

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 Firehall, 100 Bremer St, Weaverville, CA
 Wednesday, June 26, 2013

Wednesday, June 26, 2013; 9:10 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Joe Polos	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ann Garrett	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Bill Brock ¹	Forest Service
Teresa Connor ²	California Natural Resources Agency
Judy Pflueger	Trinity County
Tom Stokely ³	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ³	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Alternate for Sharon Heywood; 2) alternate for Curtis Milliron 3) non-voting members and attended by phone.

Others that attended: Don Reck, and Carl Dealy (Bureau of Reclamation); D.J. Bandrowski, Andreas Krause, Ernie Clarke, and Victor Haro (Trinity River Restoration Program); George Kautsky and Robert Franklin, (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Wade Sinnen (California Department of Fish and Wildlife); Dan Dickerson (landowner); Seth Naman NOAA Fisheries.

List of Motions that Passed during the Meeting

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to approve the TMC April 2013 meeting minutes.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Regular Business:

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting and asked the TMC members to review the agenda. Mike Orcutt noted his request for changes. Ernie Clarke noted that Chris Jordan will join the meeting by telephone at 10:30 AM.

Approval of April 2013 minutes

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to approve the TMC April 2013 meeting minutes.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Brian Person asked the TMC attendees and members of the audience to introduce themselves.

2. Open Forum

Tom Stokely said CWIN and others have filed a lawsuit against the Delta Stewardship Council regarding the Bay-Delta Plan. He noted that removing conveyance restrictions in the Delta will result in further drawdowns of the Trinity Reservoir. Stokely also said that two years ago there was a joint meeting of the TAMWG and TMC and that relations were at a low. Since that time, there has been a large improvement in relations.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person reported that he attended most of the TAMWG meeting yesterday as he continues efforts to speak directly to the TAMWG members and be more responsive. AFA funding agreements are not yet completed with the tribes. Sequestration has resulted in a 5.2 % reduction in Reclamation budgets across all programs. Sequestration will have a greater reduction in 2014.

Mike Orcutt said the Hoopa Valley Tribe's response is that sequestration should not affect their funding as long as water is being delivered per the original agreements. Person responded that contractual reimbursable requirements are well established. The funding structure for the program must rely on Congressional appropriations. There is ability to transfer funds to the program provided we make good use of these funds. Robin Schrock said that there will not be the option to extend funds due to the early cutoffs.

Person said the program lost Chris Smith a design engineer. Person noted that the program working environment and how disagreements were handled in the workgroups was a factor in his departure. He asked that this has to be taken into account and that this should "incentivize us to work more collegially."

4. Report from TAMWG Chair

Tom Stokely, Vice chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) reported on three motions made by the TAMWG relevant to the TMC: 1) ask for a NEPA analysis of the fall flow options; 2) ask for a presentation on ethics and conflict of interest for the TMC; and 3) consolidate the workgroups but not so to reduce the watershed efforts. There was interest in emphasizing a previous motion of no gravel injections this summer.

Mike Orcutt asked that the watershed work be subject all the peer-review and scrutiny as the other programs.

5. Report from Executive Director

Ernie Clarke referred the TMC to the Executive Director's report that was part of the handouts provided. He next touched on a set of specific topics.

Procurement processes (handout) Q&A

Clarke referred the TMC to the Acquisition Document in the handouts. Clarke noted that several staff from Bureau of Reclamation contracting were present and ready to address the issue of acquisition. Victor Haro, contracting officer for the TRRP introduced several other contracting staff.

Haro then provided some comments on the review of the watershed analysis proposals. He noted that the contracting regulations did not permit outside review of the specific proposals for

reasons of confidentiality. Dave Hillemeier noted that the Klamath Task Force reviewed proposals. Haro said the Chief of acquisitions would need to address this issue. Hillemeier said it is challenging under this sort of process and he would like to see a resolution. Mike Orcutt said the TMC was led to believe that they would be able to see the proposals. Person responded that there are limitations about disclosing proprietary information. Haro said if the request for proposals does not say the proposals will go for outside review, they cannot be sent out for external review. Hillemeier said then they should state that proposal will be submitted for outside review. Clarke asked if the TMC wants to review all proposals. Hillemeier thought they may want to, or at least their technical staff should have the opportunity to review proposals. Person said that these issues could be taken up in future discussions with the contracting office.

