



**PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM (PRRIP -or- Program)**

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Virtual Meeting**

*Meeting held in-person at ED Office in Kearney, NE*

Tuesday, October 10, 2023; 9:00 AM – 12:00 NOON CST

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

**State of Wyoming**

Barry Lawrence - Member

**Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)**

Brock Merrill – Member

**State of Colorado**

Kara Scheel – Member

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)**

Matt Rabbe – Member

**State of Nebraska**

Caitlin Kingsley – Member

Jennifer Schellpeper – Alternate

**Environmental Entities**

Rich Walters – Member

Amanda Hegg – Member

Bethany Ostrom – Alternate

Melissa Mosier – Alternate

**Upper Platte Water Users**

n/a

**Colorado Water Users**

Jason Marks – Member

**Downstream Water Users**

Brandi Flyr – Member

Jim Jenniges – Member

Dave Zorn – Member

Mike Drain – Alternate

**Independent Scientific Advisory Committee (ISAC)**

Dave Marmorek

Jennifer Hoeting

David Galat

Alan Kasprak

Michal Tal

**Executive Director's Office (EDO)**

Jason Farnsworth, ED

Chad Smith

Malinda Henry

Justin Brei

Tim Tunnell

Patrick Farrell

Mallory Jaymes

Jason Bruggeman

Seth Turner

Sarah Fancher

Ed Weschler

Helen Davis

Kristen Cognac

Libby Casavant

**Other Participants**

David Baasch – Crane Trust

Avery Dresser – NE DNR

Shuhai Zheng – NE DNR

Mike Archer – NGPC

Joel Jorgensen – NGPC

Melissa Marinovich – NGPC

Devin Brundage - CNPPID

Cory Steinke – CNPPID

Mark Pegg - UNL



## **#1 WELCOME & ADMINISTRATIVE**

Scheel called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM Central Time.

## **AGENDA MODIFICATIONS**

Henry asked for 5-10 minutes at the end of agenda item #6 Plover and Tern Predator Management / Monitoring to allow Rowe to provide the TAC with information on plans to build in-channel tern and plover nesting islands.

[00 - PRRIP TAC Quarterly Meeting Agenda October 2023](#)

## **MINUTES**

Henry presented typographical errors pointed out by NE DNR in the July TAC meeting minutes that were corrected prior to the meeting and asked for approval of the corrected meeting minutes.

**TAC MOTION:** *Rabbe moved, and Jenniges seconded to approve the July 18-19, 2023 TAC Meeting minutes with the above-mentioned corrections. Minutes approved.*

Document: [07-18-23 PRRIP TAC Meeting Minutes FINAL\\_0](#)

## **#2 WET MEADOW HYDROLOGY**

*TAC Review of Peer Review Panel*

Smith said he had just recently finished populating the peer review panel for the Wet Meadow Hydrology Report. He will send information on all six potential panel members, along with three names recommended for the panel and a formal TAC motion for consideration to the TAC by the end of the week. The EDO requests TAC review and feedback on those candidates, either approving the motion to recommend the three suggested individuals to the panel or recommending the motion be changed to include someone else from the six potential members. The TAC did not make a motion during the meeting, rather a virtual motion will be made electronically after TAC review of panel members.

Document: [02a PRRIP Wet Meadow Hydrology Report Peer Review Scope of Work](#)

### **EDO ACTION ITEM:**

- Send complete panel information to TAC.
- Send a motion to recommend three suggested panel members for TAC consideration.
- Facilitate electronic TAC motion.

### **TAC ACTION ITEM:**

- Review panel information.
- Electronically approve motion to recommend or change motion to include other panel members for appointment.

