PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Executive Director's Office Conference Room – Kearney, NE
April 18, 2012

Meeting Participants

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Table

State of Wyoming
Mike Besson – Member (Chair)

State of Colorado
Suzanne Sellers – Member

State of Nebraska
Mike Fritz – Member

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)
Matt Rabbe – Member
Jeff Runge – Alternate

Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)
Brock Merrill – Member

Environmental Entities
Rich Walters – Member
Mary Harner – Alternate

Upper Platte Water Users

Colorado Water Users
Kevin Urie – Member

Downstream Water Users
Mark Czaplewski – Member
Jim Jenniges – Member
Mark Peyton – Member

Executive Director's Office (EDO)
Jerry Kenny – Executive Director (ED)
Chad Smith
Dave Baasch
Jason Farnsworth
Dave Zorn
Steve Smith
Beorn Courtney (Conference Line)

Other Participants
Mike George (FWS)
Jesse Bradley (NGPC)
Greg Wright (Trust)
Tyler Thulin (CNPPID)
Rich Holloway (Tri-Basin NRD)
Cory Steinke (CNPPID)
Ryan Urie

Welcome and Administrative

Besson called the meeting to order and the group proceeded with a roll call. Besson asked for agenda modifications; none offered.

August, 2011 – April, 2012 TAC Minutes

Besson asked the group if there were any changes to the August 2011 TAC meeting minutes, October 2011 TAC meeting minutes, November 2011 TAC conference call minutes, November 2011 TAC/ISAC meeting minutes, January, 2012 WC Minimum Habitat Criteria Workshop minutes, or February, 2012 Wet Meadow Workshop minutes. Jenniges stated he believe minutes from August 2011 TAC meeting were approved during the October TAC meeting and asked if

those minutes had changed. Baasch stated no changes were made to the August TAC minutes. Sellers moved to approve minutes from previous TAC meetings, conference calls, and workshops; Czaplewski seconded the motion; all approved. **October 2011 TAC meeting minutes, November 2011 TAC conference call minutes, November 2011 TAC/ISAC meeting minutes, January 2012 WC Minimum Habitat Criteria Workshop minutes, and February 2012 Wet Meadow Workshop minutes Approved (August 2011 TAC meeting minutes were approved by the TAC in October 2011 as Jenniges stated).**

2011 IMRP Reports Update

Baasch informed the group that the 2011 LTPP Report was about 2/3 completed and that he plans to have a draft out for TAC review soon. Baasch stated he received the WC Database, User Manual, and updated Report from EALP and would post those for TAC Review as well. Harner asked if Karine Gil-Weir planned to incorporate TAC suggestions/revisions; Baasch stated Karine would incorporate any suggestion the TAC may have as the contract has not been paid in full.

C. Smith stated the Fall WC Monitoring Report was previously reviewed by the TAC and that future versions would include summary figures, graphs, and tables that incorporate data collected since 2007 and possibly 2001. Rabbe suggested adding information in the report indicating it appears that one of the fall WC locations was on a sandbar that was previously created/manage as a tern and plover island by Partners for Fish and Wildlife (FWS) program which was subsequently eroded into a submerged bar. Baasch asked if this information should be included in other areas such as Rowe Sanctuary as well. Rabbe said we should look at recent aerial imagery and if we can still discern the bar then we should include the information in the report. Jenniges asked if the Partners had documentation that identified where the islands were located; Rabbe stated he mapped the islands during 2009 and has the information. Baasch stated management actions taken to create the tern and plover islands are included in LTPP Reports. Jenniges suggested we evaluate whooping crane use relative to management actions. Harner asked if non-Program management actions are archived anywhere. Walters said he had digitized layers for all known private-lands work conducted since the 1980's. Farnsworth stated the Program obtained a copy of the digitized layer and is tracking management actions taken by the Program. Besson asked if the group wanted to approve the report as final or if this change is needed. C. Smith and Jenniges suggested we add a sentence in the report stating Matt Rabbe (FWS) indicated the whooping crane observation at the Trust was located on what was formerly the managed tern and plover islands (now submerged sandbars) that existed in 2009; the group agreed. **The TAC approved the Fall 2011 Whooping Crane Report, with the change suggested by Rabbe during the meeting, as final; Baasch will make the suggested change.**

