

# Program Alternatives 6

## INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters provided a detailed look at *how* the current EMP is being implemented and *what* that implementation is achieving. They have also provided insight and understanding as to *why* a dedicated program such as the EMP was and will continue to be necessary for the UMRS.

In this chapter, three alternatives specifically identified in the program's authorizing legislation<sup>1</sup> (i.e., terminate, continue, or continue and modify the EMP) are defined and considered. Options (e.g., program priorities, funding levels, time frames) for *what* the EMP should be in the future and *how* it should be accomplished to best meet partner and public expectations are presented and evaluated relative to the fundamental goal "to ensure the coordinated development and enhancement of the UMRS" of WRDA '86. The preferred alternative is then identified and described.

In assessing the merits of the options and alternatives considered, the EMP partners took into account additional factors including: contribution to program goals and objectives, value of maintaining interagency partnerships, sensitivity to fiscal realities, need for accountability, practicality of implementation, policy issues and constraints, and appropriate roles of Federal and State government.

*...the Secretary [of the Army], in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, shall conduct an evaluation of [(A) a program for the planning, construction, evaluation of measures for fish and wildlife habitat rehabilitation and enhancement; (B) implementation of a long-term resource monitoring program; and (C) implementation of a computerized inventory and analysis system] and submit a report on the results of such evaluation to Congress. Such evaluation shall determine each such program's effectiveness, strengths, and weaknesses and contain recommendations for the modification and continuance or termination of such program."*

—Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Section 1103(e)(2), as amended

<sup>1</sup> Section 1103, WRDA '86. See text box above and report Attachment 1.

## I Program Options

▪ **Agency Roles.** The Corps of Engineers has served as lead agency for the EMP since its authorization. Yet, other options, including transferring authority for all or parts of the program to other agencies, do exist.

Maintaining implementation responsibility for habitat projects with the Corps is appropriate. The Corps has the necessary planning, engineering, and contracting expertise. In addition, habitat project work frequently requires close coordination with other river system functions, including navigation, flood control, recreation, and resource management, for which the Corps has significant responsibilities.

As the leading Federal agency for natural resources science, the USGS is well positioned to implement the LTRMP. However, maintaining authority for LTRMP with the HREPs helps to ensure that the important linkages between science and restoration protection, and enhancement work are maintained. It also preserves the less tangible but important aspects of interagency partnership.

Mechanisms for enhancing the interagency partnership that has been fundamental to the success of the EMP include expanding linkages among programs of different agencies and establishing charters for current coordination committees to provide clarification and accountability of all agencies' roles.

▪ **Program Duration.** The EMP was originally authorized for 10 years, with an additional 5 years added in 1990. Options for a new authorization include another finite period or continuing authorization. A continuing authority would ameliorate problems associated with scheduling and funding a number of individual projects, each of which has a different construction period. It also would help sustain a monitoring and analysis program which is recognized as a long term, ongoing need. However, a continuing authority does not explicitly accommodate the potential need for changes

in the program over time. Thus, a combined approach could be employed, whereby a continuing authority is coupled with a requirement, similar to the existing authority, that periodic reports to Congress be made.

## I Funding Options

▪ **Funding Framework.** Options for EMP funding authorization include the existing approach, whereby annual fixed amounts are specified; a total program amount for the life of the authorization period; or a non-specified amount. Fixed annual authorizations can be problematic if not adjusted for inflation. A total program amount for the life of authorization would provide the greatest flexibility to respond to variable annual needs. However, such an approach is not compatible with a continuing program authorization. An unspecified authorization amount provides no Congressional indication of the appropriate level of investment and no benchmarks for program partners to use in budgeting decisions.

▪ **Funding Amount.** Since 1991, the EMP has been authorized at \$19.455 million annually. The EMP is a program composed of multiple activities and projects designed in response to changing environmental needs over time. This is in contrast to a single project for which a definitive cost estimate can be made. Thus, the level of investment is driven by efforts to balance national priorities within established budgetary constraints. In determining whether an appropriate future EMP authorization should be more, less, or the same as past investments, it should be recognized that the annual amounts reflected in the existing authorization were developed in 1981. In the past 16 years, inflation alone would increase those costs by a total of 75%.

