost is between \$2 million and \$2.5 million. EMP-CC members stressed their desire for a rigorous and informative, but cost-conscious, assessment.

Hoyer suggested that, if the accuracy assessment focuses on trend pools, USGS should also be certain to assess accuracy between Pools 13 and 26. Johnson reiterated that assessing complex cover classes is the most important factor in determining the data's accuracy. In response to a question from Mollahan, Johnson said USGS anticipates the 2010 LC/LU will be available for use in two to four years, depending on funding and other factors.

A-Team

Chair's Report

Kevin Stauffer reported on the A-Team's April 21, 2010 meeting, which included program and budget updates and three LTRMP presentations. At the meeting, the A-Team also endorsed the final draft Purpose Statement for its *Ad Hoc* Indicators Group, agreed to recommend to the EMP-CC that it develop EMP-CC and A-Team charters, and concluded that the A-Team Chair will compile an annual LTRMP accomplishments list. The accomplishments list will showcase LTRMP's contributions that are not typically captured in other publications. These lists will be posted on the A-Team's web page.

According to Stauffer, the A-Team first discussed forming the *Ad Hoc* Indicators Group in December 2008, for the purposes of evaluating and refining the 2008 Status and Trends Report's indicators and identifying any new potential indicators for future reports and related efforts, such as a possible UMRS ecosystem health report card. Stauffer said the Indicators Group anticipates submitting a draft report assessing the 2008 Status and Trends Report's indicators to the A-Team for review this August. Upon the A-Team's approval, the draft report will then be submitted to the EMP-CC. Stauffer said the Indicators Group will also develop an approach for identifying potential targets for each indicator. He said sub-groups will focus on fish- and macroinvertebrate-related indicators.

Marv Hubbell, Janet Sternburg, and Bernie Hoyer expressed appreciation for the A-Team's efforts in developing the Group's Purpose Statement. Hubbell noted that this is the first time the A-Team has developed a purpose statement for a major effort, and said this is a very meaningful way to communicate the Team's future plans.

Jim Fischer moved and Hoyer seconded a motion to endorse the A-Team's Purpose Statement for the *Ad Hoc* Indicators Group. The motion passed unanimously.

Future Function and Composition

Sternburg recalled that, at its August 2009 quarterly meeting, the EMP-CC asked an A-Team *ad hoc* group to consider the following issues related to the A-Team's function and composition:

- The value of inviting to additional state and federal agency staff, NGOs, and academics to participate in specific A-Team discussions to broaden the range of expertise involved when needed
- The types of positions members can/should hold within their own agencies
- Expanding the A-Team's current formal membership
- The A-Team's roles and responsibilities in light of the LTRMP's Strategic and Operational Plan and a possible future EMP/NESP transition
- An A-Team charter

Sternburg reported that the *ad hoc* group agreed to develop an A-Team charter, using the draft 1999 EMP-CC and A-Team Joint Charter as a foundation. She said the charter components might include the A-Team's purpose, membership, roles and responsibilities, and operation. The *ad hoc* group participants include Bill Franz, Rick Frietsche, Jim Fischer, Marvin Hubbell, Karen Hagerty, Bob Hrabik, Barry Johnson, Kat McCain, Walt Popp, Stauffer, and Sternburg. On behalf of the group,

Sternburg asked the EMP-CC to consider whether the *ad hoc* group should expand its current effort, to develop a joint EMP-CC/A-Team charter. If the scope is expanded to a joint charter, Sternburg said the *ad hoc* group should also expand its composition.

In response to a question from Jon Duyvejonck, Sternburg explained that an A-Team charter would facilitate a possible EMP/NESP transition by articulating the Team's goals and functions. She said that since the A-Team and Science Panel serve in different capacities, they would not be conflicting. Hubbell added that an A-Team charter would 1) articulate and codify the A-Team's operations, including partner roles, which would be of significant value to the EMP's ongoing implementation and 2) provide a tool for communicating the A-Team's functions in any future transition.

Jawson suggested that the EMP-CC and A-Team charters be developed individually. Sternburg agreed that the EMP-CC's and A-Team's roles should be explicitly separate. However, she recalled that the draft 1999 EMP-CC/A-Team Joint Charter was helpful in that, while maintaining their distinct roles, it described areas of overlap and served as a central document for both groups. Barb Naramore explained that the partners developed the draft 1999 EMP-CC and A-Team Joint Charter to recognize the interrelationships between the two groups and their individual responsibilities. In fact, the 2005 Roles and Expectations for the EMP-CC and A-Team directly reflects the draft 1999 Joint Charter. Charles Barton agreed that the *ad hoc* group should draft separate charters for the two bodies, and suggested that the group consider expanding its composition to include another EMP-CC representative in addition to the two members already serving on the group. He also observed that there will be sufficient preparation time in the event of a future transition and advised the *ad hoc* group to focus on EMP's current needs.

Fischer moved and Jawson seconded a motion for an expanded *ad hoc* group to develop individual charters for the EMP-CC and A-Team, and for the EMP-CC to reconsider the question of whether and how to link the charters after they are developed. The motion carried unanimously.