C. Smith stated the 2011 Geomorphology & Vegetation Monitoring Report was the first draft has reviewed and offered the TAC additional time to review the report if needed. Walters provided comments to C. Smith prior to the meeting that will be submitted to the contractor to address. Walters stated he wasn't comfortable with language in Section 3 that essentially accused another contractor of wrong doing. He stated he didn't want Program Reports to be a vetting process for Program contractors. C. Smith stated the paragraph on the bottom of page 3.5 and top of page 3.6 would be removed. Rabbe stated reporting the sum of all unvegetated channel widths at an

anchor point is not the same as reporting channel widths for whooping cranes. Farnsworth agreed and stated the reported measures apply to geomorphic features and that there are separate measures for whooping cranes that will be addressed in the data analysis plan. Rabbe stated he was fine with approving the Report as final so long as the assessments Farnsworth described would be conducted. Walters made a motion to approve the 2011 Geomorphology and Vegetation Monitoring Report with Walters' suggested change made; Rabbe seconded the motion; all approved. **The TAC approved the Geomorphology and Vegetation Monitoring Report as final conditioned on the removal of the paragraph on the bottom of page 3.5 and top of 3.6**.

Elm Creek 404 Permit (Agenda modification)

Farnsworth stated it was likely that the Program would obtain a 404 permit to construct nesting-islands in the Elm Creek Complex and asked the TAC if there was any objection to beginning work below the Diversion this summer. Fritz and Rabbe stated we would need to follow disturbance guidelines to ensure we don't interfere with tern, plover, and other migratory bird nesting. Rabbe and Runge stated so long as we follow: 1) guidelines in the Program's Land Management Plan for the Elm Creek Complex; 2) Service written comments on the land management plans; and 3) terms and conditions described in the Programmatic Biological Opinion there would be coverage for any impacts to the referenced bird species from land management activities.. Farnsworth stated we would begin work as soon as possible and will do whatever work we can within the guidelines laid out in the Land Management Plans.

2012 Tern and Plover Monitoring Update

Baasch led the discussion and informed the group that we planned to implement tern and plover monitoring as we did during 2011 (monitor sites twice/week from inside and outside, USGS band tern and plover adults and chicks, etc). The EDO hired a technician (Tony Jenniges) to conduct outside counts at all sites Jenniges and Czaplewski didn't monitor and that an effort would be made to keep all counts as independent as possible. The new Leaman East sandpit, Binfield Islands, and Mid-Nebraska pit near Alda would be monitored by EDO staff and our technician and that Czaplewski and Jenniges planned to monitor the pits they have in the past; Jenniges will also monitor the sandpit located north of I-80 by Lexington. USGS plans to increase efforts to document banded birds during 2012 (e.g., additional observations from blinds, boats, etc). Program staff, technician, and USGS crew planned to conduct all river surveys between Lexington and Chapman. Peyton asked if the Program planned to apply pre-emergent herbicide to our nesting areas during 2012; Baasch stated all Program managed sandpits and river islands had been sprayed. MSHA training will be conducted at the EDO conference room on April 30, 2012.

Shoemaker Island FSM Proof of Concept RFP

Farnsworth led the Discussion. The TAC was provided the RFP for the Shoemaker Island FSM Proof of Concept work and informed the group there was less detail in the scope of work so that the contractors could provide some additional ideas to consider. Jenniges stated the selection

committee would need to make sure the data collected at the Elm Creek and Shoemaker Island Complexes was comparable even if methods of collecting the data were different. C. Smith mentioned that the Program clearly specified performance measures so we would be able to relate the metrics in both areas. Rabbe suggested we ensure the data was collected during similar timeframes at both sites; Farnsworth agreed. Czaplewski asked if we had land management agreements in place for conducting the work at the Shoemaker Island Complex; Farnsworth stated we were working with the neighboring landowners to establish agreements. Czaplewski said the RFP should reflect the fact that we didn't have Agreements in place yet; Farnsworth agreed. Harner pointed out an editorial error in line 178 of the RFP; Farnsworth said he would make the correction. Merrill asked if the information in line 277 of the RFP could be stated to reflect the hierarchy of the Program; Farnsworth said he would rephrase that sentence so that the option to renew, re-compete, or cancel would be at the discretion of the Program rather than the ED Office. **Czaplewski moved to support the Shoemaker Island FSM Proof of Concept RFP with amendments suggested by Czaplewski, Merrill, and Harner; Merrill seconded the motion; all approved.**

