

**Governor's Upper Yellowstone River Task Force
Meeting Summary
April 16, 2002
Yellowstone Inn
Meeting began at 7:00 pm**

I. Introduction

Members Present:

John Bailey, Chair	Michelle Goodwine
David Haug, Vice Chair	Jerry O'Hair
Roy Aserlind	Rod Slring
Andy Dana	Jim Woodhull
Doug Ensign	Ellen Woodbury

Others Present:

George Mathieus, DEQ Ex-Officio	Jim Barrett	Bethany Rivard
Stan Sternberg, DOT Ex-Officio	Karl Biastoch	Lurah Klaas
Laurence Siroky, USFS Ex-Officio	Scott Bosse	John Dwight Hines
Allan Steinle, Corps Ex-Officio	Lionel Dicharry	
Liz Galli-Noble, Coordinator	Ron Steg	
Amy Miller, Administrative Secretary	George Jordan	
Duncan Patten, TAC Chair	Bill Moser	

II. Prior Meeting Minutes

Andy Dana offered an amendment to the February 26, 2002 minutes. The amendment was sent to the Task Force members for review in advance of this meeting.

“Despite Dr. Patten’s position, Andy Dana expressed concern that development of predictive models based on primary data collected during drought years may be problematic. His concern is that data collected by Task Force researchers, which pertain to drought-sensitive aspects of the Yellowstone River system (e.g. fishery, wildlife, vegetative recruitment, etc.), may bias any predictive models based on using such data. The contention that current data anomalies may be adjusted or corrected based on alternative data sets is also a concern. The Task Force endorsed new studies of the Yellowstone River system because of the absence of reliable historical or alternative data sets. Allan Steinle suggested that one way to address these concerns is for the Task Force and researchers to recognize that data was collected during drought years, which in some cases may introduce some uncertainty into the reliability of the studies, but that the studies nevertheless represent the best information at the Task Force’s disposal on which to base its management recommendations.”

Andy Dana explained that he did not bring this issue before the Task Force to open up discussion; instead, he wanted the meeting minutes to more accurately reflect the exchange that he and Duncan had concerning the scientific studies and data collection.

Andy Dana moved to “accept the modification to the February 26, 2002 meeting minutes as offered in his amendment”.

Dave Haug seconded the motion.

This discussion followed:

Duncan Patten made a brief comment that he did not fully agree with a few words in Andy’s statements, but did not want to take up too much time. Addressing the amendment, Duncan stated

that these are not “data anomalies;” we are in normal historic range of variation. If we were doing data collection in 1997, some people may be upset that we are collecting in a flood year. The studies are being done from spring run off to fall and winter low flows; some studies (such as geomorphology) actually prefer to collect data in low flows. The only thing that Duncan saw that might have a problem is the fisheries studies, but even for those studies we are still within the natural historic variability on the river; we have hit a low this year, but overtime one would see that lows like this are not that unusual. Duncan concluded by saying that there are a few words in the amendment that he simply does not agree with; I guess we agree to disagree.

Roy Aserlind: Did you two come to some kind of compromise, with regard to Allan Steinle’s comment?

Andy Dana: I just remember Allan saying that, but if he is uncomfortable with the statement, he should take it out.

Allan Steinle: I don’t remember what I said. I can’t remember if that is what I said or not.

Andy Dana: I simply want the minutes to reflect that Duncan and I had the exchange. My only comment is that for predictive modeling, when you first run your model your data is going to be crucial. As an example, you can think about economic forecasting, which uses predictive models. If you had run some predictive models during the economic boom of the 1990s to find out what was happening in the year 2002, that model using the 1990s data set would result in a very different view of 2002 and what it would look like than if we were using today’s data. That is the only point that I am trying to make.

All of the Task Force members voted to accept the modification to the February 26, 2002 minutes, except John Bailey, who went on record as being “opposed” to the motion. The motion passed.

Andy Dana then asked John Bailey why he opposed the motion.