Ad Hoc Indicators Group

Hagerty said the A-Team's *ad hoc* Indicators Group includes Karen Hagerty (co-chair), Barry Johnson (co-chair), Nate De Jager, Terry Dukerschein, Bill Franz, Jim Fischer, Tex Hawkins (formerly Rick Frietsche and Eric Nelson), Charlie Hanneken, Jeff Houser, Bob Hrabik Brian Ickes, Len Kring, Rob Maher, Kat McCain, Dave Potter, Jim Ragala, Kevin Stauffer, and Yao Yin.

Hagerty said the Indicators Group anticipates assessing the 2008 Status and Trends Report's indicators, setting targets and benchmarks, and exploring the potential use of additional (beyond the Status and Trends Report) UMR indicators of ecosystem health and management. Hagerty said the Indicators Group meet twice to review the Report's indicators, and plans to meet this summer to discuss the fish-and macroinvertebrate-related indicators. She said the Indicators Group's efforts will compliment the UMRS Reach Planning.

LTRMP Showcase: Submersed Macrophytes as a UMR Indicator or Ecosystem Health

Megan Moore, of the Minnesota DNR, presented on the Lake City and La Crosse Field Stations' effort to assess the potential uses of submersed macrophyte vegetation as an indicator of ecosystem health on the UMR. The Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program—Great River Ecosystems (EMAP—GRE) funded part of this research.

Moore explained that submersed macrophytes have several advantages for use as a biological indicator. Specifically macrophytes are:

- mostly immobile, and therefore cannot avoid unfavorable conditions;

- responsive to short- and long-term hydrologic, nutrient, and chemical events;
- relatively easy to sample and identify; and
- relatively inexpensive to monitor, especially since annual sampling may suffice.

Moore said the project sampling area extended from the Twin Cities to L&D 11 (about 288 miles). One hundred longitudinally stratified random sites were sampled in each 7-digit hydrological unit, with a focus on shallow portions of the main and side channels and adjacent areas. Moore said the research focused on the main and side channels because they are closely linked to tributary impacts and are efficient to sample. The team used rakes to determine the presence and amount of vegetation at each site.

Moore explained that, using LTRMP methodologies, a submersed macrophyte index (SMI) was developed using maximum depth, frequency, species richness, and total rake score as metrics. The SMI showed a significant increase along the longitudinal gradient from the Twin Cities to Pool 11, and an indirect correlation to a decrease in human disturbance. Moore said it appears the index could be used to establish CWA impairment thresholds. The Mississippi Makeover project has also used submersed aquatic vegetation to set its restoration goals. In response to a question from Hubbell, Moore said the SMI could be used to evaluate large-scale restoration activities, such as pool-scale drawdowns, and could possibly be used for small-scale restoration activities, if the data is aggregated to reduce potential effects from outliers.

Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Projects

District Reports

Brian Markert reported that MVS plans to complete Agency Technical Review (ATR) for Ted Shanks and Rip Rap Landing this year. Alternatives formulation is underway for Wilkinson Island. Market said the District is waiting on the final go-ahead to initiate construction on Pools 25/26 Islands, anticipates awarding contracts for Batchtown dredging and Swan Lake pump station modification this fall, and plans to finalize construction of Calhoun and a performance evaluation for Swan Lake this fiscal year.

Jeff DeZellar said MVP's FY 10 construction priority remains Pool 8 Islands Stage 3A. Construction on Stage 3B is expected to begin this summer. DeZellar said the 2009 stimulus funding advanced progress on Stage 3B by about one year. MVP plans to complete DPRs for Capoli Slough in FY 10 and Harper's Slough in late FY 10/early FY 11. Construction for Capoli will likely take place in FY 11-12, with Harper's following in FY 12-13. DeZellar reported that Tom Novak will be the new project manager for the L&D 3 fish passage study. MVP anticipates completing a DPR for the fish passage project by February 2011. DeZellar reported that the District has four newly approved fact sheets (Conway Lake, Lake Winneskiek, McGregor Lake, and L&D 3 fish passage), and recently submitted five more fact sheets to MVD for approval.

Marv Hubbell said MVR is developing plans and specifications for Fox Island and Rice Lake, and anticipates awarding contracts for their construction this fiscal year. District staff continue to plan Pool 12 Overwintering, with an anticipated construction start in late FY 11 or early FY 12. Hubbell said construction is underway at Lake Odessa. He reported that MVR is focusing its biological monitoring on Pool 12. Hubbell explained that MVR's FY 10 USFWS contract is well above the typical agreement, to support the added increment of work associated with the 2008 flood recovery efforts.

New Planning Starts

Hubbell reported that EMP staff are in the process of preparing 24 fact sheets and submitting them to MVD for approval. This includes the 18 projects the System Ecological Team (SET) endorsed in 2007 and projects the UMRS reach planning teams are currently identifying. He suggested that EMP-CC's August 4, 2010 meeting include a discussion on using the 2003 HREP Planning and Sequencing Framework to select and sequence future HREPs.

