

LCSG Regional Sediment Management

Notes of Policy Sub-Committee Meeting

3 April 2008

Attending (in person or by phone): Anderson, Bacchieri, Coffman, Flint, Hennessey, Marriott, Perry, Pfund, Robinson, Tortorici, O'Mealy, Trask, Blosser

There were three agenda items:

- Review Trask scope of work
- Review questions related to the scope of work for a Sediment Budget
- Discuss membership in the Science Workgroup technical advisors.

Phil recapped the 7 scope of work items and the group discussed each of them. Phil provided an overview of his general approach, which will be to ask the agency partners for as much help as they can give, but not to ask them actually to draft chapters. His staff will take the materials provided and work them into draft chapters of the plan. For this first draft, there will be many information gaps, and the text will point this out.

Task 1: Management: Phil plans to work directly with all the partners who will be providing materials.

Task 2, Policy/Technical Questions: We began this today with the review of the questions for Task 4. Future meetings will deal with other issues.

Task 3: Literature Search: Phil noted that several literature reviews exist, and he intends to use all of them.

Task 4: Sediment Budget: we reviewed the list of questions prepared by Phil and Jennifer Hennessey. Phil asked each committee member to take these back to their respective staffs and review it. He would like each member to consider these questions during their review:

- Have all the issues of importance been raised in the two-page piece provided?
- If a model is developed that answers all the questions, will it be useful to your agency or group in doing its work? If not, what is needed to make it useful?
- We will probably have severe budget limitations on what we can do. Therefore, if you could only get one or two key things out of a sediment budget model, what would they be? In other words, what are your priorities? (Phil thinks that developing a sediment budget model that answers all the questions posed could take 10 or more years).

Task 5: Historical Dredging: Phil emphasized that the budget is quite small for this item and it will not be able to synthesize all the data available in the Corps files. They will do a 5-year snapshot initially, and then develop historical data as funds become available.

Task 6: Interim Regulations: This also is a small task item with much importance. They will develop a draft regulatory framework to serve as a basis for further work later.

Task 7: Sediment Placement Criteria Development: This will be a test activity to see what draft criteria would look like and how difficult it is to apply them to a real world situation on the river.

Since Workgroup Technical Advisors: Phil asked all members to send him their suggestions for names of people who could serve as technical advisors on all aspects of the plan:

- Physical processes
- Biological processes
- Regulatory processes
- Dredging operations
- Other (land ownership, GIS, etc.)

These advisors could come from the agencies, interest groups, academia or consultants. Deb Marriott is asking the LCREP Science Workgroup for name suggestions, too.