Ernie Clarke continued his review of the Executive Director's report. He noted that budget, implementation and science updates will be covered in greater detail in presentations today. He noted several new publications that are available on the online data portal of the TRRP website. He noted two upcoming meetings—value engineering July 12 and TMC/TAMWG joint meeting August 27.

Workgroup update (handout) Q&A

Clarke next referred the TMC to the Workgroup Summary document in their handouts. Clarke touched on some of the activities of the seven workgroups.

Mike Orcutt asked about revegetation compliance strategy and the “regulatory overlay.” He hoped it was being done. He asked that if they are not doing 1-to-1 revegetation, they should justify the rationale for not doing so.

Watershed Projects (handout)

Clarke then turned his review to the watershed restoration proposals and projected a summary of proposal costs. He referred to the four that were being recommended for funding and pointed out they had total cost of \$657,000. Person noted that West Weaver Creek was “well leveraged” with other funding. Teresa Connor said the additional matching funds were coming from the Department of Water Resources Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan (IRWMP).

Dave Hillemeier asked how the watershed proposals were ranked. Clarke said they had a set of criteria and also had inputs from the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Hillemeier noted that if non-TRRP staff reviewed full proposals why the watershed analyses were not reviewed by external reviewers. Victor Haro responded that these watershed restoration tasks were part of a larger cooperative agreement with RCD, and that agreement was competed. Since they are tasks of the agreement they do not need to be competed. Judy Pflueger asked why RCD were “bidding on their own grant.” Haro said they are simply telling Reclamation how they are planning to spend the grant money. This grant to the RCD is a different type of acquisition than the watershed analyses. Mike Orcutt asked if this process is being treated the same as the other workgroup or other parts of the program.

Person asked if there were some sort of written documents that would help to explain the acquisition processes such as the watershed analysis. He asked for a simple document in lay person's language.

Information / Decision Items:

6. Fall Flows

Brian Person introduced the fall flows topic and noted that the TMC can chose to advise the Secretary, but would need to do so today. The objectives of the federal agencies are to protect the returning fall Chinook salmon and to protect the cold water pool in Trinity Reservoir. Augmenting flows to the same rate as last year (3,200 cfs) is calculated to require a release of 94 thousand acre-feet (TAF) as opposed to last year's release of 39 TAF.

Person said that the TAMWG expressed concerns that no sacrifices are being made on the Klamath side. Person wanted to cite the hardships on the Klamath side and noted 1) increased groundwater pumping may be needed at a cost of millions of dollars, 2) the Klamath National Wildlife Refuge will not get water where they normally get 80 TAF a year, 3) water shut offs are occurring to junior users, and 4) Klamath Lake may get drawn down to levels insufficient for recovery of listed species.

Mike Orcutt asked about a rumor of Pacific Corp providing up to 20 TAF of water. Don Reck said he did not know how that water may be used. Dave Hillemeier read a letter from Pacific Corp to Commissioner Conner, of the Bureau of Reclamation, regarding the potential availability of some of Klamath Hydroelectric Project reservoir water for use relief in the Upper Klamath basin.

There was discussion about exceedingly low water years that coincided with high fish years. But Reck said he was not sure how to graph that. Hillemeier said he thought it is important to show that this is something that does not happen very often.

Mike Orcutt noted a motion was made in April to convene a technical discussion on fall flows. He asked if there was an opportunity for this. Person said they are tight on time schedule and noted that the TMC has discussed this in phone calls. He emphasized that the TMC needs to advise the Secretary immediately if it so chooses. Orcutt reiterated that the TMC made the motion for a technical workgroup but it appeared that as if there was "already an analysis in hand." Now with little analysis evident and the need to make a decision, he expressed his concern. He noted that pulse flows have "other implications" and it will affect juveniles. Reck noted that the flow sub-group of the Flow Workgroup recommended pulsed flows as an idea.