Whooping Crane Proposal

Baasch led the discussion and informed the group that Walter Wehtje presented a proposal to Kenny and Baasch to collect additional information at whooping crane stopover locations in Nebraska and that the Trust had submitted a similar proposal that the TAC was provided to review. Baasch presented a map showing the distribution of stopover locations within Nebraska that included a 25-mile buffer along the Platte River, southern Nebraska, and northern Nebraska. Baasch stated the Program and Trust planned to collaborate in the research effort and would collect data at a handful of locations near the Platte River and would expand this area if time/resources allow. The objectives of the study are to determine if the data collected at non-Platte data can be used to inform Platte River management actions, determine if more data collection efforts are warranted in the future, and to assess landowner willingness to allow access to their lands if we decided to conduct a larger-scale study. Baasch briefly described some of the data that we planned to collect (distances to obstruction, disturbance, river, etc; water area and dept at wetland sites; etc), but informed the group that the Trust and EDO hadn't discussed data collection in a lot of detail; Harner added that the Trust would also be interested in information on potential prey base in each stopover area. Fritz stated prey base changes quickly so we would need to consider that when interpreting the data; Wright said we planned to collect the data as soon after use occurs as possible which would help address this issue.

Peyton and Besson asked what the significance of the 25-mile buffer was; Baasch stated the 25-mile buffer wasn't a set area, but included a lot of the Loup River locations and generally excluded the Sandhill and southern regions that are markedly different than the Platte. The area surrounding the Platte would also allow us to collect data in habitats that are more similar to the Platte River and to collect information at stopover areas in less time during the pilot study. Walters stated we should define areas based on ecotypes rather than a set distance. Fritz stated there are several decades of data on observational use of the Loup, Niobrara, and other areas and suggested we target those areas to conduct evaluations. Wright asked if we would be biasing our data if we targeted areas where public access is less limited. Rabbe and others suggested we

evaluate GPS locations as proposed so that we do not introduce bias into the data. Peyton said the proposed study appeared to contain about 4 studies wrapped into 1; landowner attitude/awareness, river system comparison, non-riverine roost evaluation, and upland site evaluation. Harner stated the study has gone through several iterations and we started with a very large and expensive study and have whittled it down to a pilot study to look at applicability of data to the Platte River as well as the feasibility and potential cost of conducting a large scale study. Baasch stated he felt we need to put a lot of thought into what data would potentially be collected in a larger scale study so that we wouldn't need to go back to the sites we visit in the pilot study to collected additional data that we hadn't thought about. Jenniges suggested we visit as many sites as possible and collect what we feel is the most important data. Peyton said we need to determine how many sites we can evaluate given time constraints, select the telemetry sites we plan to visit and possibly evaluate historic stopover areas around these locations while we are near each area. Jenniges suggested we randomly sample the telemetry locations to determine which sites to evaluate if we could only look at a subset of the stopover locations and evaluate a few additional stopover sites around the more remote locations to make the effort worthwhile. Besson asked what we meant by the study being a collaborative effort; Baasch stated the Trust and Program were both contributing time and resources to the study, but no money would be exchanged to conduct the work. Czaplewski expressed support for conducting the pilot study, but was concerned about having so many whooping crane studies going on at the same time (telemetry, database, IGERT, monitoring protocol, etc) and having the EDO participate in an expanded study because of the timing of whooping crane use, site evaluations, and tern and plover monitoring.

C. Smith asked if the Whooping Crane Recovery Team or anyone was working on a Conceptual Ecological Model for Whooping Cranes. TAC members weren't aware if this was happening or not, but Harner stated the next Whooping Crane Telemetry Project meeting was schedule to be held the same time as the Recovery Team meeting so we would try to have a joint session to discuss this. C. Smith said Program staff and TAC will likely need to spend time developing a CEM for the target species so we can address the big question related to how the Platte fits into the larger picture.

Channel Change Assessment

Runge gave a short presentation and suggested the Program should be monitoring and evaluating changes in channel features such as channel width, unobstructed view widths, etc through time. Farnsworth and S. Smith stated the Geomorphology/Vegetation Monitoring contractor would be conducting a system-scale assessment of channel widths, unvegetated width, depth, etc. Data collected at anchor points is similar to what the Whooping Crane Monitoring contractor collects at use locations so we will be able to evaluate use versus availability on the system scale. Runge stated the assessment Farnsworth and S. Smith described was actually better than what he had envisioned using the GIS approach.