## **#3 LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK**

*TAC Review of Updated Framework*

Tunnell introduced the land management framework and the recent efforts to update that framework together with the TAC and the LAC. He said the draft sent out for TAC review was scheduled to be reviewed by the LAC at their Oct 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. Rabbe said he sent edits just prior to the meeting that



have not yet been integrated into the document. Baasch asked if the MCA island in the Chapman Complex was being sprayed and managed as MCA. Tunnell said yes, that island is sprayed with herbicide every year. Baasch asked how more recent discussions regarding altered management for wet meadows gets integrated into this framework? Henry said her understanding from the TAC memo to the GC on this issue was that the uncertainty around the importance of wet meadows for whooping cranes that the Ecotope article brought about was to first be addressed by rerunning the WEST analysis with the finer-scale landcover information underneath. After the TAC integrates information from the Ecotope article, WEST rerun, and peer-reviewed wet meadow hydrology report, the TAC will make a recommendation on whether or not a change in wet meadow management is warranted. Rabbe provided a brief overview of his suggested revisions to the framework. Scheel said she would like a chance to review Rabbe's edits before a TAC motion is made. Tunnell said he would integrate Rabbe's edits into the document, send the edits to the LAC for their review and revision, discuss with the LAC on October 18<sup>th</sup>, then send out a more finalized version including LAC input to the TAC for review prior to their January 2024 Quarterly Meeting.

Document: [03 Restoration and Land Mgmt Framework revision 2023 \(tt\\_jw\\_dz\\_tL\\_mdh\\_edits\)](#)

#### EDO ACTION ITEMS:

- Integrate Rabbe's edits into the document.
- Send the edits to the LAC for their review and revision.
- Discuss with the LAC on October 18<sup>th</sup> and integrate LAC input.
- Send out a more finalized version to the TAC prior to their January 2024 Quarterly Meeting.
- Put on January 2024 meeting agenda

#### TAC ACTION ITEMS:

- Review and provide feedback on updated framework prior to January 2024 Quarterly Meeting

#### **#4 WHOOPING CRANE TELEMETRY UPDATE**

Henry reviewed the Extension Big Questions to explain why PRRIP has asked for a broader set of telemetry locations for whooping cranes across the migratory corridor. She reminded the TAC of the attempt to work collaboratively with the Whooping Crane Tracking Partnership to address Program questions. However, Pearse's position on the ISAC does not allow him to actively collaborate with the EDO to develop study design, analytical approaches, or interpret conclusions. Thus, our previous collaborative data sharing approach will revert to a traditional data request without involvement of the Partnership in study development. The EDO requests TAC guidance to formulate this data request. Henry suggested we once again ask for all migratory locations across the US migratory corridor, with the expectation that our request will be denied. We will ask for the reason for this denial in writing. Options moving forward include:

- a) Delay until after data are public approx. 2028 (2026 anticipated end to telemetry plus 2 years for publications)
  - a. Meanwhile dataset is being utilized by Program partners for publications
- b) EDO works with TAC/ISAC (incl Pearse) to develop alternatives for understanding WC response to flow under proper temporal and spatial scale.
  - a. How wide of a spatial scale is required at a minimum?
  - b. Will we have enough stopover data at this scale to evaluate effect sizes of factors we control and those we do not in the same analysis?



Rabbe and Jenniges suggested we make a request for 1 stopover away from the Platte at a minimum. Jenniges said to calculate 90% of the birds that cross the Platte and ask for 1 stopover prior. Flyr asked if all locations in NE and KS, as last suggested by the Partnership, would work as a starting point? Work with this dataset to show the partnership why we need more data and that we are not going to publish. Walters said he was concerned that Program partners have the data, but the Program does not. Baasch said the Trust has stopover information only as they are collaborating with Pearse on a publication about the importance of river use during drought. That publication has been submitted and is currently in review. Baasch said he would ask for Nebraska to Oklahoma due to several prominent rivers in Oklahoma. Henry said southern rivers was the second ask the Program made, and we were told no. Ostrom asked why the Program needs to do the science if the Partnership is going to do it? Jenniges and Walters said the Program needs the work done on a shorter timeline. Henry said the Program is interested in effect size – how much explanatory power does flow have when you also consider things like time of day, distance traveled, weather, landcover, in the same model. Hoeting suggested that the Program needs 1 stopover prior and 1 stopover following an encounter with the Platte River. Farnsworth said the EDO will ask for it all and expect the minimum. Jenniges said the minimum should be 1 stop prior and 1 stop after the Platte, NE and KS is truly just a pilot study. Drain asked why all the secrecy around this dataset? Baasch said it is protecting publications. Jenniges said the data may reveal new high use areas.