Judy Pflueger asked whether the 39 TAF released last year was "recouped" in this winter Trinity Lake refilling. Person explained several points. The inflows were much greater than 39 TAF, but Trinity Lake did not completely refill. It would have been accurate to conclude that the no harm to the water supply was caused if the Lake had filled. As a result, the power users indicate they were harmed. She asked if a drought lasts through next year, from where the water will come to refill the Lake. Person noted that a refill of the lake has about a 12 % chance of occurring next year, according to CVO calculations. They expect the Lake to be drawn down to 1.2 million acre-feet. This is about one half the total volume of Trinity Reservoir and to fill it would require an average inflow year with no releases.

Person said they have been looking for other options. One way may be to perform better in-season monitoring of fish health, temperature and flow and this could allow a more quick reaction using a smaller release volume. Hillemeier said that flow needs to be maintained at 3,200 cfs. There has not yet been a clear correlation demonstrated between temperature and fish kill. Mike Orcutt added that there is no accurate mechanism to evaluate run size. He said if we don't take action, we may need an emergency release of 48,000 or last year's recommendation of

3,200 cfs with a potential doubling. Person hoped they could do better this year, citing that a release of 94 TAF or 142 TAF will “risk next year.” Orcutt noted that the Commissioner wants a “long-term solution” and that long-term solution is “code talk” for compensation. Water banks were constrained by the Biological Opinion. Orcutt went on to cite the law that says the primary objective is to protect the fishery and that may mean you have to curtail the flow in the Valley.

Bill Brock asked what the program learned. Is 3,200 cfs a critical threshold or not? Person said they don’t know if 2,800 would have been sufficient or not. They only know the release of 3,200 cfs did not result in a large fish die off. Flow in 2002 started at 2,500 cfs and dropped down to 2,000. Wade Sinnen thought a compromise on flow would save a bit of water but no one wants to be the scapegoat in case there is another fish kill.

At this point, Don Reck showed graphs of flows at Klamath near Klamath (KNK, a gage site near the mouth) during August and September. He showed several years: during 2002 and during the 1980’s and projected flows during 2013 if they released extra water from Lewiston to reach 2,800 cfs flow at KNK. This would require the release of 63 TAF from Trinity Reservoir based on the current accretion forecast. Robert Franklin said that the science cannot predict exactly the water needed but that they are taking a risk of a fish kill. He likened it to walking along a precipice in total darkness and that it may be a good decision to take a step away for safety. Person agreed that they need to consider a different risk model. Dave Hillemeier said the returning fish numbers may be lower this year, but the biomass will likely be the same. Last year, the releases that met the 3,200 cfs flows at KNK were associated with no fish kill.

There was discussion over the fish returns. In 2002 run size was 170,000 fall Chinook. In 2012 the predicted return was 380,000 but the actual was 302,000. This year the predicted return is 272,000. There was discussion over the 3,200 cfs threshold. At first California Fish and Wildlife thought 2,500 was the minimum flow needed to prevent a fish kill now they think 3,200 cfs is needed.

Lunch Break

Fall Flows (continued)

Person reviewed the status of the discussion so far. He said that they have had a good discussion and he will inform the decision makers even if no motion can be made. He asked what next steps will be helpful?

Judy Pflueger noted that she has multiple stakeholder interests to represent and that she was leaning toward 2,500 cfs. She cited the need to arrive at a balance of water use and to also avoid a fish kill. She cited the need for flexibility instead of rigid structure. She said she was worried about next year.

Bill Brock asked about the start date of the release. Dave Hillemeier said the peak of the run is late August or early September. Mike Orcutt said he would re-confirm the 2012 recommendation but they should have started the analysis earlier.

Teresa Connor asked about how they arrived at the 3200 cfs and would it have been chosen if they thought this is the start of a three-year drought? Don Reck said there is not a lot of “quantitative stuff to grab on to.”

Bill Brock citing experience in the basin and his knowledge about weather stated that he was “reasonably confident that 2,800 cfs will get them through.”

Bill Brock made a motion to recommend a fall flow release from Lewiston to achieve 2,800 cfs base flow at KNK from August 15 to September 22 with the caveat of doubling to 5,600 as an emergency measure based on monitoring.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion failed with 4 “ayes” and 2 “opposed” and 2 abstentions.

