

**ILP Formal Study Plan Meeting for IF, Riparian IFS, Groundwater, Glacial Runoff, Geology/Soils, August 16, 2012, 9:00 am - 4:00 pm**

**Attendees:**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>
AEA	Betsy McGregor
AEA	Wayne Dyok
AEA	Bryan Carey
USFWS	Mike Buntjer
USFWS	Betsy McCracken
USFWS	Bob Henszey
ADNR	Kim Sager
ADNR	Roy Ireland
ADNR OPMP	Marie Steele
NMFS	Eric Rothwell
ADF&G	Joe Klein
ADF&G	Stormy Haught (by phone)
USGS	Dave Meyer
USGS	Chris Holmquist-Johnson
Tribal Council	Wilson Jastin
FERC	Matt Cutlip
LBG/FERC Contractor	Fred Winchell
Natural Heritage Institute/Hydropower Reform Coalition	Jan Konigsberg
Long View Associates	Steve Padula
Long View Associates	Cory Warnock
Van Ness Feldman	Matt Love
MWH	Kirby Gilbert (by phone)
MWH	Brian Sadden
HDR	James Brady
R2 Resource Consultants	Kevin Fetherston
R2 Resource Consultants	MaryLouise Keefe
R2 Resource Consultants	Phil Hilgert
R2 Resource Consultants	Stuart Beck (by phone)
R2 Resource Consultants	Dudley Reiser
Tetra Tech	Bill Fullerton
Tetra Tech	Mike Harvey (by phone)
University of Alaska Fairbanks	Regina Hock (by phone)
Cardno Entrix	Jim Gill
GW Scientific	Michael Lilly
Stillwater Sciences	Dirk Pedersen
Stillwater Sciences	Jay Stallman
LGL	Michael Link
URS	Paul Dworian
ARRI	Jeff Davis
Alaska Ratepayers	Scott Crowther

## Introduction

Steve Padula opened the meeting and explained that the intent of this meeting was to discuss the Instream Flow, Groundwater, Glacial Runoff and Geology/Soils studies that have been proposed and to have substantive discussions related to any remaining differences or inconsistencies. Steve went through a few slides reminding everyone about the formal study planning process, current status, and associated deadlines. (See the presentation on the AEA website.)

He noted that another set of TWG meetings is scheduled after the October 15 due date for filing comments on the Proposed Study Plan (PSP) to address any remaining issues. Steve stated that the agenda, meeting minutes and all presentations given during the day would be made available on the AEA website. Introductions were held.

Jeff Davis (ARRI) stated that the Susitna River is dynamic but stable. He stated that the Project would reduce the high summer turbidity and trap sediment. This may make the Susitna more like the Kenai River and it may become a more confined, single channel type situation where primary productivity and species of macroinvertebrates are changed. He expressed concern that the focus of the studies would not address the actual impacts. Phil Hilgert (R2 Resource Consultants) suggested that Jeff had basically just provided an introduction to the Instream Flow presentation and added that the approach on the Susitna instream flow study is more integrated than a typical instream flow study. Jeff stated that the fish habitat, distribution and productivity studies aren't addressing the "Kenai scenario". Phil asked Jeff to hold that thought until later in the instream flow presentation. Phil stated that Bill Fullerton's (Tetra Tech) work would be used to document the existing habitat and forecast what will happen to habitat over time. If it turns out that the river will become more confined, that effect will be modeled.

Jeff went on to state that appropriate biological data needed to be collected as input to the model. Bill Fullerton stated that the changes can be documented within the model. Jeff stated that there was the potential for the river to change from heterotrophic to autotrophic. Steve Padula stated that while Jeff's comments were relevant, the studies needed to be reviewed individually for study planning purposes with the understanding that the study efforts would be integrated at a later date. Steve asked for folks to identify the holes in the integration process so they could be addressed. Jeff stated that everyone needed to go back and look at the biological studies that inform the models and asked Joe Klein (ADF&G) for his thoughts. Joe stated that it was an iterative process but he felt the plans were on the right track. Eric Rothwell (NMFS) stated that he wasn't sure if the plans were on the correct path and that he didn't feel the study plans adequately addressed the issues that had been raised by NMFS.

