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

August 23, 2007
Quarterly Meeting

Radisson Hotel
La Crosse, Wisconsin

Charles Barton of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. on August 23, 2007. Other EMP-CC representatives present were Dick Steinbach (USFWS), Barry Johnson (USGS), Rick Mollahan (IL DNR), Mike Griffin (IA DNR), Tim Schlagenhaft (MN DNR), Gretchen Benjamin (WI DNR), and Bill Franz (USEPA). A list of attendees follows these minutes.

Jeff DeZellar announced the availability of a new report summarizing the water level management projects on Pools 5 and 8. He noted that a companion report providing more technical detail on the Pool 8 drawdown is forthcoming. DeZellar thanked Tim Schlagenhaft for his leadership in chairing the Water Level Management Task Force and Ruth Nissen for her considerable efforts in developing the reports. Schlagenhaft thanked participants from a variety of agencies, and noted the LTRMP's provision of important data.

Minutes from the May 23, 2007 Meeting

Tim Schlagenhaft offered the following two modifications to the draft minutes of the May 23, 2007 EMP-CC meeting:

1. The heading on p. 2 of the minutes should read "EMP's Ability to Address Ecosystem Restoration Needs," not "EPA's Ability…"
2. The penultimate sentence of the final full paragraph on p. 3 should read "Schlagenhaft noted that NESP calls for 35,000 acres of floodplain restoration in the first increment of ecosystem restoration," not "…35,000 acres of land acquisition…."

Gretchen Benjamin moved and Mike Griffin seconded a motion to approve the draft minutes with these changes. The motion carried unanimously.

Program Management

Marv Hubbell reported that, due to the series of short term continuing resolution authorities (CRAs) under which the Corps operated through March 2007, EMP obligations are a bit behind where they would typically be at this point in the fiscal year. However, all three districts are working on plans and specifications for contract awards; and Hubbell said he expects to obligate virtually all of the EMP's FY 07 funds by the end of September.

Mike Griffin said it seems to him that the EMP does more than its share of Section 8(a) contracting. Griffin said that, despite rules to the contrary, he is convinced 8(a) contracts cost more. He encouraged the Corps not to overburden the HREP program with these contracts. Gary Loss expressed doubt that the EMP executes a disproportionate share of 8(a) contracts relative to the Corps' other construction

projects. Loss said MVR makes a conscious effort to spread the 8(a) contracts around, while also trying to select projects on which 8(a) contractors are likely to be successful.

Hubbell reported that the House-passed FY 08 energy and water appropriations measure includes $23.464 million for the EMP. This is the same amount requested by the Administration. The full Senate has not yet acted on its bill, but the Senate Appropriations Committee approved $18.0 million for the EMP. For planning purposes, Hubbell said the Corps is assuming FY 08 appropriations will be approximately $20.0 million for the EMP.

Public Outreach

Marv Hubbell reported that the Corps sent letters to members of the Congressional delegation informing them of various opportunities to tour HREPs during the August recess. Don Powell said MVP had made arrangements to give Representatives Kind and Walz a tour of Pool 8 in early August. However, bad weather precluded the trip. Instead, a tour and press conference were held at UMESC. The EMP, WRDA, and Representative Kind's sediment and nutrient bill were highlighted.

Hubbell said Corps staff continue efforts to develop new EMP displays and handout materials, as well as the Dubuque Museum display. In addition, Colonel Sinkler has had recent sessions with two editorial boards in the Quad Cities. The Colonel highlighted both EMP and NESP ecosystem restoration when talking with both boards. Hubbell said an HREP was recently nominated as the Corps' national project of the month. As part of the nomination process, the Corps developed a comprehensive list of other awards both the HREP and LTRMP components have received.

Mike Griffin said both the EMP postcards and DVD have proven to be very effective and convenient ways to educate the public about the program.

Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Projects

Statutory and Policy Limitations on Project Types

Marv Hubbell reported that the Corps has not yet completed its written response to the questions raised at the May EMP-CC meeting concerning limitations on certain kinds of HREP measures under the EMP. However, he provided the following overview of the Corps' anticipated response:

- *Threatened and endangered (T&E) species* — the question is essentially whether the Corps can do HREPs at 100 percent federal funding based on Section 906(e) of WRDA 86. This provision explicitly authorizes 100 percent federal funding for restoration projects that benefit federally listed species. However, explained Hubbell, this conflicts with ER 1105-2-100, which provides that projects will not be formulated to benefit a single species. As a matter of fact, the Corps has not previously supported projects that would result in 100 percent federal funding based on T&E benefits, though it has formulated projects that benefit a range of species, including T&E species, and will continue to do so. Hubbell said MVD will elevate this issue with Corps Headquarters to seek review and clarification regarding how to apply this authority and policy to the EMP. Charles Barton said MVD will share its review request with the program partners before submitting it to HQ.

  Several EMP-CC members asked questions concerning the origin of the policy against single species projects and principles for resolving conflicts between authority and policy. Terry Smith said he would have to do additional research about the foundation of the policy. Regarding conflicts between authority and policy, Barton observed that there is no conflict if an authority simply allows, rather than directs, the Corps to do something that the Corps, as a matter of policy, elects not to do.

Mike Griffin asked for clarification on a related question — i.e., the distinction between ecosystem restoration and aquatic restoration, from the Corps' perspective. Griffin emphasized that the EMP is about ecosystem restoration and said attempts to narrow its scope to aquatic systems are potentially very problematic, depending on how those systems are defined. Smith said this distinction is under very active discussion currently within the Corps. Hubbell said the Fox Island HREP raises these kinds of questions and will be an opportunity to explore the boundaries and connections between ecosystem and aquatic restoration.

- *Pool scale water level management* — with the exception of one small project early in the program, water level management projects have not been pursued under the EMP. More recent pool drawdowns have combined various authorities and funding sources, including O&M money. However, MVD is willing to consider a pool scale drawdown proposal under the EMP, contingent on the proposal having gone through the standard project development process. Hubbell emphasized that several issues would have to be addressed before a pool scale water level management project could be implemented under EMP. These issues include impacts to navigation operations, dredging to maintain commercial and recreational uses, mussel impacts, and the 50-year design life standard.

  Tim Schlagenhaft observed that the 50-year design life standard may be particularly challenging. According to Schlagenhaft, it is not possible to estimate the durability of drawdown effects at the project outset and thus not possible to say when the management action would need to be repeated. Hubbell suggested that one approach might be to specify upfront the conditions in the pool that would trigger additional drawdowns. Don Powell said this is how he would be inclined to structure a drawdown project under the EMP. He noted that the project plan would also need to consider the possibility of conditions precluding a drawdown in a particular year. Jeff DeZellar described a pending report on the Pools 5 and 8 drawdowns that will, among other things, attempt to define key thresholds that mark the point at which it is worth repeating a drawdown.

  Barry Johnson observed that these types of challenges are precisely the kinds of things that adaptive management efforts will need to address. Johnson said the institutional capability to perform adaptive management, and support the move from experiments to management strategies, is critical. Hubbell concurred, and suggested that it might be helpful to explore these issues in the context of individual cases before attempting to craft an overall management structure to support adaptive management. In response to a question from Johnson, Hubbell said the Corps would define the "project" in the case of water level management as one pool over time.

  Terry Smith said the Corps wants an approach to water level management projects that fosters long term, systemic benefits. Powell observed that one challenge of recurring project costs is the issue of committing future program funds. DeZellar said it would also be difficult to project the timelines for future drawdown needs. Hubbell agreed, but said there is an opportunity now to explore these issues in the context of a particular project proposal. Hubbell said he views this as a very good thing for the program. Schlagenhaft agreed, and said he was pleased to see the Corps' openness on these issues.