Opposed were Yurok Tribe and Hoopa Valley Tribe.

Abstentions were FWS and NOAA.

During the discussion before the vote, Mike Orcutt expressed his opposition by citing the first priority is fish. The Central Valley still gets half the water with no compensation. He wants to exercise “latitude under Proviso 1” whereas the program seems to be changing things with no rationale. Bill Brock agreed with Orcutt that 3,200 cfs would be better for the fish, but he was thinking about how to bank water for next year. Dave Hillemeier said that he liked this recommendation better than others put out there as it is important to reduce risk, but that the Yurok Tribe is most comfortable with 3,200 cfs.

Since the motion failed, it was decided there was no need to reconfirm last year’s motion. Person said he would consider writing a letter to summarize the TMC discussion and if he elects to do so, he will send the letter out for review.

7. Implementation Update

2013 Rehabilitation projects

D.J. Bandrowski described the schedule for new projects to be constructed this year, (Douglas City and Lorenz Gulch) noting that construction should start in July. George Kautsky clarified that only half of Douglas City will be constructed and that these sites are about number 29 and 30 out of the original ROD 47 planned sites.

Bandrowski explained the history of the re-design of the Indian Creek site and some of the concerns that lead to the project. Teresa Connor asked how the various concerns were raised. Bandrowski explained discussions occurred in TRRP meetings with partners and with conversations with landowners.

Bandrowski said that the Bucktail Bridge is at 60 % design and they expect construction in 2014 or 2015.

2014 Project Objectives and metrics

Three new sites are just now being designed. Bandrowski said they recently held a joint design/stakeholders meeting but it was not very well attended. He passed out a poll sheet used at the meeting used to assess stakeholder’s priority for various goals.

Joe Polos asked about issues working on private lands in the upcoming sites. Bandrowski said Poker Bar is on private lands. If we ignored that, the sites have “consistent” private and public land ownership. The Forest Service owns lands on Dutch Creek and they require a more detailed environmental review. Last year’s fall flows did affect construction and this was successfully dealt with.

Bandrowski passed out a flow chart showing the design schedule for the three 2014-2015 construction projects (Lower Junction City, Dutch Creek, and Bucktail).

Mike Orcutt asked about the added cost for extra meetings with stakeholders. Bandrowski thought they actually save money by holding meetings by avoiding confrontations later on as happened before.

Seth Naman asked about the increased costs to the Indian Creek. Bandrowski said the only extra cost will be the increased mobilization costs due to construction occurring over two years.

Mike Orcutt asked what are they supposed to do over gravel given the TAMWG's interest in having no gravel additions this year. Person clarified the former guidance given to the TRRP during an earlier conference call to "pursue" the project are to continue to add up to 1,500 cubic yards of gravel at the Sawmill Site.

8. Science Update

Phase 1 Review

Ernie Clarke noted that six appendices were drafted. Two appendices are just "hours" from being finished, but they need to just find the time. They have not committed to a date. Mike Orcutt noted the perpetual updates of what still needs to be done, and that "this is not real useful." Brian Person said he had a "pretty good comfort level" with the way the SAB has handled things.

Peer Review Procedures

Clarke reported that they had developed a policy on peer review and showed the TMC a table of contents of a document describing the policy. Mike Orcutt asked when they will address the recommendations of the adult review. Clarke said the Fish Workgroup has developed an implementation plan. Robert Franklin appreciated the value of this review policy in that it would help with interaction within the program.

Workgroup Procedures

Clarke reported the development of a document explaining the rules for the technical workgroups. He showed the table of contents. There were specific rules on how to arrive at consensus and how to deal with disagreements where consensus cannot be reached. Clarke suggested that this sort of document is one that could be handed to a new participant. Responded to a question Clarke said that core members should be TMC representatives. George Kautsky noted the description of the Design Team was not included. He noted the described role of the Executive Director is different than what is practiced. Kautsky cited that the Workgroup charter had different dispute resolution than the Procedures document.