Wayne Dyok (AEA) encouraged the group to read FERC's draft EIS from the 1980's. He stated that the same issues that are being raised now were raised then but our technology and quantification tools are much better now. Betsy McCracken (USFWS) echoed the concerns raised by Jeff and Eric and stated that she was concerned about the instream flow study approach. Phil stated that he thought that everyone had common objectives regarding using the instream flow study to assess Project effects and that more detail was needed to refine the approach.

## Study Presentations

### **Fish and Aquatics Instream Flow**

Phil Hilgert gave the Fish and Aquatics Instream Flow presentation. Areas discussed included goals and objectives, study area, methods and expected results.

Eric Rothwell stated that the goals and objectives in the presentation sounded similar to his vision but what he read in the study plans sounded different. He stated that utilization of habitat types by all species and life stages needed to be understood. Phil stated that it was unlikely that data for certain species (e.g., burbot) would be able to be acquired and that you have to obtain and utilize the best available data. Eric asked what the end product would look like if inadequate data were being used. Phil stated that the RSP was not the end product and that details could be worked out after the Study Plan Determination (SPD). He stated that collaboration would be ongoing throughout the process.

Matt Cutlip stated that a schedule in the RSP relative to when that continuing collaboration would take place is necessary for FERC to approve the plan. Phil acknowledged that the PSP didn't have that level of detail but text and tables would be developed to incorporate into the RSP. Joe Klein stated that the instream flow plan was a good concept but he needed more confidence in the approach and associated details. Phil stated that a 3-day meeting at the end of September would address some of the detail. It would consist of a one day office workshop and 2 days in the field. Joe stated that another meeting was needed before that to discuss habitat suitability curves (HSC).

Betsy McCracken stated that she didn't want to replicate the 1980's work. Phil asked her to hold that thought as it was addressed in the presentation and encouraged the idea of having an additional meeting.

Mike Buntjer (USFWS) asked how the instream flow sites would be selected. Phil agreed that details of the site selection process were needed in the RSP. Study site selection is dependent on the results of reach stratification and habitat mapping that is being done later in 2012. **Action Item.** In the absence of identifying study sites, the RSP should describe the process, schedule and criteria for identifying and reaching consensus on study site selection. Phil acknowledged that they will try to increase the level of detail in the RSP regarding process, schedule and criteria for reaching consensus on instream flow details.

Chris Holmquist-Johnson (USGS) asked if there had been any thought into using the Delphi Method. Phil stated that it was a possibility depending on what site specific data are available and what can be acquired. Dudley Reiser (R2 Resource Consultants) stated that the Delphi method exists in the hierarchical approach that is planned; primarily if enough data points can't be acquired for a specific species. Joe asked why all species data couldn't be acquired during the open water period. Phil stated that certain species just don't exist in numbers high enough in the Susitna to acquire the needed data. Eric stated that areas where AEA feels that the participants are requesting too much must be specified in the PSP. Betsy McCracken stated that the USFWS put a good amount of effort into their requests and much of it was ignored. Wayne Dyok stated that discrepancies would be addressed during RSP production and AEA wants to work through all of the issues.

Joe asked what the contingency plan was if site specific species data couldn't be acquired. Eric Rothwell asked what variables other than depth and velocity influence habitat suitability for species. Mary Lou Keefe (R2 Resource Consultants) stated that topography and gradient are considerations in describing mesohabitat units, and that other factors such as substrate, cover, and upwelling will influence microhabitat suitability.

Dudley Reiser stated that the initial HSC work will use the 1980's data and then current data will be integrated as it comes in. Betsy McCracken stated that the "good" and "bad" data needed to be sorted out prior to utilization. Jeff Davis stated that the fish distribution study plan needs a lot of work and noted that that study feeds the instream flow work.

Jan Konigsberg (NHI/HRC) asked if any of the literature related to stranding discussed peaking in the winter and ice flows. Phil stated that there is a lot of literature on peaking operations, but much of it was from the Pacific Northwest; they would also be looking at a hydropower peaking project on a large river in Manitoba with similar characteristics.

Jeff Davis asked about the image of Whiskers Creek Slough in the presentation and noted that changes had occurred since that image was taken. He pointed out that backwater effects exist in the slough and there are different conditions now than in the 1980's. Phil stated that the degree of change is a matter of scale; the gross channel characteristics have not changed much, but there have been localized changes, such as large woody debris distribution. The localized changes are one of the reasons why they need to replace and expand hydraulic modeling from the 1980's.