- *Land acquisition* — per a 1994 memo from Corps Headquarters to the NCD Commander, and the WRDA 99 implementation guidance, EMP funds cannot be used directly to purchase LERRDs[1]. However, the non-federal sponsor can receive credit for the value of LERRDs they contribute to a project. Under the WRDA 99 implementation guidance, this is permitted regardless of whether they owned the lands/interests prior to execution of the project cooperation agreement (PCA). However,

[1] LERRDs=lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocation of utilities or other existing structures, and disposal areas.

these LERRDs must be a necessary component of a project that also includes a construction element. Hubbell explained that credit is not made until after the PCA is signed.

Schlagenhaft noted that many potential floodplain restoration projects may not have a construction element in the near term—i.e., the construction piece does not become feasible until LERRDs are acquired from multiple willing sellers over a period of years. Schlagenhaft said that it may not be possible to get to the construction stage if acquisition costs are not cost shared along the way. In response to a question from Schlagenhaft, Smith explained that the Corps must consider how a project is providing benefits. For example, since the Corps is not a land management agency, it would not be in a position to acquire land that is already restored. However, the Corps could consider a project in which land is first acquired and then restored. For a restoration effort involving multiple acquisitions over a period of years, Hubbell explained that it might be possible to formulate several discrete projects that could stand alone. However, the individual projects could not consist solely of land acquisition.

Hubbell noted that Illinois is not seeking to be reimbursed for LERRDs costs exceeding the required non-federal cost share on the Rice Lake HREP. Barb Naramore cautioned that this should not be presumed to be the default position of all states or NGOs in similar circumstances. She said it is entirely possible that a state would seek reimbursement for LERRDs costs exceeding 35 percent of total project costs in another instance. Catherine McCalvin concurred, noting that The Nature Conservancy might well seek reimbursement in order to cycle those funds into the acquisition of additional lands. Rick Mollahan said Illinois might seek to apply its excess LERRDs credits from the Rice Lake project to another project on the same portion of the river.

Schlagenhaft observed that the Root River project proposed under NESP is an example of the type of complex acquisition effort that might need to be pursued in phases. He asked whether NESP funds would be available to restart the Root River planning effort in order to explore some of these issues more fully in the context of a specific project. Chuck Spitzack expressed confidence that this could be done, particularly if the WRDA authorization is passed.

Mike Griffin asked whether the Corps has ever reimbursed a sponsor under the EMP when LERRDs costs exceeded the non-federal share. Hubbell said this has not been done under the EMP. However, Charles Barton said the Corps has reimbursed sponsors under other programs.

HREP Data

Hubbell reported that the status of the Corps' HREP database is unchanged since the May meeting. Problems in linking the GIS and Access components have not been resolved. Currently, according to Hubbell, the Corps can query the Access data, but cannot use the spatial features. He said the Corps remains willing to retrieve data on behalf of program partners and stakeholders. Regarding the question Gretchen Benjamin raised at the May EMP-CC meeting, Hubbell said he had not yet reflected on whether UMESC should serve HREP data as part of an effort to develop more of a "one-stop-shop" for UMRS data.

Chuck Theiling briefly described efforts by Corps and UMESC staff to develop an ecosystem restoration decision support system (DSS) for NESP. HREP data has been included in the DSS and is, in fact, the only restoration data currently included. Hubbell said the Corps would report back at the November EMP-CC meeting on the relationship of this DSS to the HREP database.

Update on LTRMP Data Utilization Pilot

Hubbell said that, after consulting with staff in the three Corps districts, Jason Rohweder has been coordinating with other UMESC staff to implement the $50,000 pilot effort to enhance HREP utilization of LTRMP data. Rohweder then gave a brief presentation summarizing his work. After initial consultations with MVP and MVS concerning the two districts' priorities, Rohweder said he and others developed wind fetch and wave models for use in evaluating alternative island designs. He described the function and application of these models, as well as the range of data sources used. For MVR, Rohweder's efforts this year have focused on developing pre- and post-project monitoring to evaluate the Pool 12 over wintering project.