▪ **Funding Source.** If the Corps is to continue to serve as the lead agency for a future EMP, three budget categories are available: General Investigations (GI), Construction General (CG), and Operation

and Maintenance (O&M). None of the Corps' budget categories is ideally suited to the nature of the activities undertaken in the EMP. The LTRMP carries out monitoring and data analysis, while the habitat program is primarily a construction activity. Within the HREP program, some projects resemble operation and maintenance activities (e.g., water level management). In balance, the construction budget is most appropriate given that the EMP is clearly not a study (suggesting GI authority), nor is it conducting O&M in the traditional sense. Also, habitat restoration, protection, and enhancement, all of which are essentially construction activities, do and likely will continue to represent the largest percentage of total program funding.

### **I Cost Sharing Options**

Cost-sharing options range from 100% Federal to 100% non-Federal. Other relevant options include 25% or 35% non-Federal, both of which have precedents in other Corps authorities<sup>2</sup> established to carry out for environmental protection, restoration, and enhancement work.

For the LTRMP, 100% Federal funding, as the current EMP authorization provides, recognizes that monitoring, data analysis, and applied research associated with a "nationally significant" ecosystem that spans multiple-state jurisdictions is most appropriately funded by the Federal government. That funding base may be leveraged by utilizing and incorporating data sets and information generated and funded by others, such as State and local governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, and universities.

Restoration, protection, and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitats typically produces benefits beyond the local or even State level and therefore should be looked upon as a shared responsibility. Cost-sharing enhances joint decision-making.

One cost-sharing formula for habitat projects would be 25% non-Federal, paralleling the formula currently used for Section 1135 projects. Similar to Section 1135 projects, which are associated with

existing Corps projects, habitat projects are principally undertaken on a river system that is managed by the Corps as a Federal navigation project.

Those projects undertaken on lands managed as a national wildlife refuge are appropriately funded at 100% Federal cost. Current law prescribes such an approach in recognition of the on-going Federal responsibility for such land, as well as limitations which states have in investing in Federal lands.

The potential exists for enhanced recognition of non-Federal contributions in the form of in-kind services and increased responsibility for design and construction by the non-Federal sponsor. Precedent exists in the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 amendments to the Section 1135 program for crediting in-kind services and provisions for executing reimbursable work (Section 211). Credit for in-kind services has the potential benefit of leveraging Federal dollars.

### **I Program Components**

As currently structured, the EMP includes five components for which specific funding levels are authorized: habitat projects, long term resource monitoring, computerized inventory and analysis, recreation projects, and the economic impacts of recreation study. While options for a future EMP could include various combinations of these five components, in reality, habitat projects and the LTRMP are the heart of the EMP. Maintaining them as individual components of a single authorized program would ensure that the critical linkages between them are preserved.

The long term resource monitoring and computerized inventory and analysis components have become virtually indistinguishable and in fact are inextricably related. For this reason, they have come to be jointly referred to as the Long Term Resource Monitoring Program (LTRMP).

Other current program components need not continue in the future because they are either completed (study of economic impacts

<sup>2</sup> See report Attachment 5.

of recreation) or because other authorities are available (recreation projects.)

Recreation projects have not been pursued under the EMP. While recreation is an important use of the UMR, recent Administrations have deemed such projects a non-Federal responsibility.

## **HABITAT RESTORATION, PROTECTION, AND ENHANCEMENT OPTIONS**

### **I Other Authorities**

There is a variety of other authorities that could be used to undertake some of the activities now accomplished under the EMP. For example, the Corps has various environmental authorities<sup>3</sup> including Section 1135, Section 204, and Section 206. Similarly, the USFWS has responsibility for such programs as Partners for Wildlife, the Small Wetland Acquisition Program, and refuge management. However, none of these alone, or in combination, could fully replace the EMP. They were designed, in many instances, for different purposes. Many of them are targeted to smaller scale resource issues than those generally encountered on the Upper Mississippi River System. More importantly, the combination of discrete projects undertaken through a variety of different authorities does not constitute a comprehensive approach for maintaining and improving an entire ecosystem. Nor do they offer the extensive partnership benefits of the EMP. These are the unique values and potentials of the EMP.

