

CESAW-PM-C
CESAW-TS-PS

MEMORANDUM FOR: FILE

SUBJECT: Minutes of the 3 June 2004 Executive Committee/Work Group Leaders' Meeting

1. The subject meeting was held at the Roanoke Rapids Power Station from 0900 to 1245. The following individuals were in attendance.

2. Team Status and Prioritization of Tasks: A detailed summary of the discussion during the work group leaders' reports is Attachment 1. Each of the work group leaders or a work group representative provided an update and discussed their work group prioritization ranking. The prioritization ranking was determined at the 29 April 2004 work group leaders' meeting. All work groups have completed their scope of work for phase 1. The downstream flow-based recreation and operating policies and administrative principles groups have completed their scopes of work for phase 2. The water quality group anticipates finishing their phase 2 scope of work in the summer of 2004. The work groups which were not considered a high priority at the April team leaders' meeting are waiting for direction from the Executive Committee at this meeting. A listing of the work groups and their prioritization from the April work group leaders' meeting is Attachment 2.

3. Proposal for Modeling Oversight Team: There was discussion on the role of the modeling oversight group. It was agreed that the group is needed to determine what the model should do and review the model. The purpose of the modeling oversight team would be to ensure all models are appropriately synergetic and not competing, but working congruently. Ms. Hetherman mentioned that the group should be comprised of two representatives from North Carolina, two from Virginia, two from the Corps of Engineers, and one from The Nature Conservancy. Mr. Morris and Mr. Paylor stated the team leader should be from USACE. It was suggested that the model group invite a stakeholder to their meetings to be sure we know what information we need to get out of model and where we want to go. The following persons were identified as the appropriate modeling group members:

It was recommended that the modeling group costs be covered by the work group each participant is currently involved in. There should be a clear line item for modeling oversight in each affected work group's scope of work.

4. Overall Priorities Within the Nine Work Groups: Ms. Hetherman went over the priority ranking hand out. Mr. Morris pointed out that the groups were ranked by timing, not importance. He stated he would like to fund all of the high priority work groups first. It was determined that there was funding to cover the four high priority work group's number 1 priority tasks as well as to document where we are to date with the other five groups. Ms. Hetherman stated what the approximate costs would be for this work in

Fiscal Year 2004. She suggested that a coordination and documentation line item be added in the scope of work to capture the cost for the lower priority work groups. Mr. Pearsall suggested completing the Study in 2006. He stated this would give us two growing seasons and one year to write the report. Mr. Wood stated the schedule was funding driven. There was a question about the State of North Carolina getting ahead with in-kind services. Ms. Hetherman stated that this is possible, but the Sponsors cannot get ahead with cash. Mr. Wood stated the Corps would check the "in-kind" services South Atlantic Division Policy.

5. Executive Committee Comments: All work group proposals were accepted.

- Move forward on the four high priority topic areas: downstream flow regime and effects on riparian ecosystem; water quality; diadromous fish and downstream riverine aquatic resources; and operating policies and administrative principles.
- Work groups not ranked as a high priority need to complete a general scope to capture work completed and the rationale for any further work recommended.
- Modeling team was approved.
- Water supply group should answer the question: "How is the available amount of water calculated for water supply?". It was agreed that the Corps will look into this and be prepared for a discussion at the next meeting.
- Write proposal to recommend that the salt wedge tasks be included in the SOW for water quality to eliminate redundant tasks.

6. Next Meeting. September 28 was the date the group selected for the next meeting. Mr. Morris suggested that this meeting be at the McKimmon Conference Center in Raleigh. Mr. Wood agreed and recommended that the December meeting be at the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir.



Lisa Hetherman
Project Manager



Richard Lewis
Lead Planner