

## TLG CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY

### January 5, 2006

#### **Participants:**

Brian Spears (Vice Chair)	Rusty Sheppard
Mike Beckwith	Lloyd Brewer
Anne Dailey	Ron Roizen
Terry Harwood	David Fortier
Paul Woods	Rob Spafford
Rog Hardy	Mark Maserik
Bill Adams	Jeri DeLange (Note Taker)
Bill Ryan	
Nick Zilka	

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:** TLG Process and Flow Chart

Brian Spears led the call as Phillip Cernera was unavailable. He mentioned that he recently emailed everyone a draft copy of the TLG document production flow chart to review. Spears indicated that he has received good comments on it including requests from the CCC and BEIPC Executive Director to be more involved in the process and to allow sufficient time for response. Rusty Sheppard commented that it takes time for the CCC to review and comment; and that they usually only receive a week at the most. Harwood mentioned that it depends on what is produced to determine what additional time may be needed.

Rob Spafford commented that he believes that targets are good, but there should not be inflexible rules. Otherwise, the process breaks down. Sheppard reiterated that the CCC has a difficult time responding when it is only given a week because it is a volunteer organization. He suggested that the flow chart be revised to allow the CCC two weeks at the end of the process. Spears asked for input on how to fit the CCC into the process. Lloyd Brewer suggested that the CCC could be placed in between the minority position. Spears discussed adding that the CCC would like two weeks under the guidelines so this can be incorporated when the timelines are developed.

Another issue that was brought up by Sheppard included changes being made to a document before the CCC has had an opportunity to review it. Harwood pointed out that a good example of this includes the upcoming scheduling:

- January 31 – TLG Meeting
- February 1 – CCC Meeting
- February 3 – Deadline for BEIPC board packet information

He then explained that in regards to the two sections (ICP and blood lead) that need to be revised in the 2006 work plan, that this does not even allow a day in between the TLG and CCC meetings. If substantive changes are required, it will be difficult to incorporate them in order to make a presentation to the CCC the following day. Sheppard mentioned that this is the reason that sometimes two separate packages go to the BEIPC because the CCC may not even see the final changes until after their meeting.

Harwood also indicated that it takes him a few days to put together the packets after his deadline for information in order to mail them to the commissioners in time. Spears asked Harwood for the timeframe. Harwood answered that he needs to allow two weeks to send out the board packets and that he will put together a reasonable amount of time for the process in the future. However, he pointed out that it would be difficult again this time because of the holidays and the scheduling that has already been made. Spears mentioned that he wants the document flow chart to be specific and thanked Harwood for providing the information. After he makes the revisions for CCC review and comment to the flow chart diagram, he will send it out to everyone.

Spears then reminded everyone of the TLG meeting on January 31 and said that the location has not been determined yet. He inquired if there were any upcoming PFT meetings. Anne Dailey mentioned that there would be an OU-2 meeting on February 21 at the US Forest Service Office (Caribou room) in the afternoon at 1:00 p.m. She indicated that she also reserved the room for the morning in case the TLG needs it. Hardy asked about the water quality issues for OU-2. Dailey responded that remedial actions for OU2 will be evaluated for source removal and containment. The EPA is working on putting together a revised model, updating data, and conducting analysis.

Mike Beckwith indicated that he wanted to comment on his perception of the TLG. He has been involved for a few years and pointed out that it is a technical group. However, he does not feel that anything technical has been discussed the last few months. He stated that the purpose of the Basin Commission was to help in the implementation of the ROD's and to think of ideas to deal with the technical issues related to the ROD's. Beckwith believes that other issues, including tribal affairs such as the integrated resource management plan, should not be discussed unless they are related to the ROD. He suggested that now is a good time for the TLG to get back to its purpose as it is a new year. Beckwith also commented that too much time is being spent on scheduling.