Presentation: [Whooping Crane Telemetry Data Request](#)

#### EDO ACTION ITEMS:

- Write up data request for full US migratory corridor and 1 stopover before through 1 stopover after the Platte as the Program's minimum required dataset to answer Extension Big Questions (EBQs) 4-6 of the Extension Science Plan.
- Send to Whooping Crane Tracking Partnership for consideration at their October meeting.
- Sit down with Partnership members to discuss at North American Crane Workshop in late October.

#### **#5 SCIENCE ONBOARDING**

Henry presented a "button" added to the PRRIP site to make recent publications for TAC review and consideration for onboarding more accessible. The EDO has posted articles there that are directly relevant to Program science and management, keeping the TAC/GC apprised of new science as it comes out. Zorn asked if this is the EDO's effort to filter and bring items to the forefront, and asked if the TAC should bring relevant literature in for posting as well? Henry said yes, this is the EDO's first cut, but ultimately it is up to the TAC what they want to review and formally onboard. The EDO appreciates any TAC input to help keep this list complete and up to date. Scheel asked about the State of the Platte, which may also gather these sources of information. Smith said this information will be included there as well.

Link to relevant science onboarding articles on PRRIP site:

[Relevant Science Onboarding](#)

#### EDO ACTION ITEMS:

- Continue to update link with science relevant to the Program.



- Add to January TAC agenda a TAC discussion re: which items, when to discuss and/or onboard.

#### TAC ACTION ITEMS:

- Review publications found on the link periodically and inform their GC members of main takeaways.
- Add to the list as items come to your attention by sending articles to Henry.
- Prioritize those publications you would like to see discussed and/or onboarded by January TAC.

### **#6 PLOVER AND TERN PREDATOR MANAGEMENT / MONITORING FOR 2024**

#### *Plan for 2024*

Henry discussed with the TAC the study design that has been implemented systematically since 2021 to quantify the impact of predation on plover and tern productivity and evaluate Program effectiveness at mitigating these impacts (EBQs 8-9). The EDO suggested we stick with current study design through the 2024 breeding season for the following reasons:

- Provide 4 years of data under the same level and type of effort as was initially planned in the Science Plan Implementation Timeline.
- Learn all we can about effectiveness of interior fencing and lighting from the site with the highest potential for reward before our lease expires at the end of 2024. Broadfoot South Kearney hosts a large number of nests each year but had very low productivity prior to predator management implementation. Broadfoot South productivity has increased, and no nests have been documented as failed due to predation over the last two years.
- Get one more year of predator management out of the predator fence installed on Broadfoot South Kearney.
- Cost for 2024 is minimal, as investment in fence and equipment has already been made.

The EDO suggested the following timeline moving forward. Use early 2024 to work a data analysis plan through the TAC and the ISAC. Run the analysis during the summer and fall of 2024. Check in with the TAC in July and October and use the information gathered to decide how to proceed for 2025.

Ostrom asked why Broadfoot South productivity improved after the first year of implementation? Henry said it may have something to do with improvements made to fence integrity. We did some dirt work on the site to reduce wash outs under the fence after the first year and have done some minimal maintenance with shovels throughout the nesting season. Scheel asked if the deterrents have impacts on plovers? Henry said we evaluate potential impacts on nest locations, behavior, and productivity each year and have found none. Baasch said we should take out failed weather and failed unknown nests/broods. Henry said we have not done that yet. Rabbe asked whether the 2024 Science budget takes the change in fencing to avoid eagle entrapment. Farnsworth said yes, LP-2 includes more permanent fencing at entrances of active mining sites to replace temporary fencing. Jenniges recommended we keep the current experimental design for one more year. There was no opposition from the TAC.