John Bailey: We can’t have a discussion on a very broad topic when we are talking about previous minutes. I think that we should have a discussion on this whole topic, because if we are going to make the minutes address everybody’s statements we have to make sure that we get them all in. That is why we have a tape recorder again. If I had known that we were going to go this route, I would have made many more comments at our last meeting. I believe that what I am hearing is: we are going to find when we get to the end, that because the data was collected when we were in drought, the data’s no good; and we have wasted a lot of peoples’ time. I think that the data is just as valid if we were in flood years or drought years; we get whatever the river gives us.

I think that all of us—with our different history of the river—when we get the data in, various ones of us are going to say, ‘I am having trouble buying in because we were in drought years.’ Others will say that ‘the last few winters have been mild and cold, so fish populations are high, therefore I think that flows are not as important as days below 40 below.’

I expect when we get done, we will come back to these minutes and we will say that we agreed to this modification. I am concerned about that. I know that several Task Force members believe that the drought is influencing; I believe that the floods influence just as much. I don’t know what a *normal* year is.

Andy Dana: Your concern is substantive; it is not about what the minutes reflect.

John Bailey: Exactly.

Andy Dana: Your opposition is to the substance of the statement, as opposed to the fact that the

statements were made.

John Bailey: Yes, we cannot go back to the past minutes and insert stuff that some of us would have said.

Andy Dana: I think that it is very important for the minutes to reflect the discussion.

John Bailey: We certainly are going to have to do a better job from now on.

Michelle Goodwine then commented that the Task Force still needed to vote to approve the full February 26, 2002 minutes. There was no further discussion.

Dave Haug moved to approve the February 26, 2002 minutes. Michelle Goodwine seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Financial Updates

1. Grant Spending Report:

Amy Miller reported the following financial updates to the Task Force:

EXPENDED GRANTS			
Grant Name	Completed	Amount	Study Component
DNRC Watershed Planning Assistance Grant	6/30/99	2,100.00	Physical Features Inventory
DNRC HB223 Grant	7/30/99	10,000.00	Aerial photography
DNRC Riparian/Wetlands Educational Grant	6/30/00	960.99	<i>Hydrologic Response to the 1988 Fires Workshop</i>
DEQ 319 Grant (1 st)	9/30/00	40,000.00	Coordinator position
DNRC Watershed Planning Assistance Grant	1/31/01	10,000.00	Watershed Land Use Study
DEQ Start-Up Grant	6/26/01	49,138.00	Coordinator position, Admin Secretary, additional cross-sections, operating expenses.
DNRC HB223	10/1/01	6,500.00	Riparian Trend Analysis
BLM Funding	10/26/01	10,000.00	Wildlife Study
DEQ 319 Grant – 2 nd	3/21/02	58,000.00	Coordinator position
CURRENT GRANTS			
Grant Name	Amount	Spent	Remaining Balance
DNRC RDGP Grant (expires 12/31/02)	299,940.00	247,325.26	52,614.74
DEQ 319 Grant (3 rd) (expires 6/20/03)	44,000.00	3,735.31	40,264.69

IV. Project Completion Schedule

1. Project Timeline

In early 2002, John Bailey asked Liz Galli-Noble to put together a full project completion timeline for Task Force review (see *Attachment A*). John Bailey instructed Liz to contact all the research teams and confirm that they would be finished in December 2002, as was decided in 2001. Liz reported back to John that all of the teams would be able to meet the December deadline except the geomorphology study. Other major actions were also included in the timeline—for example the Partner Coordination Subcommittee's work on the MOU, future educational workshops, and recommendation development—in an attempt to outline the full project scope.

Duncan mentioned that the timeline only reflected the research teams' work beginning in January 2002. He suggested that a start date be added to the timeline for clarity.

2. **Geomorphology Study Deadline and Historic Photo Work**

As Liz Galli-Noble reported previously, the geomorphology team stated in early 2002 that they would be unable to meet a December 2002 deadline. She then presented a short summary of events concerning the issue to the Task Force.