Eric Rothwell asked if the 2-D model addressed upwelling. Phil said that 2-D modeling can be used to quantify depth, velocity and substrate and they will be looking to integrate upwelling as an additional parameter. Michael Lilly (GW Scientific) pointed out that there are several models that will be used with this Project and that the cumulative output from these models will tie together to answer the big questions.

Betsy McCracken asked if the groundwater studies were at a scale appropriate for fish habitat. Michael stated that they were. Betsy suggested that piezometers be installed at the sites. Michael stated that that language was already in the plan. Michael mentioned that the AEA teams such as geomorphology, instream flow-fish and riparian had been discussing and coordinating their approach. Bob Henszey (USFWS) asked why he hadn't been involved in all of the discussions leading up to plan development. Phil stated that some discussions of study approach have been internal to the AEA project team but no one has been excluded from any participant meetings.

Joe Klein asked if AEA would be using PHABSIM/RFR for certain life stages. Phil stated that the river flow routing model (RFR) will be used to identify river stage under alternate Project operations at locations downstream of the dam site, thus it will be used for all of the studies connected to river flow. Betsy McCracken asked how the appropriate habitat models could be selected prior to knowing fish distribution and abundance. Phil stated that model selection is preliminary at this time but is tailored to anticipated Project effects based on the 1980s studies. Model selection may change depending on the results of current studies, but the intent is to collaboratively make decisions with the TWG.

Jan Konigsberg asked if ice formation will be modeled and how stranding and trapping would be addressed during the winter. Phil stated that a combination of the ice work from HDR and the varial zone model will quantify the potential for stranding and trapping during the winter time under alternate Project operating scenarios.

Eric Rothwell stated that the overall schedule seemed idealized and that a contingency should be built in to extend the study period if it can't be completed within the current confines of the ILP.

**Action Item.** Phil stated that AEA is working to fit it into the existing schedule. Eric stated that he wanted to make the point to FERC that if the process or approach wasn't consistent with participant sentiment, the schedule needed to be extended. Matt Cutlip stated that he understood and that there were opportunities throughout the process to comment and if extensions deemed appropriate, FERC would make that determination.

Marie Steele (ADNR OPMP) asked if Alaska was unique given that an abundance of statewide data isn't available. Matt stated that this was a unique project. He stated that it was a large project on a large system and that the data needed to be seen before a determination relative to extensions was made. Matt Love (Van Ness Feldman) stated that every project is challenging and what was needed was a path to move the study program forward.

**Action Item.** Eric stated that he needed to see biological cues related to flow. He wanted that added to the overall instream flow analysis. Phil said he understood. Joe Klein added that more discussion was needed and listed a series of questions:

1. What is the sampling strategy for the defined habitat types?
2. How many and at what range will discharge-calibration sets be collected for each sampling method?
3. Will the 2-D model include side channels and sloughs within the study area?
4. What criteria will be used to identify cover types and substrate sizes?
5. For PHABSIM, will transects be dependent or independent?
6. What water surface elevation models and composite suitability index will be used?
7. What criteria will be used to select and weight transect-derived models?
8. What criteria will be used to identify "a representative number"?
9. HSI curves are needed for identified target species for each habitat type, over two years.
10. How will the data be aggregated to evaluate single flow recommendations?
11. Will a DSS-type program be available to review study results?
12. How do you envision the "collaborative process" will work?
13. When will major decisions be made, (e.g., site selections) and how often will the work group get together?
14. What equipment will be used?
15. Similar information is needed for the eulachon and boating evaluations. What is the sampling strategy, how many cal-sets and how will HSI curves be developed?
16. Varial zone modeling may need more defined time steps.

Phil stated that these were the details that needed to be discussed and worked out with the TWG. Joe stated that more meetings were needed. Phil stated that some details could be addressed prior to the RSP. Relative to the areas that can't be addressed till later, the RSP will discuss the process, schedule and criteria for reaching that level of detail.

Joe asked what type of equipment would be used for velocity measurements. Phil stated that his personal preference was the Price AA but there were other options including ADCP (acoustic Doppler current profiler), and Swiffer meters and stated that this was a good example of the detail that could be worked out at a later date. Matt Cutlip stated that FERC would have to make a determination about whether implementing the RSP will provide the FERC with enough information to make licensing decisions. Ideally, this level of detail should be worked out at the RSP phase under the ILP, but it comes down to a FERC determination about study plan adequacy. Dudley Reiser stated that instrumentation use can be a contentious issue and they expected that the level of detail of instrumentation would be worked out collaboratively with the TWG. Wayne Dyok thanked Matt for his input and stated that the Boundary Dam PSP/RSP, which had been approved by the FERC had been used to a large extent as a template for the level of detail presented in the PSP. He acknowledged that some studies needed additional detail and that AEA plans on being collaborative throughout. Matt said he understood and reiterated that if the RSP is missing information needed to respond to specific requests, there needs to be a specific plan and schedule for reaching agreement on those details.