### **I Upland Sediment Control**

Erosion in upland areas has a significant effect on floodplain and aquatic areas as the resultant sediment is deposited and accumulated in critical habitats. Yet, HREPs involving upland sediment control measures have not generally been pursued under the EMP. While not expressly precluded under the EMP authorization, Corps policy has regarded such features as beyond its purview and as the responsibility of other agencies.

Nevertheless, two EMP projects with upland features (Swan Lake and Batchtown) have been advanced as a result of specific Congressional directives. In both instances, the upland sediment control features were the most cost-effective way of protecting habitat in the project area. These features include hillside retention ponds, terracing, and other measures to reduce sediment delivery to the specific project area, but do not extend to land conservation practices throughout the watershed.

There are various options for enhancing the EMP's capacity to address upland sediment: amend the EMP authority to expressly allow upland sediment control features; pursue such approaches under the existing EMP authorization by changing Corps policy; or utilize existing authorities of other agencies.

### **I Land and Easement Acquisition**

The original EMP authorization was silent regarding the subject of acquiring lands and easements for habitat projects. Consequently, the subject was addressed through a series of Corps of Engineers policy statements reflecting the current Administration's position and policies as developed for other Corps programs.

Initial policy stated "The use of privately-owned lands (or other lands that do not fit into the categories [of lands managed as a National refuge, Corps project lands, or state-owned lands managed by a state for fish and wildlife purposes]) for fish and wildlife enhancement projects should not be pursued." The consequence of this policy was twofold. First, the policy of "no acquisition" focused habitat projects in areas

---

<sup>3</sup> See report Attachment 5 for more details.

where there were existing Federal and State land holdings. This severely hampered accomplishment of EMP goals in certain reaches/pools of the Upper Mississippi River Basin—i.e., areas where wildlife habitat lands in Federal and State ownership were few. In particular, the Open River reach below St. Louis is largely leveed, with the floodplain in private ownership. Opportunities for habitat enhancement and restoration are thus limited. To date, no HREPs have been undertaken on this lower river reach.

Second, the policy also excluded land or easement acquisition from willing sellers as a measure available for evaluation and implementation within the EMP. Applying resources to preserve existing habitats that are essentially healthy or to enhance marginal habitats that are not currently within the State and National Wildlife Refuge system could be a more economically efficient means to achieve environmental restoration, protection, and enhancement.

In October 1994, the USACE modified the policy on land acquisition to its current status. This modification resulted in inclusion of land acquisition as an additional technique for habitat enhancement and restoration within the following parameters:

- a) The acquisition is primarily for fish and wildlife preservation, enhancement or restoration purposes;
- b) It is cost efficient compared to other techniques;
- c) The land acquisition component has a non-Federal sponsor to acquire the land, fulfill the construction cost sharing requirements, and assume full responsibility for all project operation and maintenance activities for fish and wildlife on such land;
- d) The project or any portion thereof for which lands are to be acquired is cost shared 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal;

e) Similar to the Section 1135 program, cost sharing for proposed habitat projects that include components of both land acquisition and construction would consist of a lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocation and dredged material disposal area credit applied to the non-Federal sponsor's portion of the 25% cost share requirement. (If the value of the LERRD contribution exceeds 25% of the total project cost, the Federal Government would reimburse the difference to the non-Federal sponsor.)

f) Lands purchased for inclusion in a national wildlife refuge would be acquired under the existing programs and authorities of the USFWS.

g) No greater than 10% of the total allowable program funds for habitat projects of the UMRS-EMP would be used for land acquisition through the 1994 through 2002 period.

h) Any land acquired must include active construction and/or operation and management measures to improve the value of the fish and wildlife habitat over its value in its current condition.