Presentation: [Plover and Tern Predator Management 2024](#)

#### EDO ACTION ITEMS:

- Implement predator management and monitoring in 2024 as done in 2021-2023.
- Develop a data analysis plan early in 2024 for TAC/ISAC review.



### *Rowe on-channel tern and plover nesting habitat*

Hegg informed the TAC that Rowe will be building five acres of tern and plover on-channel nesting islands near the Pearse tract. The islands will be built high enough to avoid inundation at 3,000 cfs. Rowe has no long-term plan for the islands other than general maintenance. Rabbe asked about J2 water releases, will it stay low to provide a good window for building? Steinke said can expect a reduction in water in the river late October or early November. Baasch said that is during whooping crane migration. Walters asked if those islands fall under Program monitoring? Henry said, yes, the EDO would follow the current monitoring protocol for river surveys, and if nesting occurs, will increase monitoring to twice weekly. Henry asked about camera monitoring on the islands if nesting occurs. Hegg said Rowe is okay with the use of camera monitoring. Henry asked if these islands fall under Program incidental take? Rabbe said the Program has provisions for on-channel take and for channel inundation (though rare), and for monitoring. Four of five years of nest inundation from environmental flows would be necessary to revisit incidental take issues. Jenniges asked if Rowe would be utilizing existing islands or is this new construction? Rabbe said he thinks it will be rehabilitation of vegetated islands.

## **#7 SEDIMENT AUGMENTATION**

*TAC Feedback on Sed Aug Synthesis Report*

*TAC Review of Per Review Panel*

*TAC Review of Sand Dam RFP Scope of Work*

Fancher began the discussion summarizing two technical fixes to the report that have been incorporated:

- Cubic yards to cubic feet conversion has been done to use one metric consistently.
- The equation used to predict the progression of incision as shown in Murphy et al. will be used to remake and replace the figures in the report.

Farnsworth summarized main takeaways and remaining uncertainties in a short presentation. He summarized TAC feedback on the report that was more policy oriented. He also asked if halting augmentation was untenable, if so, it needs to be framed as implementation rather than as science learning. Jenniges said he thought the report did not provide enough context for peer reviewers to understand all the sediment sources. He is concerned that peer reviewers may not have enough history or context to interpret results. Farnsworth said that prior augmentation and channel widening cannot be addressed with LiDAR so the report starts at 2016 with the channel being a product of all past efforts at that point. Flyr suggested adding hydrological information that coincided with augmentation activities (higher peak flows) and how those peak flows are divided between the north and south channels. Jenniges said that during peak flows, more hydro is run down the south channel. Farnsworth said that high flows also activate the break through channel, allowing both water and sediment into the south channel. Farnsworth said if we are doing this to gather information to address EBQ 3, we may not need to augment sediment to decrease uncertainty around how long it would take for incision to impact the channel downstream of the Overton bridge at Cottonwood Ranch. You can learn about rate of incision by not augmenting during a period when you have LiDAR as a tool for monitoring. The GC decision in June was to stop for 2024, not to stop altogether. What the TAC needs to decide is if this is an offsetting action that just needs to be done, or if there is still learning to be done. If offsetting, we reword EBQ3 to reflect this. Jenniges reminded the TAC that the Cook and Dyer tracts were purchased to push sediment into the river. Drain asked two questions: 1) Do we want to answer the question re: how significant the