Kip Runyon said Rohweder's work this year has been very helpful. Runyon said he expects to use the models extensively in designing the Swan Lake Islands. Don Powell said MVP has also been very satisfied with the pilot project results. Hubbell said the pre- and post-project monitoring plan developed for the Pool 12 project should be very helpful in examining adaptive management applications.

Gretchen Benjamin said Rohweder's work appears to be quite good, but said she had anticipated more of a focus on how LTRMP data could be used to support HREPs. Schlagenhaft concurred, emphasizing that he hoped this effort would help identify current limitations with the LTRMP data. Mike Griffin said he would rather see program resources go to building islands rather than demonstrating their value repeatedly. Griffin also said he would like to see more monitoring data used. Rick Mollahan said the new models look good and would have been quite helpful in refining the Peoria Lake island designs.

In response to a question from Griffin, Hubbell said there is not much work remaining to be done under the FY 07 pilot effort. Hubbell said he would work to ensure that FY 08 efforts under this initiative place greater emphasis on using LTRMP data to the maximum extent possible. Yao Yin cautioned that the controlling factors are different on different river reaches and thus our models should not assume that what works in one area works in another. As an example, he noted that water level fluctuations and turbidity are generally higher on the lower river, so the vegetation response to island creation may be quite different than it has been on the upper river. Theiling agreed and said he envisions models that take account of those reach differences. Hank DeHaan noted that the models developed do, in fact, make use of the LTRMP's land cover/land use and bathymetry data, though they do not use component data.

HREP Planning and Sequencing

Hubbell distributed a brief written report and summarized the current status of the HREP System Ecological Team (SET). Key issues for the SET include:

1. Finalizing its summary report, as outlined to the EMP-CC in May 2007
2. Moving forward on some of the identified next steps
3. Linking SET efforts with the LTRMP Strategic Planning work and other initiatives

Hubbell proposed an approach that would build on other related efforts to identify EMP/UMRS goals and objectives. He stressed the need to divide responsibilities into manageable units. He then outlined a potential approach, moving from vision and mission statements to the development of goals and objectives that would inform the selection of HREP actions and LTRMP indicators. Hubbell suggested that the ecosystem restoration objectives would be categorized into seven habitat classes and would be defined and prioritized for each of 12 geomorphic reaches. Indicators would then be developed for these objectives and these indicators would help shape LTRMP monitoring and research priorities through the LTRMP's strategic plan. Hubbell provided an example of how this might work, describing

a possible backwater restoration objective for a particular reach and the related reach-scale design criteria.

Chuck Spitzack emphasized the need for shared ecosystem vision, goals, and objectives for the UMRS. Hubbell agreed, and stressed his desire to build on work that has been done to-date. He said the SET intends to focus on UMRS, not EMP, objectives.

Barb Naramore observed that Hubbell had presented some very interesting ideas, but said the EMP-CC members' ability to respond thoughtfully was quite limited, given that this is their first exposure to his proposal. She suggested identifying a process for continuing the discussion. Hubbell said he would like an indication from EMP-CC members today as to whether they believe this is a productive direction to move. Hank DeHaan emphasized that the Corps' goal is to develop a structure that allows the partnership to move forward with prioritization. Various EMP-CC members and meeting participants identified several efforts on which any SET effort should build, including the NESP Science Panel's soon-to-be-released report, the Illinois River Section 519 work, pool plans, and the Middle Mississippi partnership's reach plans.

Dick Steinbach emphasized the need for EMP and NESP to be consistent. In response to a question from Tim Schlagenhaft, Hubbell said the SET would facilitate the process and provide data, but would not be responsible for defining goals and objectives. He said resource experts on the system would need to do this, perhaps through a series of SET-sponsored workshops. Objectives for a particular reach would be set by the resource professionals working on that reach. Naramore asked how this would differ from similar efforts under the Habitat Needs Assessment (HNA) and pool planning initiatives. Chuck Theiling said the differences include the geographic scope (i.e., system scale), emphasis on past conditions and changes, and focus on what we might do differently. DeHaan said another key difference would be in how we capture and standardize the information to inform our selection of management actions and indicators. Theiling distributed a handout showing an example of potential reach scale design criteria.