To date, the impacts of the 1994 change in policy have been minor. Because substantial lead time typically is required for land or easement acquisition and most HREPs were initiated prior to the policy change, there have been few opportunities to pursue projects under the new policy. However, the Rice Lake HREP (Illinois River, La Grange Pool) is evaluating land acquisition alternatives made possible by this policy change.

Options for establishing land and easement acquisition from willing sellers as a viable habitat restoration tool include amending the EMP legislation to expressly authorize it or revising administrative policies that currently constrain it.

## I Innovative Projects

The EMP has taught us that some of the standard approaches to environmental restoration, protection, and enhancement may not be the most effective and that some of the traditional planning and construction guidelines stifle innovation. The original concept of the EMP included traditional, innovative, and experimental; small and large scale; and structural and nonstructural projects. The types of projects that will most effectively meet system goals and objectives will change over time as we gain experience, develop new technologies, and recognize river system dynamics.

There is a variety of policy options available for enhancing the EMP's ability to adapt to changing needs and pursue promising new avenues. One option is to reconsider the traditional design of a 50-year project life, which also requires a 50-year O&M commitment from the USFWS or non-Federal sponsor. However, the pursuit of innovative projects and the spatial distribution of projects may be limited in the future by the practical effect of cost sharing requirements which can preclude projects on Federal lands unless they meet the requirements of Section 906(e) of the 1986 Water Resources Development Act.

## LONG TERM RESOURCE MONITORING OPTIONS

### I Program Focus

A variety of options exists for changing the focus of the monitoring and research program established under the EMP. The options identified as being of greatest interest to river management agencies are: modify monitoring design; increase emphasis on research activities of direct relevance to management actions; expand the number of components monitored (e.g., wildlife, mussels, and additional water quality parameters); and expand support of navigation project O&M research requirements including forecasting of future river conditions. These changes do not require legislative action.

The focus of the LTRMP was never intended to be technology development, even though a computer inventory and analysis (CIA) element was authorized separately. An information management system is an integral part of the program and not an end in itself. Eliminating the distinction between the CIA and LTRM would recognize this relationship.

- **Spatial Scale.** The LTRMP's primary monitoring activities currently are limited to five pools and a selected reach of the open river. Options include monitoring additional pools and open river reaches and expanded monitoring of floodplains, tributaries, and the UMR basin.

## PLANNING OPTIONS

No quantitative, systemic plan exists for UMRS habitat restoration, protection, and enhancement, or, more broadly, for integrating the multiple uses, development, and management of the river. Options identified to meet this need include a system-wide habitat needs assessment, a broader ecosystem management plan, or an integrated basin-wide management plan. It is recognized that there is a need for a greater level of comprehensive planning and integrated management of environmental and economic activities and programs on the river. However, such an effort was deemed beyond the scope of what the EMP alone was designed to achieve.

## ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

After considering a variety of options for changing specific aspects of the current EMP, a range of basic alternatives was formulated that combines those options into programmatic "packages" for evaluation (see Table 6-1). Each alternative offers a different strategic approach to meeting the ecological needs of the UMRS.