C. Smith stated the EDO has began to write the data analysis plans for target species and geomorphology and vegetation monitoring and once those are fully developed everyone should have a better idea about how all the data and analyses fit into the larger picture.

Lower Platte River Stage Change Study Peer Review

C. Smith presented information on results of the Stage Change Study Peer Review and stated the peer review process occurred after the Stage Change Study Report was accepted by the TAC and GC as Final. All 5 peer reviewers indicated the Program should accept the study as 'Final;' however, 3 of the peer reviewers indicated revisions should be made if possible. Several of the comments provided by the peer reviewer would push the study beyond the scope of the original Stage Change Study and other comments were editorial changes that could be made if the Program decided to issue a revised Stage Change Study Report. General consensus of the peer reviewers was that the study addressed what it was supposed to, but a larger scale study would be needed to address some of the objectives of the study that related to pallid sturgeon. Runge concurred that replicating this study in other parts of the river would change the scope and require more work and money, but stated that the task at hand is the recommendation to accept the report as final or not accept the report. Discussion on additional studies, document revisions, or other types of work that may affect the conclusion of the study would need to come though the direction of the GC.

C. Smith drafted an initial motion for the TAC to consider "Recommend the GC accept the Lower Platte River Stage Change Study Peer Review and accept the Final Lower Platte River Stage Change Study as complete without revision;" however, the TAC could consider other motions as well. If the TAC concurs, this motion would be presented to the GC for consideration during the June 2012 GC meeting in Cheyenne, WY. Similar to the LAC if there is a majority and minority opinion, the motion would be explained to the GC by one TAC representative supporting the motion and one TAC representative opposing the motion.

Besson asked how peer review comments related to conducting a larger scale study and looking at other river reaches related to whether the Program should accept or reject the Stage Change Study and peer review. Runge cited information provided in an email he sent to the EDO (included below).

Information copied from a Service email:

- **Stage Change Study Objective** - The Study objective was to develop information needed to evaluate the potential effects of Program water management activities on water stage and how those stage changes might affect the physical characteristics of the lower Platte River.
- **Stage Change Study Conclusion** - Finally, the increase in discharge does not move the conductivity, turbidity, temperature, or dissolved oxygen outside the typical range preferred by pallid sturgeon (Figures 42 and 43).
- **Heisel peer review comment** - No. Determination of differences in water quality parameters using Analysis of Variance is flawed because the serial correlation in the data was not accounted for. The current analysis is not sufficient to determine whether there are significant impacts for these parameters.
- **Guy peer review comment** - "Finally, the increase in discharge does not move the conductivity, turbidity, temperature, or dissolved oxygen outside the typical range preferred by pallid sturgeon (Figures 42 and 43)." Not sure we know what typical is for pallid. Can you reword to avoid 'typical' and 'preferred?'

Runge identified that the peer review comments represent one of many comments from peer reviewers, but elected to focus on the subset of comments as one example for discussion. Runge stated peer review comments that relate to overall conclusions such as these are significant and should be addressed. Runge added 3 of the 5 peer reviewers suggested do not accept unless revised, so he felt the Stage Change Study should be revised. Any manuscript that is submitted for publication in a peer reviewed journal must address peer review comments prior to acceptance, and Runge promoted this standard as one the Program should adopt.

Peyton suggested we make the suggested editorial changes and include a statement in report stating the conclusions may be different if a larger scale study was conducted. C. Smith indicated there currently was no money budgeted for having the research team revised the document, however, we would have the report revised if the TAC and GC decide the peer review comments should be incorporated into the document.

Peyton moved to accept the peer review and Stage Change Study as Final without revisions; Walters seconded the motion; the motion was not approved unanimously. A minority/majority report will be provided to the GC with the recommendation.

Farnsworth stated the Service should document specific measures that need to be taken in order for the Service to accept the Peer Review and Stage Change Study as Final. Runge agreed to assist Service TAC representative, Rabbe, with a Service minority opinion. Baasch asked the group if the motion should be broken into 2 parts; 1) accept the Peer Review and 2) accept the Stage Change Study. Rabbe said the documentation would indicate the Service accepts the Peer Review.