deficit is so we can use that information over the long term? or 2) Is this an offsetting action or price of admission. If offsetting, just need to decide how you want to spend your money to contribute. Think about whether we are replacing bank sediment sources (lateral erosion) with trucked in sources? What is the most efficient way? Can the north channel serve as an additional source of sediment? Jenniges suggested we shorten the experiment to upstream of Overton where you can see the impact. Rabbe recalls, or has assumed, that this is an offsetting action for a known sediment deficit. Flyr asked what our point of detection is? Are we below the limit of detection or do we need more time? How many years out until we can get an answer? Drain said every dollar that goes to this is a dollar that does not go to something else. Ostrom mentioned historic stochasticity of natural events and asked, if we can't find an answer, is it still worth doing? Do we risk letting it get worse? Will it get worse? Fancher said at a recent conference on sediment augmentation she attended, one of the participants said that it takes about 10 years, decades, to see a signal. Casavant reminded that this was with gravel augmentation, not sand. The speaker suggested dispersed but targeted locations for augmentation. Farnsworth said what we have learned is really that the channel is somewhat self-mitigating, for how long is the next thing we need to learn. Alternatively, we just say that an offset is required, and the TAC develops ways to provide the sediment. Farnsworth and Rabbe both said the cost for mechanical implementation is increasing. Brei said we also do not know if the quantity we augment is on the correct scale. Drain said that is where learning comes in. Maybe augment somewhere else and let lateral erosion do the work for you in the J-2 return area. Brei said we have indicators like wetted width, region where slope changes, region where planform changes to help us measure efficacy. Farnsworth said the south channel is as close to a closed system as we can get. Downstream of Overton is too messy to detect your single action. Jenniges suggested we further limit our scale of investigation, keeping the experiment upstream of the influx pipe that enters upstream of Overton. Ostrom asked whether we are willing to risk degradation to learn about augmentation? Rabbe said there is lots of uncertainty around stopping for five years, detecting degradation after it is too late. Jenniges and Rabbe said what they are hearing from the TAC is that stopping augmentation is not an option. Walters said the TAC needs to agree to continue augmentation, how much to augment, as well as the sustainability of that action. Maybe looking at the sand dam and other alternatives is the way to move forward. Walters asked how we learn more as we augment? Drain said given the uncertainty in effectiveness, need to utilize expert opinion.

Drain asked what we want to get out of peer review? Farnsworth said that using the large LiDAR dataset to evaluate volume change is a new science. We would like input on how to incorporate error or threshold in a way that can separate lateral erosion from bed erosion. Benefit of peer review is getting highly qualified technical feedback on analysis used as well as any suggestions for a better approach we can use moving forward. Peer review is a technical review as opposed to a weight of evidence in conclusion review. Smith said we need specific technical expertise to tackle these uncertainties. Smith will add these specific questions to the Peer Review Scope of Work to make sure they get answered. Flyr asked if what we are picking up is only noise? Casavant said large hydrological events can mask other processes. Farnsworth said noise distributed randomly is ok due to the huge dataset, but non-random noise is not ok. Brei said we require more error checking than most clients. We have been working for six years with the current LiDAR contractor to evaluate every dataset. He said we may be evaluating at too fine a scale, creating more problems than it solves, maybe we need to back it out a bit.

The TAC recommended adding augmentation to the 2024 Science Budget. The TAC also recommended moving the report forward for peer review. The EDO will add the technical questions noted above to the Peer Review Scope of Work to be addressed by reviewers.



Farnsworth and Schellpeper asked for TAC logic supporting the decision to continue augmentation. Walters said the TAC is developing a process here to give a recommendation without being motivated by what the GC will do with the information. Mosier asked where this leaves adaptive management learning. Nothing in the report gives you an answer that tells you to stop augmenting. Scheel asked if we might learn more by stopping augmentation? Farnsworth and Brei said with current LiDAR over the next five years you could measure effects (or continuing or stopping) better, information on if and how changing planform sections move over time. Farnsworth said we could move augmentation to Dyer and still learn about the J2-Overton reach while providing sediment to the system. Farnsworth suggested the EDO put money in the 2024 Science Budget for augmentation, contingent upon further TAC discussion, ISAC and peer review feedback, and GC approval. The TAC will continue to talk further on the issue in January and go back to the GC in March of 2024.

The TAC supported changing the Sand Dam RFP to broaden it to include alternatives upstream of the Cook property, including the sand dam, alternative forms of passive augmentation, and targeted locations for augmentation above or at the Cook/Dyer properties. Rabbe and Jenniges said options to move sediment between the north and south channel are problematic (robbing Peter to pay Paul scenarios). No formal MOTIONS were made.

