

Fish and Wildlife Working Group  
June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2021, virtual meeting

A big thank you to Andrew Stephenson and Sharonne Baylor for providing additional notes from the meeting.

Attending:

IA DNR

Kirk Hanson, Ryan Hupfeld

MN DNR

Neil Rude, Nick Schlessler, Kevin Stauffer, Lucas Youngsma

WI DNR

Brian Brecka, Deanne Drake, Jeff Janvrin, Brenda Kelly

UMRBA

Andrew Stephenson

USACE

Steve Clark, Tony Horecek, Dan Reburn, Jon Schultz, Elliott Stefanik, Nathan Wallerstedt

USFWS

Sharonne Baylor, Casey Bryan, Stephanie Edeler, Tim Miller, Mary Stefanski, Steve Winter, Tim Yager

USGS

Jennifer Dieck, Ben Finley, Jennifer Sauer

NESP orientation (see slides)

- Jennie S. – are there opportunities to put forward projects that address science needs?
- Steve W. - we could forward on a project that includes a science and monitoring, feasibility, science needs project. We're not sure if that would truly be considered within the list of authorized project types. Perhaps they will only fund the things in the authorized project types, but it might be good to have info on other potential projects that could be funded by other types of money.
- Nathan W. – all ideas that people deem important, they should be included in the discussion. Projects that could potentially be funded through the Adaptive Management component of NESP (science support, monitoring; see page 4 of slides) can be included in a

final list of 10 FWWG-endorsed projects, but they might not be funded immediately in a first round of project initiation/execution.

- Elliott S. – what are the next things MVP wants to focus on with NESP funding, if/when it is available. In the past, we've only had a couple small things we've been able to work on. Everything to date has been for PED, no construction funds have been received yet. What we have this year, and what we're looking for in the future, are things we can grab onto, if and when funding is available, that MVP can do for PED type-work. Sometimes when funds are available it's best to grab on to the first thing that's available, and a more "traditional" project might be the easiest, best fit. All 10 FWWG-endorsed projects would, if funded, start with initial feasibility-type of efforts. We need to have something, ready, on-the-shelf, that we can spend money on. If we don't, the funds will be taken by MVR and MVS because of the on-the-shelf projects they have. If we do, we'll have additional discussions and that's when more effort can be invested.
- Elliott S. - funding is uncertain, so we should be practical, and not kill ourselves with coming up with detailed, complex project descriptions, we should keep it simple. In the past we've received in bits and pieces, and it's hard to know if we'll have funding in the near term.
- Steve C. – we should think about a range of projects that require different levels of effort (small, large, etc.). Perhaps one big one that would require a large effort, to show we can use a large amount of funds to do big projects. It might also be good to have an easier project that could be executed quickly from funding through construction. Along with other considerations about what is good for the river!
- Elliott S. – The USACE can help prioritize these considerations after projects are identified. Which ones represent quick construction, which ones have greater engineering needs, etc.

NESP concepts (NESP authority project types on slide #2?) – is there concurrence in FWWG about which ones are most important?

- Kirk H. – I'm ok with discussing NESP concepts that the FWWG might think are important, or should be prioritized, but there are some things that NESP is uniquely suited for. Examples are forest management and bankline erosion. Forest restoration isn't specifically called out in these authorized project types, but a dollar amount has been appropriated to it. We recently had a DMMP meeting in P9-10 where we talked to the public about forest loss and island erosion as much as DMMP stuff.
- Jon S. – Blair Dilman was down at that meeting.
- Kirk H. – are the numbers provided on slide #3 a ceiling, or a floor? For instance, it says that we're going to do 29 side channel efforts.
- Elliott S. – we're not necessarily tied to these numbers one way or another. They were something that NESP developed in 2005 as a target with different types of projects. It was the first attempt to consider diversity of projects. For instance, at that time fish passage was a major concern, but we may not want to go there now or ever.
- Jon S. – I'd like to remind everyone that in 2012, the MVP, MVR, and MVS collectively worked on the systemic forest stewardship plan. That plan could guide systemic forest management/restoration activities funded by NESP.