Comment [RJ1]: It is difficult to recall discussions of the meeting, but I remember stating that I would help out with developing a minority opinion. I also recall saying that my involvement beyond that point (e.g., measures needed to address peer review comments) would be limited until I know how the GC votes on this topic. There is no point in putting extra effort into this until we know the position of the GC. - Runge

Besson suggested the TAC consider modifications to the Peer Review Process. Czaplewski stated the questions asked of the Peer Review panels need to be articulated clearly so peer review comments are direct and on point. The group agreed the EDO should try to set the peer review process up in the future so the review is conducted while contractors are still under contract (and within budget) and before reports are accepted as final. Several TAC members suggested we have 1 of the peer review panel members serve as an 'editor' so comments we receive aren't contradictory.

LUNCH BREAK

Target Flow Discussion

C. Smith led the discussion and presented information on recent EDO-Service discussions, the various target flow objectives as defined by Bowman, D.B. (1994), and steps that will be required to establish a rigorous adaptive management process for target flows.

Runge stated current target flows are likely wrong where they were based river habitat data that does not reflect current conditions. Even if the species use the habitats in the same manner as past, a change in river conditions would likely change flows needed to benefit the species (i.e., target flows). Runge also stated that certain target flows were not intended to optimize conditions for a single species. Jenniges stated the Service should have clear objectives if they are releasing water (e.g., a release of 2,400cfs should be to accomplish a set objective). George said the Biological Opinion includes qualitative measures of species' benefit and the TAC would need to

establish qualitative measures to describe the qualitative benefits if we wanted to test specific hypotheses. The overall goal of target flow releases should be to figure out what the 'right amount of water' for the species really is. Jenniges said getting water past the choke point(s) is an adaptive management issue; if we can't get water through the system, the Program will have to change management actions (remove choke point, come up with different water objectives, etc) and those decisions would be made by the WAC or LAC. Czaplewski said another issue is addressing biological problems and this is the area the TAC should weigh-in on. Besson agreed both issues need to be addressed and stated we have to figure if/how we can get water through before we go down the road of establishing species' hypotheses. Kenny stated currently the only way to get 3,000cfs through the choke point would be to dredge the channel 1.25 – 1.5 feet on an annual or near-annual basis and that not a viable option for the city of North Platte. One option they were amenable to would be that if we could keep water away from the houses along North River Road, the city of North Platte would help us have the National Weather Service raise the minor flood warning level. S. Smith is modeling what a new potential minor flood stage needs to be to push 3,000cfs through this area. The big issue will be obtaining 404 permits to restore a state channel (now a wetland) that runs through this area so it conveys more water. S. Smith and Kenny stated at best, the choke point issue probably won't be resolved until summer/fall of 2013. The other potential option to better time and control releases will be the J-2 Reregulating Reservoir, but that realistically will not be available until 2016. Besson stated, while we are figuring out how to address the choke point issues and developing ways to get the water through the system, the TAC/WAC could spend this time figuring out what the objectives of target flows are and to define what success is. Besson expressed concern about the time it would require the EDO to develop new monitoring protocols, etc and asked if some of the current monitoring efforts could be used to address the target flow objectives.

Czaplewski stated target flow objectives need to be established in order to score or operate any of the water projects such as the J-2 Reregulating Reservoir. George stated if monitoring is in place, there are opportunities to capitalize on natural flow events to help determine what optimal target flows might be. Jenniges stated we could evaluate cause and effect relationships once we know the effects we are supposed to monitor. Czaplewski stated that if we don't establish objectives and parameters to monitor to update the target flows, the second increment's Biological Opinion would be based on the same out-dated science; George agreed. George stated we have 20 years of whooping crane data that could be mined to determine what whooping cranes prefer and could evaluated how much water would be needed to create similar conditions throughout the system. Besson stated regardless of what the species' water needs are, if we can't get water through the choke point it may not matter until we get that problem addressed. George said we may have to consider looking at a combination of North and South Platte flows to meet species' water needs. Besson asked George if we should focus on what we can do with 1,200-1,700cfs of flow or eliminating the choke point; George indicated we should focus on the choke point. Besson suggested we continue to focus on the choke point, but come up with monitoring protocols to learn about species response to current water conditions and natural events. Steinke stated not much monitoring and learning was done during the 2011 high flow event so we should do additional monitoring to learn from the natural events. Kenny stated the Program monitored the heck out of the system during 2011 and asked what additional monitoring the TAC felt was needed. Runge said it may not be a question of what else we