Documents: [04 Sed Aug Report TAC EDO Feedback](#)  
[05 Sed Aug TAC EDO Comment Matrix](#)  
[06a PRRIP Sediment Augmentation Synthesis Report Peer Review Scope of Work](#)  
[07 PRRIP RFP for Sand Dam Retrofit Feasibility Draft for TAC.pdf](#)  
[07 PRRIP RFP for Sand Dam Retrofit Feasibility Draft for TAC.doc](#)  
Presentation: [Sediment Augmentation](#)

#### EDO ACTION ITEMS:

- Add \$250,000 to FY2024 Science Budget for Sediment Augmentation contingent upon further TAC discussion and GC approval
- Clean up Sed Aug Report for peer review
- Add more historical context and technical questions to Peer Review Scope of Work
- Finalize Sed Aug Peer Review Panel Information
- Bundle revised Sed Aug Report, revised Peer Review Scope of Work, and Peer Review Panel Information and send as a package together with a TAC Motion to recommend for peer review to the TAC electronically by the end of October/beginning of November
- Broaden scope of Sand Dam RFP to an alternatives study
- Add continued TAC discussion of sediment augmentation to Jan Quarterly TAC agenda

#### TAC ACTION ITEMS:

- TAC review of Sed Aug Report Peer Review Package in November for electronic TAC Motion to recommend report for peer review
- Jan TAC continued discussion to make recommendations on sediment augmentation moving forward to GC for March 2024





### **#8 FY2024 DRAFT SCIENCE PLAN BUDGET**

Henry introduced changes to 2024 budget line items in response to GC request to present a budget more in line with what is typical for consulting firms. We have included personnel, vehicles, airboat, trailers and accompanying expenses in the ED-1 budget for 2024. No longer part of the Science budget. Hours devoted to monitoring effort are estimated to stay about the same. In November, the GC will receive a draft budget including these items. TP-1 and WC-1 target species monitoring line items have decreased as a result. PD-18 Science Plan Related Equipment has been removed. Henry then ran through each line item with the TAC. Shellpeper asked to add “why” language to descriptions of line items. Following from TAC discussion above, the sediment augmentation budget will be increased to include both augmentation and an alternative study for 2024. Rabbe asked whether Special Advisors were 1-year appointments or longer? Farnsworth said in the past the EDO has kept advisors on as needed. Rabbe said it is important for the TAC and the ISAC to interact with these advisors as well. Smith said those advisors will come to all relevant meetings. Baasch asked about the list of publications in the budget. Smith said that there are aspects to each of these technical reports that are worth considering for publication. Drain suggested we keep the money in the budget and determine if publication is necessary later. Smith noted an increase in the ISAC line item to allow Hoeting to participate in the ISAC selection panel to replace Galat in 2024. Galat will also attend the summer ISAC meeting in 2024.

#### **EDO ACTION ITEMS:**

- Add language to each line item to link implementation with the Extension Science Plan Big Questions.
- PD-22 Sediment Augmentation line items to be increased to \$500,000, including \$250,000 for sediment augmentation and \$250,000 for a study examining alternatives to sediment augmentation. Contingent upon continued TAC discussion, integration of feedback from ISAC and peer review, as well as GC approval.
- ISAC-1 ISAC Stipends and Expenses increased to \$240,000 to include a stipend for Hoeting to sit on the ISAC selection panel in 2024 and to pay for Galat to attend the summer 2024 ISAC Meeting.

**TAC MOTION:** *Walters moved, and Rabbe seconded to recommend the FY2024 PRRIP Science Budget and Work Plan, incorporating the above-listed changes, for approval. Motion passed.*

Documents: [08 FY2024 PRRIP Science Budget TAC DRAFT](#)  
[09 FY2024 PRRIP Science Work Plan TAC DRAFT](#)

### **TAC MEETING REVIEW & WRAP-UP**

#### *Meeting Feedback*

Scheel circled back with the TAC to summarize ACTION ITEMS and TIMELINES.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

##### **EDO:**

Wet Meadow Hydrology Report

- Send complete panel information to TAC.
- Send a motion to recommend three suggested panel members for TAC consideration.
- Facilitate electronic TAC motion.