**TABLE 6-1: Summary and Comparison of EMP Alternatives by Features**

Features	End EMP	Continue (at 1986 levels)	Continue and Modify
<b>Time Frame</b>	Not applicable	15-year fixed duration re-authorization (2003-2018)	Continuing authority with requirement for a Report to Congress every 6 years
<b>Total Federal Funding</b> (excluding periodic planning costs)	0	\$19.455 million/year <sup>1/</sup>	\$33.17 million/year <sup>2/</sup>
<b>Federal Funding Source(s)</b>	Not applicable	Corps of Engineers <sup>3/</sup>	Corps of Engineers <sup>3/</sup>
<b>Habitat Protection, Restoration and Enhancement</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding (Federal)</li> <li>Cost Sharing</li> <li>Geographic Scale</li> <li>Features</li> <li>Lead Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$13.0 million/year</li> <li>-25% non-Federal on non-refuge lands</li> <li>-100% Federal on refuges</li> <li>Main channel and floodplains of navigable system</li> <li>Habitat projects, including hydraulic exchange, water level management, backwater dredging, island construction, and other traditional and innovative habitat rehabilitation, protection, and enhancement measures</li> <li>Corps of Engineers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$22.75 million/year <sup>2/</sup></li> <li>-25% non-Federal on non-refuge lands</li> <li>-100% Federal on refuges</li> <li>Main channel, floodplains, and immediately adjacent upland areas of navigable system</li> <li>HREPs undertaken in context of system-wide habitat needs assessment; habitat projects, including hydraulic exchange, water level management, backwater dredging, island construction, and other traditional and innovative habitat rehabilitation, protection, and enhancement measures; upland sediment control; land/easement acquisition from willing seller(s)</li> <li>Corps of Engineers</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring, Data Analysis, and Applied Research</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding</li> <li>Cost-Sharing</li> <li>Geographic Scale</li> <li>Lead Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$5.955 million/year</li> <li>100% Federal</li> <li>Monitoring of select pools</li> <li>USGS, with funds provided through Corps of Engineers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$10.42 million/year <sup>2/</sup></li> <li>100% Federal</li> <li>Monitoring at widely distributed channel and floodplain locations. Emphasis on acquiring and analyzing data at multiple scales.</li> <li>USGS, with funds provided through Corps of Engineers</li> </ul>
<b>Habitat Needs Assessment</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding</li> <li>Activity</li> <li>Lead Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0</li> <li>None</li> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to \$1 million (initial cost). Approximately \$250,000 (in 1997 dollars every 6th year thereafter)</li> <li>Comprehensive Habitat Needs Assessment</li> <li>Corps of Engineers</li> </ul>

<sup>1/</sup> Includes \$500,000/year authorized for recreation projects.

<sup>2/</sup> Current EMP authorized appropriation for the HREP and LTRMP program elements updated for inflation. (1981 appropriation level X 1.75)

<sup>3/</sup> It is proposed that program funding continue to be provided through the Corps' Construction General (CG) budget.

## I End EMP (No Action Alternative)

- **Description.** EMP authorization would expire at the end of fiscal year 2002. No UMRS-specific program authority would replace it.
- **Features.** After 2002, UMRS habitat restoration, protection, or enhancement would be accomplished under other existing authorities. Monitoring, data analysis, and research would be limited to those sites and parameters of greatest interest to individual State or Federal agencies.
- **Implementation.** No action, other than annual appropriations through FY 2002, would be required of Congress. HREP planning and design work would be discontinued unless project construction could be completed prior to 2002 or implementation could be funded under another authority, such as Section 1135. Projects currently under construction would be accelerated, if necessary, to realize completion by fiscal year 2002. The Environmental Management Technical Center's LTRMP responsibilities would be dismantled with data and equipment transferred to the Corps of Engineers or other appropriate agencies.

## I Continue EMP

- **Description.** The budget and structure of the current EMP would continue unchanged after FY 2002.
- **Features.** The process for identification and selection of HREPs would remain essentially unchanged. The types of projects undertaken would conform to existing Corps policy. The pace of project implementation would decrease as the effects of inflation over time reduce actual purchasing power. LTRMP monitoring design would need to be regularly revised and data analysis and

research efforts reprioritized to meet funding limitations.

- **Implementation.** Congressional action would be required to extend authorization beyond FY 2002. Partner agencies would help restructure and downscale the habitat program and LTRMP due to the effects of inflation.

## I Continue and Modify EMP

- **Description.** A continuing authority and increased funding level would be provided to continue and enhance two program components: HREPs and LTRMP. A habitat needs assessment would be conducted to help guide the selection and design of HREPs and provide a basis for project performance measurement.
- **Features.** HREP measures would be expanded to include a wider variety of restoration, protection, and enhancement techniques, including upland sediment control of local watersheds directly affecting riverine habitat; land and easement acquisition from willing sellers; and more innovative measures.

The LTRMP would continue with an emphasis on: a) improving monitoring design; b) applied research to provide information needed for river management; c) an expanded array of components monitored, including wildlife, mussels, and enhanced water quality parameters; and d) expansion of spatial scale to include more widely distributed sampling locations within the floodplain and analysis at multiple scales. In addition, LTRMP responsibilities would be expanded to include broader responsibilities for HREP monitoring and support for the habitat needs assessment (HNA).

