

**TLG CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY**  
**February 19, 2004**

Participants:

Phillip Cernera  
Rob Spafford  
Rogers Hardy  
Paul Woods

Bill Rust  
Bill Adams  
Jana McCurdy  
Dave Suhr

Ed Moreen  
Rusty Sheppard  
John Perfect  
Randy Connolly  
John Roland

This summary provides the salient issues. These notes are intended to capture key topics, conclusions, and next steps and not the nuances of the discussion.

**Agenda Items:**

1. Review last week's Basin Commission meeting:

The Basin Commission approved seven projects totaling \$957k last week that leaves \$300k to be allocated. Commissioner Allred asked for another look at the IDEQ proposal to have INEEL do groundwater metals characterization in Canyon Creek. The Commission, especially Commissioner Panabaker, expressed concern that too many of the projects are studies and evaluations; not enough are work "on the ground".

It was noted in this morning's discussion that the Basin divides naturally into three parts, the Upper Basin, the Lower Basin, and the Lake, and that it would be a good idea to strive for balance among these when selecting projects. It was also noted that the TLG should work to articulate better how models and studies lead to future work.

Since the Basin Commission adopted the projects that were Lake oriented, it appeared that they endorsed Lake management. The Commission decided, at least for the short term, to retain its coordinating role and forgo a change to an implementing entity.

2. Discuss the approach to soliciting and selecting projects for the next Clean Water Act grant:

This grant is \$2 million. Several participants noted that the TLG should provide clearer guidance for project sponsors. With clearer guidance, proposals should be more developed and more focused.

3. Recap the Lower Basin Forum:

Attendance at the Lower Basin Forum (LBF) Tuesday was not universal for a number of reasons. Those who were able to attend took part in a good technical interchange mostly concerning sediment transport in the Lower River and floodplain, the consequent potential for recontamination, and the dynamics of bank sediments v. bed sediments. Art Bookstrom presented information from a yet to be published paper concerning sediment deposition rates.

A summary of the Forum has been sent to the TLG and others.

Two shortcomings were noted: Discussions seemed at times to run in circles because of participants' lack of familiarity with previous work, and key people were not able to be present. URS' categorizing of available information should help alleviate the first of these. Attention to scheduling will help with the second.

During the discussion of the LBF, the idea was floated that it would be useful to have a "war room" or reading room, where hard copies of documents would be available. Cerner offered room at the Coeur d'Alene Tribe's Coeur d'Alene office for such a facility.

Discussion of the LBF also included a desire for a memo from USGS transmitting unpublished data from the LBF, and a desire that the URS package "winnow out the nuggets", or core background documents.

The LBF demonstrated the complexity of the lower river system, and highlighted recontamination as a major issue. From the discussion, it appears that stream bank work may be much broader than just source control. There are ecological and human health dimensions.

4. Additional \$2 million in CWA grant funds:

Again, this grant is for up to \$2 million. Participants noted a need to decide how to solicit proposals for this funding. It was felt that the "bar needs to be raised", and that the "shotgun approach" used to date needs to be improved. John Roland's timelines (distributed at the LBF) may help with this.

It was noted that the Basin Commission did not appear to be entirely happy with the TLG/CCC relationship. This possibly could improve if the TLG explained its long-range approach to the CCC. The CCC needs to have more time to consider information from the TLG. Joint TLG CCC meetings were suggested as something that might help.

The suggestion was made that the TLG could make more use of the 5-year plan and the LBF in soliciting new CWA projects. A request to review the deferred projects followed. The next CCC meeting is scheduled for March 10, and the CCC should receive an update from the TLG at that meeting.

5. Repository Issues (two kinds):

Ed Moreen noted that the Harrison Library wants out of its role as a document repository. The material takes up too much space.

Moreen announced a tentative date for the next Repository PFT meeting on March 19, probably in the evening, and probably in Kellogg.

6. Review the schedule of upcoming meetings (Jana McCurdy):

CCC	TBA	
Board Packet Due	March 15	
Repository PFT	March 19	
Basin Commission	March 29	10:00 Wallace Inn

7. One Final Note:

The group was reminded Commissioner Krulitz asked for a proposal on Pinehurst flooding. Cernera will distribute the Pinehurst letter for consideration in this or the next round of CWA proposals.

**Round Table:**

The TLG gave up the phone line to the Water Treatment PFT call at 9:00, and there was not time for a round table.

Thank you for your participation.