Background:

The DNRC would require additional financial and funding assistance (see Task 1 & 2 below) in order to satisfy the December deadline. Given that the geomorphology team has been required to constantly adjust and expand their project scope over the years, it did not come as a surprise that they will require additional assistance.

Because of the immediacy of this problem, John Bailey went to Helena on April 5, 2002 and met with Bud Clinch, Todd O'Hair, Jack Stults, Rich Moy, and Chuck Dalby. They discussed the overall project completion schedule and possible solutions to this problem. It was stressed that the December 2002 deadline is crucial because data from a multitude of research investigations must be presented to the Task Force members in a logical and timely manner. Further, the Geomorphic Analysis is the base study and therefore must be presented early-on in the educational process.

At the April 5 meeting, Chuck Dalby said that the Task Force would likely not meet their management recommendation deadline in August, and therefore the Task Force should request another one- or two-year extension. John Bailey explained that he refuted that claim and said that from what he has heard from some Task Force members and the Governor's office is that we should finish in August 2003. John also explained that the Task Force could not make that decision; that decision would have to be made by the Governor. If the Governor extended the Task Force, than fine, but John would not ask for another extension.

Conclusion: In order for the geomorphic study team to meet its December 2002 completion deadline (contract deadline for the RDGP Grant and for the Task Force), they will require the following assistance:

Task 1. Contracted Services: scan, rectify, and mosaic historic aerial photos \$55,000
Task 2. Staff Support: general GIS support (9 months of FTE) \$35,000

TAC Recommendation:

Task 1: Hire private contractor to scan, rectify, and mosaic historic aerial photos (years: 1943, 48/49, 54, 65, 73, 76, 83, 87, 91).

- Original estimated cost (650 photos): \$45,000 to \$55,000
- Revised estimated cost (20% reduction): \$35,000 to \$45,000 (focal study areas only, not full corridor)

The TAC members and researchers involved plan to meet again at the CEA workshop (April 27) to finalize "focal area extent and photos needed" details. All agree that this still leaves enough time to complete the contract and work.

- Contract: Park CD will sponsor the bid and contract; DNRC will provide technical assistance for the bid and contract; 60-day turnaround timeline
- Funding: DNRC will contribute \$28,000; funding still needed, \$17,000
 - Governor Martz asked EPA for funding (outlook not promising)
 - John/Liz asked Corps for funding (no reply to date)
 - Task Force contribute money from old Start Up Fund source (?)

Note: All three research teams and TAC members are comfortable with this proposal; they feel that this is the best approach given quality control and timeline issues.

Deadline to have this product in hand:

Dalby believes that the contract/bid process will take four weeks (complete by mid June). He is then hoping that with a 60-day turnaround contract, the work will be done by mid August, with the earliest years (1948/49) delivered first; these are also the most needed. Merigliano needs a product no later than August; Hansen needs a product as soon as possible but can live with this timeline.

Where do we go from here?

- (1) Bud Clinch, DNRC Director, committed to additional DNRC staff to this project, if needed; Task 2 can be covered by the DNRC.
- (2) Additional funding will be needed.
- (3) Bid and contract need to be finalized as quickly as possible.
- (4) Liz, and when possible Duncan, has been directed to meet with Rich Moy and Jack Stults (DNRC) on a monthly basis to monitor geomorphology study progress.