Ken Lubinski stressed that the NESP Science Panel has endeavored to establish ecological goals and objectives independent of program authority, so that they are true system goals and objectives applicable to multiple programs. Hubbell said the SET is not proposing to establish goals and objectives that fall wholly outside of the EMP authority.

Holly Stoerker asked why such an effort is needed now — i.e., what impediments does the EMP face in the absence of explicitly articulated goals and objectives? Hubbell cited two primary challenges:

1. Without goals and objectives, the SET cannot assess and compare proposed projects' merits on a system basis. This stymied the SET earlier in the year when the group attempted to evaluate and prioritize projects under the 2003 HREP Planning and Sequencing Framework.
2. EMP and/or system goals and objectives would help tremendously in guiding LTRMP strategic planning decisions.

Gretchen Benjamin asked whether there is a pressing need for the SET to select new projects for planning. Hubbell said MVS's immediate need for new projects was already addressed with the decision to move forward with Pool 24 Islands and Rip Rap Landing in the absence of a SET recommendation. However, Hubbell said there is a second, implicit, part to Benjamin's question — i.e., is it worth going through a goals and objectives effort at this time? He noted that the 2003 framework does not allow us to choose well among projects. The SET's proposed approach would facilitate these choices and provide transparency by allowing SET members to evaluate projects relative to the benefits they would provide. As such, Hubbell said he believes the effort would be worth it, even given the uncertainty surrounding the EMP's future. Spitzack concurred, stressing that this planning

would not be program-specific. The resulting insights regarding system goals and objectives would serve the needs of NESP, as well as EMP. DeHaan said the intent would not be to get down to design criteria and other highly detailed questions.

After further discussion among EMP-CC members and observers, it was agreed that Hubbell would prepare a white paper detailing his recommended approach to developing system goals and objectives. This will include a strategy for identifying habitat-based restoration priorities and articulating key indicators to guide the LTRMP. Hubbell said his paper will also address the coordination between EMP and NESP on such an effort.

Long Term Resource Monitoring Program

Strategies for Developing Status and Trends Information

Barry Johnson outlined potential options and strategies for developing status and trends information for the UMRS. He described the current monitoring design, with its focus on six trend pools/areas, and identified some of the capabilities and limitations of this approach:

- We have lots of data on a wide range of conditions in our six trend pools/areas.
- We can identify trends in those areas.
- We can use status data to analyze relations.
- We can use data in these trend areas as pre-project data to evaluate HREPs and other management actions.
- We can't make direct estimates of conditions in the unsampled pools (i.e., design based estimates), though we can make inferences (i.e., model based estimates) using what we can determine about similarities among locations.
- We don't have control or reference pools where we are not making any improvements.

Johnson explained that, if knowing trends in our six key pools/areas is not sufficient, then we have options for modifying the program, including:

- Add more focal areas
- Replace focal pools with a rotating design that samples all pools over a 3-5 year period
- Add sampling in reaches that are not currently sampled, but use lower levels of effort — i.e., a rapid protocol that focuses on trends

Johnson observed that the EMP has relied mainly on the analysis of LTRMP status data to determine relations among variables. The LTRMP has not done much experimentation or hypothesis testing. Johnson asserted that a more complete approach under NESP would be to combine long term monitoring with more focal studies and increased HREP evaluation, including designing multiple HREPs for learning at large scales. As we move to a new phase on the UMRS, Johnson posed the following questions for partners' consideration:

- We need continued information on trends, but over what spatial scales?
- We need continued information on status to analyze relations, assess the long term dynamics of indicators, and look for cyclical behavior, but in how many locations?
- How can we use the opportunities provided by NESP to improve our ability to determine relations among components and address specific research questions through focal studies?

