

**TLG CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY**  
**January 15, 2004**

Participants:

Phillip Cerna	Bill Rust	Bill Adams
Rob Spafford	Paul Woods	Mike Stevenson
Lloyd Brewer	Luke Russell	Sheila Eckman
Jana McCurdy	Jim Hansen	
Dave Suhr	John Roland	

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

**Agenda Items:**

Review Tuesday's meeting and find a path forward:

Cerna noted that Spafford sent out a sheet yesterday that summarizes the levels of acceptance for the CWA projects that were considered. The TLG needs to determine what to present to the Basin Commission. Cerna noted that we did not rank previously considered projects at Tuesday's session, and asked the group if there is a need to reevaluate those projects, or should the TLG provide the Commission with a list of all of the projects listed in order of level of acceptance with columns listing reasons for strong support or objection.

Roland said he felt the projects were ranked relative to each other, and the TLG should not just combine the lists. He thinks the TLG still has work to do: it should recommend specific projects. Adams agreed: specific projects, specific reasons. Woods recalled some of the reasons related to lower basin projects, and suggested lower basin projects – the ones deferred until after the Lower Basin Forum – could be funded from future funds. Brewer noted that this sounds like what was done before. He is concerned that these projects not be deferred permanently. Roland noted that most of the January proposals that had the most support were lower basin projects. Deferring lower basin projects leaves the group with lots of potential funding and few projects. Cerna observed that there were projects offered that were in the lower basin area, but that were not "Lower River projects" (e.g. the wetland inventory proposal).

Rust brought up what he characterized as a policy question: The Basin Commission is a remediation entity. The problem with studies is that they are almost a continuation of the RI. There is not a lot of support for that where he comes from. Woods noted that the Lake Management Plan plays into this question, as well.

Cerna asked if the group should move forward before the policy questions are answered. Russell reminded the group that it needs to have recommendations to the Basin Commission by January 28.

Additional discussion ensued, including Dailey's reminder that CWA funds are not for remedial design, Rust's objection to the Basin Commission potentially becoming a conduit for extension of the RI, and Cerna's note that his early position was to move away from ROD actions with CWA funds.

TLG Conference Call Summary, December 18, 2003

Sheppard observed that the TLG is out in front of the Basin Commission: these are good projects, but the Commission needs to guide the TLG. There are good projects on the Lake, but the Commission has not accepted the Lake Management Plan. It is difficult to get support for Lake projects until that happens.

Further discussion resulted in the group's acceptance of its need to provide the Commission with specific recommendations, and of the need for further discussion of projects. It was agreed to hold a conference call next Tuesday at 8:00 AM to continue.

Bill Adams will arrange for a call-in number, and will provide the details when they are available.

[From Adams' subsequent email:

The call in number is (202) 275-0199, Conference Access Code: 4694#, on January 20, 2004. We have the line from 8:00am to 10:30am PST.]

The next regular TLG call is January 22, at 8:00 AM.

Thank you for your participation.