Workgroup Options

Clarke explained options to streamline the workgroups in order to reduce meeting times and enhance integration. Currently there are eight separate workgroups. Option B would reduce the workgroups to five that feed to the IDT. Temperature would be added to Flow and Watershed would be added to IDT. Option A would have three major groups: Design, IDT and Flow. The remaining five workgroups would respond to the needs of these three major groups.

Dave Hillemeier thought Option A would lose emphasis on fish. He thought maybe the workgroups may need to put more thought into development of agendas so to avoid unneeded meetings. Joe Polos liked the Option A as it may be more responsive to the needs of the

program. It will be a lot of work for those on the IDT. Mike Orcutt was concerned about the changes. Andreas Krause liked Option A as the existing structure is “onerous” and limits cross communication. He thought Option A has multi-disciplinary teams organized around program management actions.

Bill Brock thought the IDT may not evaluate proposals as effectively as the Watershed Workgroup and this could be a problem.

Ann Garret made a motion implement Option A for workgroup formation and assess how it is working in twelve months.

Joe Polos seconded the motion.

The motion was withdrawn.

During the discussion of the motion, Mike Orcutt thought it was premature to restructure and he had not had time to discuss it with his tribe. Teresa Connor wanted more information on the IDT membership and wanted to make sure no one was being excluded. Dave Hillemeier said he was not ready to support the motion until he had time to discuss with his staff.

Person asked if the motion maker and second if they may want to give it more time and ask the IDT to provide more information on it. The motion was withdrawn.

SAB input to 2014 Science Workplan

This sub-item was discussed following Item 5. Executive Director’s Report as Chris Jordan was able to join the meeting via phone at 10:30 AM. After this sub-item, the TMC returned back to Item 6.

Ernie Clarke introduced the Science Workplan and projected a summary document and went over some items. Clarke projected a bulleted set of review comments by the SAB. SAB member, Chris Jordan, NOAA Fisheries, talked about the SAB review process by a phone connection. Jordan said that overall, the SAB is impressed with how the Workplan have developed and has incorporated peer review. He noted the Decision Support System (DSS) is a good way to integrate the program but they thought implementation (Scenario 1) is not yet viable. They recommended using the DSS at a more simple level and building it up as they go. A critical question for projects is how the results will be used to advance the program or answer specific management questions. He thought the program is not as integrated as it should be and the clear linkages among projects and how they are linked back to the major program objects are lacking.

Ernie Clarke said he would print out the bulleted recommendations for the TMC (he did this during lunch). Brian Person asked Jordan if there were more redundancies or more gaps in the program. Jordan said gaps were difficult to identify at this point, but they will become more apparent as you try to make decisions based on data. Redundancy is more evident but they could not completely evaluate that without know more about the “genesis” of the projects. George Kautsky appreciated the report on the 2014 plan. He asked if the 2014 plan’s order may appear out of place. Jordan said some of the more complicated tasks of the fish habitat model may be tried at a less complex level. Start DSS with what is in hand and build more complexity based on a demonstrated need and not on a perceived need. You may want to sequence the steps of building complexity.

9. DSS Implementation Options

Ernie Clarke went over the history of the Decision Support System (DSS). The SAB recommended the TRRP follow Appendix H of the Phase I report to work with Atkins to come up with three scenarios to implement a DSS. One example was the development of the Klamath fish model and adapt it to the Trinity. The SAB recommend the TRRP to try to develop a more simple model that could be used sooner.

Robert Franklin noted that DSS will not provide specific answers guiding design. George Kautsky expressed some concern citing that he did not know what the scaled down version of the DSS might look like.

10. 2014 Budget

Brian Person noted that the discussion on 2014 is tentative given the sequestration. Ernie Clarke led the TMC through a printed version of the budget that was part of the TMC handouts. The 2014 proposed budget was \$2.89 million (M) for administration, \$7.78 M for Rehabilitation and Implementation, \$5.07 M for science. This came to an 18 %, 49 % and 32 % split.

He showed the details of the administration budget and the science budget. He noted that the science budget has \$4.8 M proposed but only \$3.5 M available. They are waiting for SAB input to help pare down the list. Mike Orcutt asked about the Klamath Scale project being under review. Clarke said it is being reviewed based on SAB recommendation. Joe Polos also said that the last year's peer review were mixed. There were technical questions about methods and it was recommended by the adult review. Orcutt asked about the decrease in the coded wire tagging based on the purchase of the tags. Clarke noted that this number is misleading as it includes maintenance of trailers. Orcutt said they could resolve other question in another forum.