Mike Griffin asked Johnson whether we have enough data to determine how event-driven the system is. Johnson said some events, such as the 1993 flood's impact on fisheries, are detectable systemically for a few years. More typically, events such as the recent flooding on river tributaries in parts of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa produce more localized and less enduring effects. The current approach to monitoring generally picks up on signals of special events if they are large enough in scale, according to Johnson. He noted that, on Pool 8, the data are showing some non-event-driven changes that are likely related to island construction.

Dick Steinbach said he previously understood that LTRMP trend pool data are of relatively little use in assessing HREPs. He asked Johnson whether he was correct in hearing a slightly different message in today's presentation. Johnson said we can use the monitoring data to discern project effects if the signals are strong enough. This would most likely be the case with a large scale project, or perhaps several smaller projects working in concert. Griffin asked whether the SET should consider the availability of pre-existing baseline data in selecting among HREP proposals. Johnson suggested that we should consider what we will learn from a project as one of several important factors.

Key Findings from Recent Publications on Fisheries

Johnson reported third quarter highlights for LTRMP:

- A project completion report identified vegetation, connectivity, and shoreline complexity as the most important determinants of fish abundance and diversity.
- An evaluation of LTRMP fisheries data from 1991-2001 showed that analyses of scales from fishes collected in the Illinois River provided sufficient information to assess fish age structure and growth on the La Grange Pool and that these techniques should be transferable to other LTRMP focal reaches.
- A new database and paper report include 108 life history characteristics for more than 200 fish species on the UMRS. The database can be updated as more information becomes available.

Johnson also noted that an additional program element (APE) project has been collecting water quality data in Pool 8 all summer, using continuous samplers. As a result, the LTRMP will have data providing insight on the trajectory and impacts of the recent flooding in the area.

FY 08 APE Process

Johnson summarized the FY 08 APE selection process and distributed a list of pending proposals. From the 22 letters of intent received, the A-Team, Corps, and USGS recently agreed to invite 18 full proposals. These full proposals are due in August. Tim Schlagenhaft observed that the focal questions have been very helpful in guiding the FY 08 process.

Jennie Sauer noted that the principal investigators (PIs) have not yet seen the list Johnson distributed. She said she would be contacting the PIs by early next week regarding which projects have been selected for full proposals. The PIs will also receive the review comments from the A-Team, USGS, and USACE. Johnson observed that the addition of an initial letter of interest step in this year's APE process, prior to submission of letters of intent, appears to have been successful in prompting more collaboration among investigators. Hank DeHaan concurred and said the Corps is very pleased with the enhanced coordination and collaboration that has clearly been taking place.

Status and Trends Report

Johnson reported that the Status and Trends Report has been further delayed. In response to over 600 comments from more than 30 reviewers, there have been changes to the review draft. These include substantial changes to Chapter 1, which is now shorter and more focused. Some of its former content has been shifted to other chapters. Many additional references have been provided. Johnson said he and Karen Hagerty are completing the final draft of the report, which will be submitted for editorial review on September 1, 2007. The final report is now slated for printing and distribution in January 2008.

In response to a question from Schlagenhaft, Johnson said that the revised draft does not include any substantial new information or analysis. Schlagenhaft stressed that he would like to see the next Status and Trends Report incorporate non-LTRMP data as well, to provide a more complete picture of the system. Johnson said this would certainly be an option, but cautioned that it would add to the time required for the report.

A-Team Report

Terry Dukerschein reported that the A-Team met via conference call on July 26. Members were pleased with this year's modifications to the APE process and believe that the overall quality of the proposals has been enhanced. Dukerschein noted that from her perspective as a PI, the process was also easier.

A-Team members are pleased with their opportunities to be involved in the LTRMP strategic planning process. One A-Team participant raised questions about the Planning Team's public involvement strategy.

Other topics of discussion for the A-Team included the selection of topics for future science presentations and the need for more LTRMP component meetings involving both UMESC and field station staff.