Hardy said that he will continue to bring up issues because he feels that they are related. Ron Roizen indicated that he understands Beckwith's remarks in regards to the process level versus comment level. He pointed out that this is the way that bureaucratic groups work and that it is important to resolve. Roizen also mentioned that the ROD actually says little about the LMP and to be careful not to overstate that position. Beckwith said that he agrees with that. Harwood mentioned that when you look at those things on the lake and what Dailey is trying to do with standards for OU-2, the actions should be focused on remedies and not the effect of. Dailey answered that the point on designing for Phase II is the need to consider water quality standards.

Bill Adams informed everyone that there will be a mine/mill meeting on January 9 at 8:30 a.m. in the basement conference room at the Idaho Dept. of Transportation in CDA. The next water

treatment PFT meeting will be January 30 at the US Forest Service Office on Schreiber Way in CDA. He is working on putting together the agendas for the meetings. Spears asked about the difference in technical discussion between Adams and Beckwith. Adams indicated that technical discussion occurs at the TLG level with further discussion brought up in the PFT group for more interaction. Spafford mentioned that he has observed this in the PFT agendas as they are filled with technical issues. He suggested that the TLG may need more detailed agendas. Beckwith reiterated the need to back off from scheduling and get back to the process so that technical discussion can occur. Otherwise, he feels the discussion may not go in that direction.

Adams remarked that PFT reports may be helpful to the TLG in order for members to be aware of what the groups are working on. Dailey agreed. She also believes that it may be helpful for the Basin Commission to know. David Fortier indicated that he is concerned about the amount of time allowed for the PFT's to report on technical issues as they do not have five weeks. He believes the concept is good, but there is not time to give updates. However, they could talk about general issues. Adams said this needs to be resolved to meet goals for construction; specifically more in terms of planning and approval. He agreed that on design issues, there would not be enough time. Beckwith suggested working with Harwood to lay out the schedule.

Spears expressed his view on people's frustration that the PFT's are more scientific groups; and that the TLG is more technical leadership and not strictly scientific. He remarked that this is why politics are involved. Sheppard commented that the State's water quality standards for the Lake are radically different than the Tribe's. Hardy commented that the Basin Commission would not exist if there were no politics involved and that the public wants to know what is going on.

**Announcements:** Dailey indicated that she sent an email out to everyone to notify them that the final NAS report is out. Harwood mentioned that there may be a human health PFT conference call sometime next week, possibly on January 12. Roizen inquired about a schedule for the PFT meetings and conference calls. Upon further discussion, Jeri DeLange said that she would post information for conference calls and meetings for the TLG and PFT's on the Basin Commission web site calendar at: [www.basincommission.com](http://www.basincommission.com). Please send information to be posted on future events to either Harwood or DeLange.

### **Round Table:**

**Dailey:** Reported that training for environmental data will be conducted on Storet next week.

**Harwood:** Indicated that he is working on the annual accomplishment report.

**Spafford:** Nothing to report.

**Adams:** Mentioned that the mine/mill conference call will begin at 9:30 this morning.

**Sheppard:** Reported that he will be having surgery next week. He also mentioned that Commissioner Currie would like to get a copy of the video from the last lake monitoring PFT meeting. Beckwith indicated that he would talk to Holly LeBret about a copy.

**Roizen:** Brought up the ICP PFT process and mentioned that he found it a little unsatisfactory. He is conducting an email discussion to provide more content on the table. Roizen indicated that he is concerned with the boundary issue and whether properties that test clean will still be included.

**Brewer:** Nothing to report.

**Zilka:** Nothing to report.

**Fortier:** Nothing to report.

**Beckwith:** Reiterated his previous points on the TLG process and that it should be focused on technical issues.

**Maserik:** Mentioned that he took over the position of Chair for the recreational PFT from Dailey. He said that digital mapping should be completed by the end of January and that he is working on scheduling a recreational PFT meeting.

**Ryan:** Nothing to report.

**Hardy:** Inquired about the status of the lake map. Beckwith indicated that he did not know and that Rebecca Stevens was out of town.

**Schedule:** The next TLG conference call will be scheduled 1/12/06.

Thank you for your participation.