

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 it's 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 to 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

#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.