D.J. Bandrowski went over the Rehabilitation and Implementation (RIG) budget. He noted they dropped the well program. Mike Orcutt asked about the moving of riparian bird monitoring from science to RIG. Bandrowski said it served a regulatory and a monitoring function. Orcutt asked why the tribe designs were detailed and the DWR was not. Bandrowski said that the DWR included more small items and he decided not to list them all. There were questions on the LiDAR. Joe Polos asked if it were much more expensive to add the entire 40 miles versus just the project sites. Bandrowski thought the bathymetric results would be the greatest costs since it requires a jet boat. Polos also pointed out watershed work is narrowly focused per the ROD and the budgeted activities may be beyond the scope of the ROD. Mike Orcutt said the ROD specified \$500 K versus the budget that has \$657 K.

11. Outreach—TRRP Video Preview

Ernie Clarke showed a video on the Trinity River prepared by Jeff Morris. Wade Sinnen thought it was good. Mike Orcutt asked if there were room for modifications. Orcutt thought additions may include that the dam cut off 109 miles of habitat and it is gone forever. There are detractors and they may say "What about the hatchery and harvest?" Judy Pflueger asked about the purpose. Person said what is the restoration and what lead to it and what are some of the positive factors. He noted the 90 % diversion may be overstated since the average pre-program diversion was 75 %. Dave Hillemeier noted he would like to see lamprey research. They mentioned side channel but it would be good to capture the fluvial effects. Orcutt thought the mining may have been overplayed. Funding deficiencies hinder the program. It should cite tribal fisheries along with subsistence fisheries. Tribe has concurrence authority on the project. Wade Sinnen thought the wildlife portion was glossed over. George Kautsky said he thought it was originally planned

as an evidentiary piece for the mining claim at Douglas City and asked if it is meeting that plan. He asked how medium like video subject to review. There was a discussion about the role of peer review. Joe Polos said the TMC is the group to review the video. He thought as far as evidentiary piece, this was to be a general overview and there would be experts at the trial. Dave Hillemeier thought it was a useful piece and it should be put on the website. A further discussion is warranted.

12. Open Forum

Carl Dealy of the Bureau of Reclamation appreciated sitting in on the TMC meeting and he thought the TMC has gone a lot further than they think they have. He appreciated the work they are doing.

Robert Franklin said his family is connected to this program. The community of McKinleyville on the coast is very much “about this river.” He encouraged the TMC to continue to think about this and try to reach this bigger audience.

Brian Person noted the calendar and that the fall coast meeting may need to be moved to Weaverville due to travel restrictions with sequestration.

Adjourn of meeting 4:52 PM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 Firehall (623-6156), 100 Bremer Street, Weaverville, CA
 June 26, 2013

Wednesday, June 26, 2013

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
	<i>Regular Business:</i>	
9:30	Introductions: ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of April 2013 Minutes	Brian Person, Chair
9:45	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
10:00	Report from TMC Chair ▪ Federal/Regional updates	Brian Person
10:15	Report from TAMWG Chair	Elizabeth Hadley
10:30	Report from Executive Director ▪ Procurement processes (handout) Q&A ▪ Workgroup update (handout) Q&A ▪ Proposed Watershed Projects (handout)	Robin Schrock
	<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>	
11:00	Fall flows	Brian Person
12:00	Break	
12:15	Fall flows	Brian Person
1:00	Implementation Update ▪ 2013 Rehabilitation projects ▪ 2014 Project Objectives and metrics	DJ Bandrowski
2:00	Science Update ▪ Phase 1 Review ▪ Peer Review Procedures ▪ Workgroup Procedures ▪ Workgroup options ▪ SAB input to 2014 Science Workplan	Ernie Clarke
3:00	DSS implementation options	Ernie Clarke
3:30	2014 Budget	
4:15	Outreach – TRRP video preview	Jeff Morris
4:30	Open Forum	
5:00	Adjourn	