- Tim Y. – would the USACE envision a separate pot of funds becoming available for systemic forestry efforts, or should we proceed with consideration of forestry projects in this current effort?
- Nathan W. – yes, we should proceed with consideration of forestry projects in this current effort.
- Tim Y. – if many of the projects have multiple components that address multiple objectives (multiple HNA-II indicators, multiple NESP project types), how would that mesh with zeroing in on one or two “concepts”. For example, when we do island building, it typically includes backwater dredging, some forest management, topographical diversity.
- Steve C. – I’m not sure. The idea of first identifying FWWG’s priority concepts was provided by someone else and I don’t have additional insights about the approach.
- Andrew S. – we’ve also been asked to identify if there are any specific NESP-authorized projects from slide #3 that FWWG is no longer interested in. For instance, is fish passage a effort that FWWG is still interested in light of new conditions involving invasive carp?
- Brian B. - fish passage at L&D 4 and L&D 8 are a low priority and could be put on the back burner.
- Steve C. – concurs with Brian B.
- Tim Y. - the USFWS is content to be neutral on fish passage, in part to support the state partners by way of not opposing them. But we might want to keep fish passage in the mix of potential NESP projects in case future conditions change, and there is a way to do fish passage projects that benefit native fishes without also benefitting invasive fishes. Perhaps there are science needs related to this that NESP could fund.
- Kevin S. – concurs with Brian B. and doesn’t see a need for fish passage projects at this time, but also concurs with Tim Y. that conditions might change in the future and fish passage projects might be desirable.
- Kirk H. – concurs with Kevin S. There will probably be a lot to learn from L&D 22, there has been a lot of adaptive management and monitoring at that project.
- Kevin S. – the L&D 8 embankment project had a lot of previous planning work done, but there may not be much that comes out of it.
- Elliott S. – the L&D 8 embankment project got folded into the initial planning efforts for the Reno Bottoms HREP project but was screened from the HREP when new information and a better understanding of conditions came out of the feasibility phase of the HREP planning, and determined the embankment component wouldn’t be beneficial. However, the L&D 8 embankment project illustrates one of the unique capabilities of NESP. If modifications to navigation structures could provide valuable habitat, that’s something we could do. Moving forward, if the program gets up and running, we may want to look harder at these types of projects, projects which can’t be easily done under UMRR but can be done under NESP.
- Kirk H. – water level management is in the NESP authority. Can NESP be used to enhance the current feasibility-type work, the planning, that is currently being done on WLM?
- Nathan W. – are you asking if we can we use NESP money to further advance or look into WLM? Presumably, beyond what is going on in the PAS effort?
- Kirk H. – yes, funding is limited in that effort right now.

- Nathen W.– conceptually, yes. But as we go through this process today, we may find out if that is important to the bigger group. If it rises to the top, could do that. It would be a feasibility/PED type effort, we could do that if group wanted to.
- Steve C. – we have WLM within P5 and one of the approved fact sheets, I don't know why we couldn't do that with this.
- Elliott S. – yes but if funding is inconsistent, does that harm a WLM project if it lies idle for a few years, waiting for the return of funding? Lots of WLM is coordination and planning, such a big thing for all stakeholders. If funding dries up and it sits for 8 years, how much needs to be updated? It's a little different than updating engineering/design plans.
- Kirk H. - NESP has a restoration (ecosystem) component, a navigation component, and a mitigation sub-component associated with navigation. How do these different components and subcomponents get funded? Are we selecting projects overall and then putting into whichever side has funding at the time?
- Elliot S. and Nathan W. – we're not sure and we'll need to follow-up on that question.
- Andrew S. – that's a great question. A long-term strategy for the program should be to figure out which features fit best under which funding side (eco, navigation, systemic mitigation). There may be opportunities to advance projects more quickly under systemic mitigation (for example, bankline stabilization.
- Andrew S. – We should remember that NESP has a unique ability to fund projects addressing cultural resources.

Agency presentation of projects (ideally a very brief, approximately two-minute presentation about each project)

- Iowa DNR project presentations
  - Upper Iowa Delta (Pool 9)
  - Frenchtown Lake (Pool 10)
  - Swift and Dead Sloughs (Pool 11)
  - Bankline Protection (multi-pool)
  - Forestry Restoration (multi-pool).
  - Tim Y. – is there an upper limit to how far the Upper Iowa Delta project would extend up the river?
  - Kirk H. – as far as we can get. Maybe private ownership determines the upper limit.
  - Kirk H. – we put “unknown” for willing sponsor on the Upper Iowa Delta project. We brought it up with Wendy Woyczik., but she's been busy.
  - Tim Y. – I want to let people know that the refuge's McGregor District is pretty tapped out right now with 6 UMRR HREPs in various phases, and a vacant district manager position at this time. The practicality of it right now is that there is not adequate staff to support projects in that district. This affects Iowa more than other states in the FWWG.