Phil stated that the proposed 3-day meeting was brought up after the June meeting; after some discussion, the dates for the meeting were set at September 26-28.

Marie Steele asked if there would be a workshop with participants to go over instream flow field methods. Phil stated that this would happen in 2013 prior to field work occurring. Marie asked if that was in the plan. Phil reiterated that additional detail would be added to the RSP and where that detail couldn't be added, the RSP will discuss the process, schedule and criteria for reaching that level of detail.

Betsy McGregor stated that there would be another preparatory instream flow meeting in September prior to the 3 day meeting/site visit. **Action Item.** Eric Rothwell wanted to make sure that everyone who wanted to attend would be notified. Wayne agreed. Eric suggested that once the "core group" was invited, the dates should be put on the AEA website. Joe asked if there was a SharePoint site for meeting minutes, correspondence, etc. Betsy stated that the meeting minutes and presentations are located on the AEA website and that an FTP site existed as well for transferring large files.

## **Riparian Instream Flow**

Kevin Fetherston gave the Riparian Instream Flow presentation. Areas discussed included goals and objectives, study area, methods and expected results.

Bob Henszey stated that before the presentation started, he wanted to preface by saying that the plan needed more detail and collaboration.

**Action Item.** Bob asked if seed recruitment would be looked at. Kevin stated that it would be.

An ADNR representative asked if wetlands would be included in the analysis. **Action Item.** Kevin stated that some wetlands would qualify and that floodplain conditions and alterations would be addressed. Jan Konigsberg asked if the role of downed cottonwoods would be evaluated. Kevin stated that it would be discussed later in the presentation.

Joe Klein asked if ice scars on trees were indicative of an ice jam. Kevin stated that that was the preliminary conclusion. Jeff Davis stated that at times, multiple chunks of ice the size of sheds flow through certain areas.

Michael Lilly led a discussion on ice jams and ice erratics and their associated processes. Eric Rothwell asked if data existed documenting at what flows ice jams form and break-up occurs. Kevin stated that they haven't yet collected these data. Michael elaborated by saying that you will get pulses moving down the system causing these conditions.

Bob Henszey pointed out that transpiration can be measured on plants by looking at the water table. He added that by looking at the water table, you can get a feel for root length. **Action Item.** Jan Konigsberg asked if the study will document how transpiration is affecting the understory. Kevin stated that it would.

Bob stated that given the bimodal flow trend on the Susitna, he doesn't see any 2 year old seedlings. He asked if it was worth looking at both peaks. **Action Item.** Kevin stated that during the study, seedlings would be evaluated for age and then the hydrograph would be reviewed.

Michael Lilly lead a discussion on the Whiskers Slough complex, its specific issues and resource areas to be addressed. Eric stated that he saw a need to have a stream gauge on the Chulitna. Michael pointed out that the USGS was in the process of reestablishing a gauge on the Chulitna.

Bob stated that he'd like to see more wells near the channels. **Action Item.** Kevin stated that further discussion could be had to refine well sites.

Bob asked how groundwater will be linked to perennial response. Kevin stated that if a robust data set exists, this can be done. Michael stated that there are long-term USGS gauge data that can be run through project groundwater models to predict what will happen relative to plant response.

Joe Klein asked if cottonwoods needed a descending water table to recruit. Kevin stated that they can't be drowned but need to stay wet.

**Action Item.** Joe asked if climate and wildlife issues would be integrated into the analysis of riparian succession. Kevin confirmed that it would.

An ADNR representative asked if longer term monitoring stations were needed. Kevin stated that it depended on the results from the initial 2 years of monitoring.

Jeff Davis asked how changes in channel formation would affect patterns of vegetation. Kevin stated that it would have a dramatic affect and that looking at changes in channel formation over time will help identify vegetation patterns.

