

DRAFT

TLG CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY January 20, 2004

Participants:

Phillip Cernera	Luke Russell	Bill Rust	Jeff Johnson
Anne Dailey	John Roland	Stan Miller	
Jana McCurdy	Rebecca Stevens	Paul Woods	
Dave Fortier	Ed Moreen	Jim Hansen	
Bill Adams	Ginny Dierich	Mike Stevenson	

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

As you are all aware, at the end of a rather long day of meeting on January 13, 2004, the TLG did not finish its selection of CWA proposals for recommendation to the Board. As a result the group decided to hold a conference call to focus on completing the TLG recommendation. Therefore, the agenda topic for this conference call was to further discuss the second round selection of CWA proposals.

Sub-topics of discussion;

a) How much is available for expenditure? Cernera suggested that based on Luke's approach of increasing the cost of all projects proposed (as he did with the first round of cwa projects, by adding additional project management costs) in addition to what has been currently proposed may indeed be a double counting of these costs already embedded in each proposal.

As a result, these added costs will be re-evaluated to determine what, if any costs can be removed from projects already adopted. We must also be certain that the current project proposals have incorporated these costs as part of their current proposed costs. Luke and Cernera will re-evaluate these costs. In the meantime the TLG will work under a funding cap assumption of \$1.2 million.

b) The Counties position on this round of proposals; The county TLG representatives plan on writing a memo to their Board members explaining that some of the projects dealing with addressing nutrients into the Lake were technically "good" projects. They did not rank them high, however, because they are unclear if their Board members endorsed being involved with "nutrient management" related projects, given the fact that there is yet a clear understanding of how the Commission may want to be involved with Lake Management issues. Therefore, if their Board members believed that nutrient

management was something they wished to be involved in then the Plummer, Mica Creek, and Lake Creek projects were ones they could technically endorse. In addition, they still do not endorse lower river projects that do not first get us to the implementation of the stream stabilization project currently adopted by the Commission.

Given this update, the TLG decided to move forward with projects which ranked a 3.0 or above. Cernera suggested that the group look at phasing several of the projects which ranked 3 or above in a effort to move forward with all of them meanwhile staying within our funding ceiling of \$1.2 million. This exercise resulted in the following project proposal recommendations;

Projects;	Recommendation	Cost
#14) USGS, Lake Responses;	Conduct Phase I and II of proposal	\$190K
#9) IDEQ, North Fork Assessment	Phase the work Refine proposal to include USFS/DEQ coordination	\$165K
#11) INEEL, Canyon Creek	Defer pending URS work Draft up URS workproducts and schedule for Board	
#10) USGS, Lower River	Conduct Phase I and II	\$193K
#1) USFWS, Wetlands Invent.	Fund as presented	\$152K
#4) USFWS, Fish Response	Fund as presented	\$106K
#7) Tribe, Aquatic Veg Survey	Fund as is yet hope to refine sampling method which could yield cost saving	\$130K
	SUB-TOTAL	\$936K

Given the fact that this list still did not use all the money available, the Chair then suggested we look at the projects which scored closest to 3.0.

#12) Plummer, sewer plant	First identify TLG sponsor (DEQ/Tribe) If sponsored, then modify scope to phase approach Phase I (more data collection) \$30K Phase II (implementation) deferred
---------------------------	---

#8) DEQ, Mica Bay

Phase the proposal
Phase I (feasibility Assessment)
Phase II (implementation)

DRAFT
\$20K
Deferred

GRAND TOTAL

\$986K

Path Forward; Given the fact that we were limited by time, the group decided to move forward in the following manner; a) Cernera to write up summary of this conference call discussion, b) State and Tribe determine project sponsorship for Plummer Creek sewer project, c) State to modify N.F. scope of work, d) Tribe to determine what savings can be incurred by modification of sampling protocols for aquatic vegetation study., and e) discussion of this topic further on our weekly TLG conference call scheduled for January 22, 2004 at 8am. The call in number is (206)-553-4557. Remember this will probably be the last time we will be able to discuss this topic prior to submitting our recommendation to “interim Core Staff” by COBD, January 27, 2004.

Thank you for your participation.