- Minnesota DNR project presentations
  - North-Sturgeon Lakes (Pool 3)
  - Trempealeau NWR Topobathic Restoration (Pool 6)
  - Root River Floodplain Restoration (Pool 8)
  - Water Level Management/Seasonal Hydrologic Restoration (multi-pool)
  - Systemic Floodplain Forest Restoration (multi-pool)
  - Neil R. – regarding the North and Sturgeon Lakes project, this was originally an HREP, and lots of planning has already been done, but ultimately MN couldn't sign a PPA.
  - Kevin S. – nothing has changed for what MN can and cannot sign.
  
- Wisconsin DNR project presentations
  - Upper Pool 5 (Probst Lake/Island 42/Mosiman's)
  - Johnson Island (Pool 6)
  - Lake Onalaska – Phase II (Pool 7)
  - Wing Lake/Hunter's Point (Pool 8)
  - System Wide Connectivity (multi-pool)
  - Brian B. – the Lake Onalaska Phase II project scored highest for the HNA-II indicators. There's already a scoping group that has done a lot of groundwork on this.
  - Brian B. – regarding the Wing Lake/Hunter's Point project, a new water control structure was recently constructed that eased connectivity concerns and increased the area's water quality. Sedimentation is the area's next major issue to tackle.
  - Brian B. – WI DNR is a strong advocate of using science to inform decisions. As such, they've collected lots of data that can and should be used to help move things forward.
  
- USACE project presentations
  - Wacouta Bay (Pool 4, Lake Pepin)
  - Upper Reno Bottoms (Pool 9)
  - Systemic Habitat Dredging (multi-pool)
  - Systemic Forest Restoration (multi-pool)
  - Bankline stabilization and Natural Levee (multi-pool).
  - Jon S. – forest inventory dataset is 92% complete. We have good data on existing conditions, this will lead us to documenting forest status and trends. We've developed with the three districts a finalized forest management geodatabase that can be queried at the pool, compartment, and stand levels. We have effective means and tools to assist in decision making and help us prioritize restoration needs.
  - Unknown person – we could incorporate Pool 3 into a multi-pool systemic forest restoration project. Neil's presentation for MN DNR identified Pool 3 as being part of their multi-pool Systemic Floodplain Forest Restoration project.

- Unknown person - we're trying to sync forestry goals with wildlife goals. The systemic forest stewardship plan documents USACE, USFWS, and states' needs. We have tools to move forward with science-based decision making. These prescriptions are focused on existing conditions, and restoration/management methods include TSI, invasive species control, and mechanical scarification, but may not include topographic diversity or dredge material placement.
- Unknown person - swamp white oak is very flood tolerant, even with longer inundation. We're looking at light seeded soft and hard mast. We're looking to develop forest management objectives jointly with partnering agencies.
- Steve C. - Megan McGuire's prioritization framework is an available tool.
- Tim Y. – if we approach forest restoration from systemic project standpoint as opposed to each project being individual, would some efficiency be gained in terms of contracting and mobilization? What you're going to see from USFWS, is we've identified one of these (Pools 7&8 Forestry) as a project. Is it better to proceed forward with individual projects or as a group of projects?
- Jon S. - I don't personally know if this should be approached independently or systemic wide. But, given the NESP language, it may be best to use system wide approach with this.
- Brian B. – I have thoughts along the line of maybe having different phases to a systemic project? It's a pretty expansive approach. What about systemic forest restoration Phase 1 and then other phases to follow?
- Steve C. – I think we could do that.
- Brian B. – are we worried about this project being too expensive? It sounds like we have a good start on the project with background, we probably don't need to find all the sites. Would we be concerned about going through a process and then discovering we don't have adequate funds or time?
- Jon S. – in light of this it would make sense if we prioritized Phase 1 or Phase 2. A phase could also serve as an option year.
- Steve C. – as far as construction goes, I'm imagining a lot of these as individual projects that are too cheap and simple for a single UMRR or NESP project. Bundling makes it more efficient and sizeable for a project. There are places in the river where we're comfortable that ground elevations won't be something we want to modify. We may want to discuss what we could do to forests in those areas to make them the best they can be. We may end up planning by pool for these. Knocking out a pool with some kind of prescription may be scalable to a contract size. Taking all small things that are too small for one HREP.
- Jon S. – I agree. If there is a proposed overwintering project, I hope we could piggyback on that opportunity by increasing topographic diversity – forest restoration could be a component of that. Also, I agree that trying to lump and package these at a pool scale is a good idea, we can pick out additional areas. We could put together one prescription per pool per area.
- Anthony H. – on other projects we've had bid options. That might be something to consider. We'd have to talk with contracting to see what they're comfortable with.