Jay Stallman (Stillwater Sciences) asked if different operational scenarios as they relate to geomorphic change over time were going to be evaluated. Bill Fullerton stated that it will be characterized but some of the longer term changes would extend beyond the license term and the

results would be speculative. He stated that the results of the geomorphology study wouldn't be as specific as defining new topography but that reviewing the history of the areas and associated changes would help the process of predicting pre vs. post project conditions. Kevin added that there are likely to be zones of change. Bill Fullerton stated that integrating dendrochronology with photos will be a great tool.

Jeff Davis asked if a reduction in fines would change the groundwater. Kevin stated that it could. Michael Lilly stated that if fines were removed from the system, there would likely be a change to the downstream environment. It could be positive, it could be negative.

Jeff asked if we had the data to support the hypothesis that there was limited embeddedness in the system. Michael stated that the work was currently being conducted to assess bed mobility and noted that the bed was active.

Michael Lilly added to the earlier ice jam discussion by stating that ice jams and flooding in early May are more temperature related than flow related. He pointed out that significant events aren't always driven by flow. They also result from temperature.

### **Cross Section Study**

Michael Lilly gave the Cross Section Study presentation which was included within the Fish and Aquatics Instream Flow Study presentation. Areas discussed included goals and objectives, study area, methods and expected results.

Bob Henszey asked if any of the 1980's wells had been found. Michael stated that they haven't looked for them.

Joe Klein asked if the ADCP was being used in shallow water. Michael Lilly said the ADCP was the primary velocity measurement tool used in the cross-section and showed pictures of it mounted on a carcraft for use in shallow water. He pointed out that velocities in very shallow areas between channels were estimated. Moving bed tests were conducted and water temperatures were collected.

### **Groundwater Related Aquatic Habitat**

Michael Lilly gave the Groundwater Related Aquatic Habitat presentation. Areas discussed included goals and objectives, study area, methods and expected results.

Michael Lilly began the presentation by saying that additional meetings are needed to address the details, process, etc. If the stakeholders could get their questions and concerns to him prior to those meetings, it would be helpful.

Joe Klein asked if wells would be dug as a part of this work even though it isn't discussed in this plan. **Action Item.** Michael confirmed this and reiterated that coordination was the key to the study program. Joe asked which group would be the appropriate one to discuss the details related to the wells. Michael stated that discussion with multiple groups at once would be the best approach. Wayne Dyok asked what the best approach for showing the integration would be.

Michael stated more meetings were needed along with continual dialogue. He stated that after the RSP is in, continued collaboration to develop the details was imperative.

Jeff Davis stated that the groundwater and surface water work should be related to the fish work. Michael pointed out that this would be discussed later in the presentation. An ADNR representative asked if water temperatures could be measured near the bottom of the water column to identify groundwater sites. Michael stated that this would be addressed during the water quality presentation tomorrow. Jeff Davis stated that it wasn't clear who was doing what from a water temperature perspective.

Wilson Justin (Tribal Council) pointed out that there is a precipitation cycle to take into account and he is worried that AEA is collecting the right data but will reach the wrong conclusions. Michael pointed out that historical data would be reviewed.

Jeff asked if the same water quality parameters would be measured for the water quality study and the instream flow study. Michael stated that the parameters were different because of differing needs.

Betsy McCracken asked how the lower boundary for the study was selected. Michael explained that the current lower boundary is based on the assumption that project effects will not extend below this point. The river routing model will be used to help confirm that potential downstream limit of Project impacts. If the impacts appear to extend downstream further or not as far, the boundary may be adjusted. Betsy McGregor stated that the 2012 data should assist in finalizing that boundary. Phil Hilgert stated that the intent is to use the flow routing model results to define the downstream boundary prior to 2013 field work. Jeff stated that the boundary should vary depending on flows out of the Chulitna and Talkeetna. Phil stated that that would be looked at as part of the boundary selection process. Wayne Dyok pointed out that AEA was looking at the amount of flow fluctuation that would result from the most extreme levels of load following operations.

Joe Klein asked a series of questions:

1. Will the operational scenarios be developed in 2012?
2. Will project design and access be developed in 2012?
3. Is the goal of the intensive study sites to overlap studies as much as possible?

Wayne answered the first two questions by stating that no project infrastructure or operational scenarios would be developed in 2012. Michael confirmed that the intensive study sites were intended to integrate many of the individual studies.