An HNA would be conducted<sup>4</sup> at the outset of the newly authorized program to identify objectives and opportunities for habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement. In general, the assessment would include a description of historical and existing habitat conditions, as well as an identification of objectives for future habitat conditions. Such an assessment would help guide the selection and design of HREPs by defining habitat needs at system-wide, river reach, and pool scales. It would address a variety of habitat requirements, including physical, chemical, and biological parameters. Six-year updates would provide a basis for recommending future changes to Corps policies and to the EMP authorizing legislation, including funding.

Every six years, a Report to Congress would be provided. Given that the EMP would be authorized as a continuing program, it is recognized that periodic adjustments may be needed. The Report to Congress would describe program accomplishments, including progress toward meeting the needs identified in the HNA, and recommend program modifications, if necessary, to achieve habitat restoration and protection objectives.

- **Implementation.** Congressional action would be required to: amend Section 1103 to provide continuing authority, increase the authorized funding level, and institutionalize further reporting to Congress on a 6-year schedule. Corps of Engineers policies including those related to land acquisition, upland sediment control, 50-year project life, and demonstration projects would be clarified or revised.

## ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION

### I Criteria

In weighing alternatives for a future EMP, the following criteria were considered:

- **Completeness.** For a future EMP, completeness would mean all necessary investments and future actions needed to realize full implementation of a range of ecosystem restoration, protection, and enhancement measures and monitoring and research requirements are met. Monitoring and research provide the essential information necessary to validate how actual conditions approach established ecosystem goals.

- **Effectiveness.** For a future EMP, effectiveness would mean that implementation of the alternative represents progress towards a shared UMR ecosystem vision. This clearly assumes that ecosystem goals and objectives exist and a means to measure the results of implementing the alternative is available.

- **Efficiency.** For a future EMP, efficiency would mean that restoration alternatives are incrementally analyzed and the most cost-effective means of producing the target outputs is selected.

- **Acceptability.** For a future EMP, acceptability would mean the alternative is broadly recognized as an appropriate means for realizing systemic ecological goals. It is widely supported by governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the general public, and the alternative accommodates multiple participant involvement in its accomplishment.

---

<sup>4</sup> Efforts to develop an HNA for the UMRS are under way. The funding requirements identified in this report would support the expedited development of an HNA at higher resolution. This product will allow both the HREP and LTRM elements of the EMP to be better, more efficiently, and effectively implemented. The HNA also is expected to provide an important component of any future comprehensive planning and management efforts for the UMRS.

## RESULTS

The End EMP alternative (or no action alternative) would result in enhancement of some 35,000 acres of riverine and riparian habitat over the life of the program.<sup>5</sup> LTRMP data would contribute to future river studies. Habitat project and monitoring and research proponents would in the future have to look to other Federal or State authorities to accomplish habitat rehabilitation and enhancement and data collection and analysis.

The alternative of a “cross-cut budget” approach, under which EMP activities would in the future be carried out under other existing programs of the Corps and other Federal agencies, has been explored and rejected because of its potential to fragment the effort. Fundamental to this issue is that Congress enacted Section 1103, the Upper Mississippi River management Act of 1986, “to ensure the coordinated development and enhancement” of the UMRS.

The Continue EMP alternative at 1986 funding levels would result in rehabilitation and enhancement of some 3,000 acres of habitat on an average annual basis through FY 2002. The level of LTRMP data collection and applied research activities would decline as real costs increase over time.

The Continue and Modify EMP alternative would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of EMP habitat enhancement and rehabilitation projects, and expand the usefulness of LTRMP data collection and research. This alternative ranks the highest according to the four screening criteria of completeness, effectiveness, efficiency, and acceptability. An average of 5,000 acres of riverine and floodplain habitat would be rehabilitated and enhanced annually during the first six-year cycle of the modified EMP.

---

<sup>5</sup> Total number of acres would be dependent upon actual program funds made available through FY 2002.