- Tim Y. – if we can get to the point where we have well-set plans, scopes figured out for these projects, there's nothing that would prevent a group like Audubon using Lesard Sams funds to work on this. We have an Audubon forester working with us now. If there are smaller pieces that don't make sense, there may be a way to get those funded and completed. I like the idea of a more systemic approach than a project-by-project approach. I see another opportunity there besides NESP and UMRR.
- Jon S. - it may be imperative to incorporate option years. Phase 1 could be establishment; Phase 2 could be continued treatments to alleviate burden on USACE and partners agencies. We could have a 5-year period for a contractor to come back to areas for weed suppression, etc. We shouldn't only work on establishment, but options should include follow-up and supplemental treatments.
- Kirk H. – monitoring and adaptive management too.
- Steve C. – I think so too. Much like HREP projects that have that, there will probably be a greater need for that early to help this stuff along. We should be thinking about this and taking advantage of opportunities to do backwater dredging when we can. We don't know that systemic forest restoration would be involved in other areas that may involve backwater restoration.
- Elliot S. – I think we want to go this direction at some point. But we have to have shovel ready projects. If there are a lot of things to get ready, we need to have opportunities for projects to get in place.
- Andrew S. – the systemic approach is great to emphasize NESP potential. A project can be broken into manageable pieces (e.g., set of 3 pools) to help us understand requirements, potential pitfalls (e.g., overlapping project boundary areas, whether projects be pulled into another program like UMRR, etc.).
- Steve C. – regarding a systemic bankline stabilization and natural levee project, the same types of questions and concerns could apply. This project is under consideration in UMRR right now, but it's not the highest priority in UMRR.
- Kirk H. – the need for this work far exceeds the ability of UMRR. There's a similar project under consideration in MVR. There had previously been a thought NESP could tackle many of these types of projects, but then they were brought to UMRR for consideration. But the scale of this type of project is too big to do under UMRR.
- Steve C. – scale is exactly why it might be better under NESP.
- Kirk H. – we'll need to do floodplain permitting, environmental permitting, etc. We'll need to break a large project up into smaller bits anyway for these reasons.
- Steve C. – if we tackle something like this in one big project for the entire district, it would be an environmental permitting challenge. Lots of work involved.
- Brian B. – regarding systemic backwater dredging, Wisconsin talked about pool-wide backwater dredging in Pools 5a or 6. The HNA-II reports show those pools have issues with backwater areas and sedimentation. We would be interested in some version of this.
- Kirk H. – I agree, there are lots of small areas that would be too small to be an HREP project. We could package multiple small areas together to have a big impact.

- Steve C. – if we considered this, do we first decide where we want to dredge, or do we first locate possible upland areas for storage because that’s a huge constraint. There might be some entities that might be manufacturing soil with river material. If there was an opportunity to couple with that in some locations, that may be viable approach. We can put it on the list and see where it shakes out.
- UMR NWFR project presentations
  - Buffalo River Sediment and Nutrient Capture (Pool 4)
  - Trempealeau NWR Island Construction (Pool 6)
  - Lake Onalaska Sedimentation Science Needs (Pool 7)
  - Pools 7 & 8 Forestry
  - Pool 8 Water Level Management
  - Mary S. – regarding the Buffalo River Sediment and Nutrient Capture project, this is associated with the refuge’s recent acquisition of Tank Ponds. This couldn’t be included in the Lower Pool 4 HREP because it was outside the authorized spatial boundary of HREP. But it’s not shovel-ready.
  - Tim m. – regarding the Trempealeau NWR Island Construction project, this was identified in the refuge’s CCP.
  - Mary S. – regarding the Pool 8 Water Level Management project, a white paper has been completed, along with a lot of other planning work. But additional science needs exist.
- Tim M. – regarding Lake Onalaska Phase II (WI DNR) and Lake Onalaska Sedimentation Science Needs (UMR NWFR), they can be combined, but they are slightly different. The science needs would need to be addressed first.
- Brian B. – combining them might not make sense.
- Tim M. – it’s ok if they’re combined.
- Tim Y. – regarding the Swift and Dead Sloughs project, could they be done under a systemic connectivity project?
- Kirk H. – they could, they’re also in a HREP fact sheet. But because they are small, distinctly defined, and ready for design, it might be best to keep them separate. I’m ok with either approach, but perhaps we should keep them desperate for now.
- Steve W. – should we combine the Bankline Protection project (IA DNR) and the Bankline Stabilization and Natural Levee project (USACE)?
- Steve C. and Kirk H. – it’s ok to combine them.
- Steve W. – should we keep the Pools 7 & 8 Forestry project (UMR NWFR) separate from any systemic forestry project?
- Jon S. – I think we could combine them and then prioritize within all the systemic options/locations.
- Tim M. – it’s part of the bigger picture, it’s ok to combine and then prioritize.
- Tim Y. – I agree with Jon S.