Wilson asked about a comment from Wayne regarding "negotiating" with landowners and stated that he gets concerned when he hears discussion related to negotiations. Wayne stated that he was stating that all parties with ownership interests should be involved in discussions related to potential access routes. Wilson pointed out that Indian grave sites, campsites, etc. should be taken into consideration.

Bob Henszey stated that more wells were needed. Wayne stated that AEA wasn't averse to discussing this but he needs certainty that additional wells will add value to the study.

Michael displayed a flow chart showing the integration of resource areas and pointed out that there would be intensive data collection at the intensive study sites. Eric asked how many intensive study sites were proposed. Kevin Fetherston stated that 6 intensive study sites were proposed. Eric asked if a similar flow chart existed for the aquatics because the chart was very helpful. Michael stated that a chart was in development.

Jeff Davis stated that available habitat in sloughs can change depending on the season, flow, etc. He stated that appropriate water quality parameters in the sloughs were key. Michael reiterated that more detail was forthcoming and where that detail couldn't be incorporated into the RSP, additional schedule, process and criteria information would be included.

An ADNR representative asked if the discharge measuring stations were telemetered. Michael stated that they were. Dave Meyer (USGS) stated that there was a QA/QC process for their stage data in the winter and anomalous data is removed.

Joe Klein stated that there was a good amount of work to do to get to the appropriate level of detail. He stated that he needed more comfort and confidence about how the study will be conducted.

## **Geology and Soils Characterization**

Bryan Carey gave the Geology and Soils Characterization presentation. Areas discussed included goals and objectives, study area, methods and expected results.

Wilson Jastin asked about the fault that caused the 2002 earthquake and whether it joins the fault system near the project. Bryan stated that the USGS had many recording instruments in the area and that fault would be included in the assessment. He continued that 4 more seismographs were being installed 10-40 miles from the dam site to collect additional data. Brian Sadden (MWH) stated that there was going to be an extensive analysis of factors that could impact the project. Wilson stated that his question was more emotional than scientific.

Jay Stallman asked if AEA was looking at potential instability along the shorelines. Brian stated that there are shoreline areas that have slumped without the reservoir, so rising of water could increase instability. Areas that have potential for movement will be evaluated. Bryan Carey stated that Watana Creek would also be looked at to see if any instability there could impact the project.

Wilson stated that he was very familiar with both the 1964 and 2002 quakes and they were very different with respect to the amount of upland sloughing.

## **Glacial Runoff Changes**

Bryan Carey gave the Glacial Runoff Changes presentation. Areas discussed included goals and objectives, study area, methods and expected results.

Bob Henszey asked if this study will be looking at sediment from the glaciers. Bill Fullerton confirmed this and stated that it will be evaluated in terms of how much of that sediment will

reach the reservoir. Mike Harvey -TT stated that glacial surges will increase sediment loading and that the big question is, will the sediment loading increase sediment flux downstream. Bob asked if any sediment increase would attenuate out. Mike stated that it would.

Wayne stated that due to personal reasons, Dr. Harrison's services couldn't be used to date in the study plan development. Wayne will follow up to verify his future availability. Wayne introduced Regina Hock (UAF) to discuss the modeling component of the study. Regina stated that the modeling set-up and file preparation was underway. She stated that initially the error bars would be large due to stations still being installed. The data collection effort in 2013 will assist greatly. Wayne asked her to explain how the model works.

Regina explained that it was a fully physical based watershed model that includes glacial retreat. It can model changes in the water cycle. She is currently using existing climate data sets and will refine further once site specific data is collected. Wayne stated that he had talked briefly with Sue Walker (NMFS) and Eric Rothwell and asked Eric if he'd like to speak on the topic. Eric declined and requested a meeting in 2 or 3 weeks. Wayne agreed to explore that possibility.

Wayne asked Regina how permafrost and changes to vegetation were monitored. She stated that the developer of the model was coming to Fairbanks to work on adjusting the model to better fit Alaskan conditions.

Steve Padula reminded everyone of the schedule for Friday and reiterated AEA's understanding of the need for additional detail in the RSP. He stated that after the meeting on Friday, follow-up meetings would be scheduled. **Action Item.** He added that all details that could be added prior to the RSP, would be added. Where detail cannot be added, the process, schedule and criteria for reaching that level of detail will be included.

Eric Rothwell stated that it would be helpful to know when that additional detail would be provided to the agencies for review. He requested some indication be provided at the close of this set of meetings. Steve stated there would likely need to be some internal discussion and small group meetings prior to producing text for review.