#### Land Management Plan Framework Update

- Integrate Rabbe's edits into the document.
- Send the edits to the LAC for their review and revision.
- Discuss with the LAC on October 18<sup>th</sup>, and integrate LAC input.
- Send out a more finalized version to the TAC prior to their January 2024 Quarterly Meeting.
- Put on January 2024 meeting agenda

#### Whooping Crane Telemetry Update

- Write up data request for full US migratory corridor and 1 stopover before through 1 stopover after the Platte as the Program's minimum required dataset to answer Extension Big Questions (EBQs) 4-6 of the Extension Science Plan.
- Send to Whooping Crane Tracking Partnership for consideration at their October meeting.
- Sit down with Partnership members to discuss at North American Crane Workshop in late October.

#### Science Onboarding

- Continue to update link with science relevant to the Program.
- Add to January TAC agenda a TAC discussion re: which items, when to discuss and/or onboard.

#### Plover and Tern Predator Management/Monitoring for 2024

- Implement predator management and monitoring in 2024 as done in 2021-2023.
- Develop a data analysis plan early in 2024 for TAC/ISAC review.

#### Sediment Augmentation

- Add \$250,000 to FY2024 Science Budget for Sediment Augmentation contingent upon further TAC discussion and GC approval
- Clean up Sed Aug Report for peer review
- Add more historical context and technical questions to Peer Review Scope of Work
- Finalize Sed Aug Peer Review Panel Information
- Bundle revised Sed Aug Report, revised Peer Review Scope of Work, and Peer Review Panel Information and send as a package to the TAC electronically by the end of October/beginning of November
- Broaden scope of Sand Dam RFP to an alternatives study
- Add continued TAC discussion of sediment augmentation to Jan Quarterly TAC agenda

#### FY2024 Draft Science Budget

- Add language to each line item to link implementation with the Extension Science Plan Big Questions.
- PD-22 Sediment Augmentation line items to be increased to \$500,000, including \$250,000 for sediment augmentation and \$250,000 for a study examining alternatives to sediment augmentation. Contingent upon continued TAC discussion, integration of feedback from ISAC and peer review, as well as GC approval.
- ISAC-1 ISAC Stipends and Expenses increased to \$240,000 to include a stipend for Hoeting to sit on the ISAC selection panel in 2024 and to pay for Galat to attend the summer 2024 ISAC Meeting.

**TAC:****Wet Meadow Hydrology Report**

- Review panel information.
- Electronically approve motion to recommend or change motion to include other panel members for appointment.

**Land Management Plan Framework Update**

- Review and provide feedback on updated framework prior to January 2024 Quarterly Meeting

**Science Onboarding**

- Review publications found on the link periodically and inform their GC members of main takeaways.
- Add to the list as items come to your attention by sending articles to Henry.
- Prioritize those publications you would like to see discussed and/or onboarded by January TAC.

**Sediment Augmentation**

- TAC review of Sed Aug Report Peer Review Package in November for electronic TAC Motion to recommend report for peer review
- Jan TAC continued discussion to make recommendations on sediment augmentation moving forward to GC for March 2024

**TAC MOTIONS:**

- July 18-19, 2023 TAC Meeting minutes approved.
- FY2024 PRRIP Science Budget and Work Plan recommended for approval.

***Future calendar events:***

- November 8, 2023 GC FY2024 Draft Budget Review
- December 5-6, 2023 GC Meeting
- January 16-17, 2024 TAC Quarterly Meeting
- February 20-22, 2024 Science Plan Reporting Session

**TAC MEETING END**

The TAC meeting adjourned at 12:23 AM Central Time.