FY 10-14 Strategic Planning Process

Marv Hubbell reported that the LTRMP Strategic Planning Team held its second meeting on July 16-18 and distributed a summary of its ongoing work to program partners and stakeholders on August 15. The team is seeking additional partner and stakeholder feedback, through the identified points of contact (POCs), by October 1.

At the July meeting, the team focused on narrowing and combining the broad range of outcomes and outputs identified at its first meeting and through subsequent partner/stakeholder feedback. This resulted in assigning initial priority to six broad outcomes, with associated inputs identified for each. Team members developed a context statement for each of those outcomes to help clarify and expand the ideas captured in the brief outcome text. Hubbell emphasized that this is an iterative process. If the Planning Team has missed something critical, Hubbell said the members will take note and address it.

Hubbell said the Planning Team has not yet addressed itself fully to the question of public engagement. Initial efforts have focused on ensuring that partners and stakeholders are kept informed of the team's progress. Jennie Sauer said that she and Mike Jawson understood that public discussion and feedback would take place at EMP-CC meetings. Gretchen Benjamin emphasized that EMP-CC meetings will not likely be a satisfactory means of engaging stakeholders in Wisconsin. Barb Naramore suggested that the Planning Team address the issue of how best to facilitate public involvement at its next meeting, scheduled for October 17-19.

Hubbell said the Planning Team is committed to being open and transparent throughout this strategic planning process. He also called for the Planning Team to revisit its own original plan and schedule for the process at its October meeting. Ken Lubinski urged that the EMP-CC be asked to weigh in on the team's preliminary work before too long. Hubbell observed that the November EMP-CC meeting might be an appropriate time for this. Bill Franz emphasized that nothing the Planning Team is working on should come as a surprise to the EMP-CC, noting that several EMP-CC members are serving on the Planning Team. In other instances, the POCs should be ensuring that their EMP-CC member is kept informed.

Other Business

Barb Naramore outlined the following schedule for upcoming quarterly meetings:

- **November 2007 — St. Paul, Minnesota**
  - UMRBA — November 13
  - NECC/ECC — November 14
  - UMRBA Water Quality Executive Committee — November 14 (concurrent with NECC/ECC)
  - **EMP-CC — November 15**

- **February 2008 — St. Louis, Missouri**
  - UMRBA — February 20
  - **EMP-CC — February 21**
  - NECC/ECC — February 22

- **May 2008 — Quad Cities**
  - UMRBA — May 20
  - NECC/ECC — May 21
  - **EMP-CC — May 22**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

EMP-CC Attendance List
August 23, 2007

EMP-CC Members

Charles Barton	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVD
Dick Steinbach	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mark Twain and Illinois River Refuges
Barry Johnson	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Bill Franz	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5
Rick Mollahan	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Mike Griffin	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Tim Schlagenhaft	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Gretchen Benjamin	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Others in Attendance

Terry Smith	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVD
Don Powell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Jeff DeZellar	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVP
Gary Loss	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Chuck Spitzack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Marvin Hubbell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Hank DeHaan	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Chuck Theiling	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVR
Kip Runyon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, MVS
Gary Wege	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, TCFO
Jon Duyvejonck	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, RIFO
Sharonne Baylor	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, UMR Refuge
Scott Yess	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jennie Sauer	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Jim Rogala	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Yao Yin	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Jason Rohweder	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Larry Robinson	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Ken Lubinski	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Brian Ickes	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Jeff Houser	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Brian Gray	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Tom Kelly	U.S. Geological Survey, UMESC
Bernie Schonhoff	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Walt Popp	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Dru Buntin	Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Terry Dukerschein	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Catherine McCalvin	The Nature Conservancy
Brad Walker	Prairie Rivers Network (IL)
Marc Schultz	Mississippi River Citizen Commission
John Wetzel	Mississippi River Citizen Commission
Holly Stoerker	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association
Dave Hokanson	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association
Barb Naramore	Upper Mississippi River Basin Association