- Kirk H. – I think it's ok to combine them.
  - Neil R. – I think it's ok to combine them.
  - Steve W. – should we keep Pool 8 Water Level Management (UMR NWFR) separate from Water Level Management/Seasonal Hydrologic Restoration (MN DNR)?
  - Tim M. – let's keep it separate, a lot of work has already been done for Pool 8.
  - Neil R. (via chat) – I think you could merge the MN and USFWS project.
  - Neil R. (via chat) – I see reno as stand alone.
  - Neil R. (via chat) – combine the bankline projects.
  - Neil R. (via chat) – MN forest proposal is same as USACE. Combine.
- 
- Steve W. – can the USAE sponsor the North and Sturgeon Lakes project?
  - Nathan W. – we need to check. We assume the state wants to do this (North and Sturgeon Lakes), they are a willing sponsor, but legally they may not be able to because of PPA.
  - Neil R. (via chat) - the proposal MN had, is that the project will be below the OHWM, so I think may be 100% federal.
  - Kirk H. – the states struggle with the fact that the USACE doesn't have answers for a number of questions, such as OHWM requiring an O&M sponsor or not.
  - Neil R. (via chat) - but Kirk is making great points.
  - Nathan W. – some of the guidance is not yet available but we understand the concern.
  - Steve C. – that's a consideration with this project too. We (USACE) are not doing a great job sorting out our policy until we absolutely need to. I would not be optimistic that we will have good answers to some of these questions. Looking forward, if we have projects that are questionable or have potential issues, we may not want to put them forward. We didn't put a North and Sturgeon Lakes project on our list because we didn't have answers about sponsors for that project. Knowing that WI can sign on to a project as sponsor allowed us to add Wacouta Bay to our list.
  - Kirk H. – this may be a good reason to put some projects on the list, to get some of these questions answered.
  - Steve W. – let's leave the willing sponsor for North and Sturgeon Lakes as unknown at this point.
  - Nathan W. (via chat) - Follow up to the PPA question on projects 100% below the OHWM and 100% fed funded - if this is the case in the past, we have been able to enter into an MOA vs. a PPA. This would be the avenue we would pursue moving forward.
  - Kirk H. (via chat) - Nathan, would that also be true for lands that are in county, municipal, or private ownership?
  - Neil R. (via chat) - I missed the text/chat for what Nathan answered to Kirk. Could you repost your response to the OHWM and fed funding?
  - Jeff J. (via chat) - Add column to say PPA or MOA will be needed prior to implementation?
  - Nathan W. (via chat) - in response to Kirk's part 2 question. "Would that also be true for lands that are in county, municipal, or private ownership?". At this time, the examples I have are on federal lands so I can't say it would apply to lands owned by county, municipal, or private ownership. This will need more research.