Chuck Theiling overviewed EMP's history related to HREP selection and sequencing. He noted that, in the program's early years, EMP used a matrix approach to select projects. However, partners called for increased transparency in the 1997 EMP Report to Congress. As a result, the EMP-CC endorsed the first Habitat Needs Assessment in 1998 and the HREP Planning and Sequencing Framework in 2003. The Framework called for the SET to evaluate potential ecological benefits of proposed projects at a system scale. Through structured decision making, the SET endorsed 18 projects for the Program Planning Team's (PPT's) consideration.

Theiling explained that the 2003 Framework directs the SET to consider each project's potential to achieve UMRS ecosystem objectives and natural river processes, consistency with regional and national goals, ability to stage and couple management actions, and long-term sustainability. However, after the first planning iteration, the SET concluded that the process allowed for their coordinated review of projects, but was labor-intensive and somewhat inconsistent, depending on members' familiarity with the project area and amount of detail provided in the project fact sheet.

Theiling said that, to lessen the potential for subjectivity, the SET recommended employing a structured decision making process to facilitate their future work. Since 2007, Theiling said the EMP-CC and NECC have jointly developed UMRS and floodplain and geomorphic goals and objectives and are currently in the process of identifying projects through UMRS reach planning, which he described as foundationally similar to the 2003 Framework.

Theiling encouraged partners to select UMRS objectives that can be represented through current DSS parameters and determine metrics that can define quality in their future efforts.

Hubbell suggested that, at its August 4, 2010 quarterly meeting, the EMP-CC discuss options for using structure decision making to select and sequence future HREPs.

HREP Database

Hubbell reported that Corps staff are currently reviewing data that will be incorporated into the HREP database portion of the EMP/NESP Decision Support System (DSS) (<http://umesc-gisdb03.er.usgs.gov/umr/dss.aspx>). Hubbell said the Corps has developed several standardized formats for providing HREP information to various stakeholders. Corps staff will also supply customized reports upon request. Hubbell asked partners to contact him (marvin.e.hubbell@usace.army.mil) with any input on the DSS's website format and reporting style.

HREP Showcase: Rice Lake

Marv Hubbell overviewed the Rice Lake habitat project, which is in its final planning stages and is estimated to cost about \$20 million, including \$7 million in land value. The project will cover approximately 6,200 acres owned by the Illinois DNR. Under the typical 65 percent federal/35 percent non-federal cost-share agreement, the Illinois DNR received cost share credit for the project land value.

However, Rick Mollahan said Illinois DNR used USFWS funds to purchase some of the land, eliminating Illinois DNR's eligibility to receive credit for those lands.

Hubbell said Rice Lake will improve floodplain connectivity, restore floodplain forest, protect cultural resources, and create habitat for mid-migration waterfowl, shorebirds, and fish. Construction is expected to begin this September and is scheduled for completion in FY 13. He explained that challenges and issues related to planning Rice Lake have included establishing land values, navigation servitude, new Corps guidance regarding project review, mining related issues, and maintaining floodplain connectivity. Mollahan noted that the project's reliance on pumps will increase annual operating costs, but said he has worked with the site managers to ensure they are budgeting for these expenses.

Other Business

Marv Hubbell introduced Renee Turner, the new District Support Team Deputy for the UMR districts.

In response to a comment from Jim Fischer, Barry Johnson said USGS staff are discussing ways to increase acknowledgement of the EMP and LTRMP in their publications.

Upcoming quarterly meetings are as follows:

- **August 2010 — La Crosse**
 - UMRBA — August 3
 - **EMP-CC — August 4**
 - NECC — August 10 (Web-based)

- **November 2010 — Quad Cities**
 - UMRBA — November 16
 - NECC — November 17
 - **Joint EMP-CC and NECC — afternoon of November 17 (if needed)**
 - **EMP-CC — November 18**

- **February 2011 — St. Louis**
 - UMRBA — February 15
 - **EMP-CC — February 16**
 - **Joint EMP-CC/NECC — afternoon of February 16 (if needed)**
 - NECC — February 17

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

**EMP-CC Attendance List
May 20, 2010**

EMP-CC Members

Charles Barton	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVD
Kevin Foerster	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, UMR Refuge
Mike Jawson	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Rick Mollahan	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Bernie Hoyer	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Kevin Stauffer	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Janet Sternburg	Missouri Department of Conservation
Jim Fischer	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Bill Franz	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5

Others In Attendance

Renee Turner	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVD
Jeff DeZellar	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Don Powell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Tom Crump	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Kevin Bluhm	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Chris Erickson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Jon Hendrickson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Marvin Hubbell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Karen Hagerty	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Chuck Theiling	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Brian Markert	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVS
Jon Duyvejonck	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, RIFO
Barry Johnson	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Walt Popp	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Megan Moore	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Robert Stout	Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Jeff Lee	Barr Engineering
Brad Walker	Izaak Walton League
Mark Prancus	JFNew
Mark Gorman	Northeast-Midwest Institute
Gretchen Benjamin	The Nature Conservancy
Barb Naramore	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association
Dave Hokanson	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association
Nat Kale	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association
Kirsten Mickelsen	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association