should monitor, but rather how else can we evaluate the data we have to address target flow questions. C. Smith stated the Program collected a lot of data last year, as well as in the past, that should be mined to inform future decisions. C. Smith asked what additional monitoring would be need during 2013 if the Services' Annual Operating Plan is similar to 2012. George stated experiments shouldn't necessarily be designed around target flows because target flows are a 'default position' in the absence of another study so target flows can be adjusted to accommodate the various studies the Program has in place. Farnsworth stated the direction forward hinges on having concrete objectives and stated we can evaluate flows that maximize whooping crane habitat availability (March 23 – May Target Flow objective), however 'channel maintenance' (February 15 – March 15 Target Flow Objective) is not a quantitative objective. We need to establish quantitative ways to measure channel maintenance in order to determine whether the required data is being collected under current monitoring protocols or if we should design an experiment or implement additional monitoring the obtain the data needed to address the objective.

Besson, Farnsworth, Czaplewski, and others indicated the next step for the TAC should be to establish concrete and measurable objectives. Farnsworth stated the objectives should be 'to support and maintain a channel that meets the species needs' and suggested we mine the data to establish probability of use curves. Besson suggested the EDO establish the curves for the TAC to weigh-in on. Farnsworth said the curves could be developed, but the TAC ultimately would need to decide where we need to be along the use curves so we have a discrete channel maintenance objective. Besson suggested a group of TAC members and EDO get together to establish measurable target flow objectives that can be discussed with the ISAC during July. Farnsworth and C. Smith stated FSM and Target Flow objectives would be the same where we are trying to achieve the same conditions.

The TAC selected a target flow subcommittee to develop target flow objectives for the TAC and ISAC to weigh-in on during the July ISAC meeting. The subcommittee includes EDO staff, Runge, Urie, Jenniges, Peyton, Czaplewski, Fritz, and Besson.

The plan is to focus the July 2012 ISAC meeting on Target Flows.

Closing Business

C. Smith will coordinate the Target Flow subcommittee meeting via email/Doodle Poll

The next TAC meeting was scheduled for July 10-11 as a joint ISAC/TAC meeting

Next GC meeting is scheduled for June 12-13 in Cheyenne

Meeting adjourned at 3:15pm Central time.

Summary of Decisions from April 2012 TAC Meeting

1) The TAC approved minutes from the October 2011 TAC meeting, November 2011 TAC conference call, November 2011 TAC/ISAC meeting, January 2012 WC Minimum Habitat

Criteria Workshop, and February 2012 Wet Meadow Workshop; minutes from the August 2011 TAC meeting were approved in October 2011.

2) The TAC approved the Fall 2011 Whooping Crane Report, with a sentence added to the report indicating the whooping crane observation at the Trust was located in an area where tern and plover islands existed in 2009; Baasch will make this change.

3) The TAC approved the Geomorphology and Vegetation Monitoring Report as final conditioned on the removal of the paragraph on the bottom of page 3.5 and top of 3.6; contractor will make this change.

4) The TAC supported the Shoemaker Island FSM Proof of Concept RFP conditioned on the following amendments:

   - the RFP reflect that we don't have land management agreements in place yet;
   - correct the editorial error in line 178 of the RFP; and
   - the RFP state that the option to renew, re-compete, or cancel would be at the discretion of the Program rather than the ED Office.

5) A majority of the TAC approved the Stage Change Study as Final without revisions; a minority (Service) opposed to the motion. All TAC members approved the peer review.

   - The Service will prepare a minority report with recommendations related to the Stage Change Study.
   - The GC will be asked to make a decision during the June meeting on whether the Program should accept the Stage Change Study and Peer Review as final or not. If the Stage Change Study and/or Peer Review are not accepted as final, the GC will be asked to provide guidance on what the next steps should be.

6) The TAC suggested we make adjustments to the peer review process so the review is conducted while contractors are still under contract (and within budget) and before reports are accepted as final and suggested consideration of an "editor" (possibly a peer review panel member) in order to streamline and sync peer review comments to the greatest degree possible.

7) The TAC selected a target flow subcommittee to develop target flow objectives for the TAC and ISAC to weigh-in on during the July ISAC meeting. The subcommittee included EDO staff, Runge, Urie, Jenniges, Peyton, Czaplewski, Fritz, and Besson.

8) C. Smith will coordinate a Target Flow subcommittee meeting via email/Doodle Poll

9) The next TAC meeting was scheduled for July 10-11 as a joint ISAC/TAC meeting