- Nate W. – regarding the question of whether the USACE can be a sponsor for water level management, yes, we can for USACE lands.
- Steve C. – this would require us to figure out whose land the dredged material would be placed on.
- Unknown person – regarding systemic-scale projects, we can study a huge area, but we'll have a \$25M limit on the project. Do we then break them into different pieces, per pool? We'd then be doing work on many agency-owned or managed lands.
- Jeff J. (via chat) - For estimated cost, would it be possible for COE to send out a "standard" cost sheet for features so there is some consistency in cost estimates?
- Neil R. (via chat) - I don't know exactly what it would be. That is probably the maximum.
- Tim M. (via chat) - Root River project is probably closer to 1500-2000.
- Neil R. (via chat) - I just measured that. 2000
- Neil R. (via chat) - I originally had Target Lake/Blue Lake area, but it won't include that.
- Kevin S. – I prefer having the agencies work on adding material to the current MS Excel spreadsheet, as opposed to writing and distributing 1-page mini fact sheets.
- Brian B. - a 1-page mini fact sheet might be good, it would help agencies assess all the projects based on a common, consistent set of information.
- Steve W. – in reply to Brian B., we can populate the spreadsheet with pretty much the same information that can be in a fact sheet. Each agency would have the chance over the next two weeks to populate the Project Description field with the information they want to share with others about a project they brought forward. We could put a word limit on the amount of text that can be added to each cell in the Project Description field.
- Tim Y. – thinking about this from the perspective of a RRF representative, I would prefer to assess projects captured in one spreadsheet as opposed to projects captured on ten individual mini fact sheets.
- Kirk H. – I would prefer a spreadsheet, but I also think it would be good to have a map for each project.
- Unknown person – in reply to Kirk H., maps would be good for projects that are limited to one pool, but they might not be useful for multi-pool projects.
- Steve Clark and Elliott S. – FWWG should forward a list of 10 projects to the RRF, and that list should be prioritized, but we shouldn't expect that priority sequence to be adopted at any of the higher levels of review and approval.
- Jennie S. – can we add a column for information or monitoring needs where the USGS can assist? Being on the front end of planning for these projects can really help our science leads make the best possible contribution.
- Steve W. – yes, we'll add that column and capture the information.

- Tim Y. – the refuge won't rank good projects lower if they are located in the McGregor District.
- Steve W. – we had some interest from folks to utilize HNA-II in this process, but it's likely not going to be used to actually score or rank projects, only to help us discuss them. That is why they are in their own columns and have a summation column. For internal agency discussions, you all have that information based on how project proposers rated how they would address HNA-II. One reason not to use them would be because bigger, more complex projects that address multiple HNA-II indicators would have an inherent advantage.
- Tim Y. – in reflecting back on Elliott's earlier advice, we should keep it simple.
- Steve W. – we now have 19 projects that the FWWG will consider further.
- Steve W. – do we think a GIS app or platform would help us with any stage of this process? The FWIC has one that they're using. But it makes me think that if the FWIC has one, couldn't it be made to be system-wide, across all three USACE districts?
- Tim Y. – the juice we get may not be worth the squeeze.
- Kirk H. – I'm not sure that the FWIC is really using theirs to much extent. Down the road it may be useful, but right now, I'm not sure that it would add much value.
- Consensus among the attendees – we'll forgo a GIS app or platform for now.
- Kirk H. – here's a spreadsheet question – did you take out the HNA-II columns?
- Steve W. - no, they're still in there to aid folks during their interagency discussions and perhaps to aid the FWWG reps during their final voting step. Some are already filled in. They won't be used in our final scoring, but you could refer to them to see how they measure up against HNA-II indicators. But the composite indicator score won't be mathematically incorporated into the final scores that agencies submit to the FWWG reps, or the final summation of all agency scores the FWWG reps calculate.
- Kirk H. – regarding the added column identifying if there is a USGS information need, it might be nice to have an adjacent column where those needs can be described. We could also add a column(s) for identifying opportunities, constraints, new data needs, etc.
- Nick S. (via chat) - MN has potential govt shutdown on July 1 as well (unlikely, but possible).

#### Post-meeting path forward

- ASAP
  - Steve W. will distribute the MS Excel spreadsheet to everyone with the compiled projects on a single tab. He will have a word limit in the Project Description field.

- Agencies will have a chance to populate the spreadsheet with the best set of information they can provide for the projects they brought forward or are taking the lead on in terms of completing the spreadsheet.
- July 9<sup>th</sup> – submission of populated spreadsheets by each agency to Steve W.
- July 13<sup>th</sup> – Steve W. will distribute a single spreadsheet, with all the compiled information he received by/on July 9<sup>th</sup>, to the FWWG. This will be the common and consistent set of project information each agency assesses and considers during their internal agency discussions.
- July 21<sup>st</sup> - Following internal agency discussions, FWWG representatives send agency priority ranks (1 = highest rank) of all projects to Steve Winter.
- July 27<sup>th</sup> – FWWG representatives vote on the endorsement of ten projects.
- July 30<sup>th</sup> – Steve Winter forwards a list of 10 endorsed projects to the River Resources Forum. Note that the list of 10 projects can be prioritized from highest FWWG priority to lowest FWWG priority, .
- After July 30<sup>th</sup> – respond to information requests from RRF or MVD.
- After July 30<sup>th</sup> – work with NESP Corps Ecos team on full act sheet development.
- September 30<sup>th</sup> - NESP Corps Ecos team submits the fact sheets to the Corps' Mississippi Valley Division office for approval.