Task Force members discussed budget options given the TAC recommendation. The following comments were made:

- John Bailey reported that he had a conversation with Rodney Schwartz (Corps) about possible funding sources. Rodney could not offer assurance, but suggested the Section 22 Program, which has a contract timeline as short as 30 to 40 days. This program requires a State sponsor, which could be the DNRC.
- Ron Steg (EPA Helena) reported that he has seen a copy of the Governor's letter to the EPA. He didn't have an answer about possible EPA funding; but mentioned that the EPA is facing a 20 percent budget cut for current allocated funding. Liz reported that Peter Ismert (EPA Denver) has made some funding inquiries, but so far funding opportunities are not promising.
- John Bailey is pleased to have received a commitment from Bud Clinch (DNRC Director) to provide needed staff support.
- Ellen Woodbury is uncomfortable with using a Corps funding source simply because of the length of time needed to move through their contracting process. Her comment was based on past experiences with the Socio-Economic study.
- Allan Steinle reported that in the past (for example with the Laurel Water In-Take Project) contracts have moved rather quickly through the Section 22 program. However, that particular contract was actually done in-house.
- Ellen Woodbury stressed that if this contract has to be completed very quickly that she would be more comfortable having the Task Force fund the work directly.
- Liz Galli-Noble commented that direct Task Force funding would definitely be easier and faster than going through Federal agencies.
- John Bailey stated that these contract items need to get off Chuck Dalby's plate, so he can continue with his geomorphology analysis.
- Liz Galli-Noble reported that all other research teams are fully funded.
- Liz Galli-Noble reported that the proposed contract and work must to be completed within 60 days.
- Andy Dana mentioned another option for funding: private outside funding. At one point last year, the Task Force considered taking outside money and rejected it at that time. However, the Task Force did say they would look at that funding source on a case-by-case basis. Maybe now is the time to revisit that option.

- David Haug mentioned that down the road private funding could be an option, but right now, the Task Force has the money and could spend up to \$17,000.

If other sources fail to materialize, an additional \$17,000 would be needed from the Task Force to contract out Task 1. John Bailey asked for a motion from the Task Force authorizing that 319 Grant funds be spent in support of this effort, if needed. He noted that the DEQ had been contacted earlier in the week, and they agreed to work with the Task Force on this issue. Given that the Task Force spent down the remaining \$21,000 from the Start Up Grant in June 2001, 319 funds are available.

Ellen Woodbury moved that “if all other funding avenues fail, the Task Force will spend \$7,000 or more, with authorization from the Chair or Vice Chair, up to \$17,000 from the Task Force’s 319 Grant.”

Dave Haug seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Note: It was added that Liz Galli-Noble would wait three weeks to determine if other funding sources materialize before committing Task Force 319 funds; Three week-timeframe: April 16 to May 7, 2002.

V. TAC/Research Business

Proposed Historic Land Use Mapping Project

Duncan Patten and Liz Galli-Noble began by providing the following summary of the Historic Land Use Mapping project proposal:

Background

Led by Tom Pick in 1999, the NRCS developed a Watershed Land Use Assessment proposal. The Task Force approved the NRCS proposal in late 1999 and the work was performed in 2000/2001. The goal of the study was to depict the extent and spatial relationships of present (1999) and past land cover/use in the Upper Yellowstone River Study Area.

Using a Landsat 7, 30-meter image dated July 12, 1999, the NRCS was able to produce an accurate 1999 watershed land use map. They compiled the information in a report for the Task Force: *A Satellite-Based Land Cover Map for the Upper Yellowstone River Watershed, Montana and Wyoming*, in December 2001.

Unfortunately, poor resolution for the 1970s era photography and imagery caused their first attempt to do the historic mapping to fail. The second attempt, using Landsat 5, 30-meter image dated July 13, 1985, also produced unacceptable results due to excessive cloud cover, confusion in the pixel-to-pixel classification, and inaccuracy in cross-referencing of new and old images. So in the end, an historic (1970s or 1985) land use map was not produced by NRCS.

In the end, the NRCS found that using older satellite imagery to do historic land use mapping did not produce an accurate enough product. At their fall 2001 presentation to the Task Force, Tom Pick and Doug Harrison recommended that if attempted again, the Task Force should employ the “old fashioned” method of doing historic mapping: using historic aerial photos. This method would be more expensive but more usable. However, due to staffing shortages and lack of funding, the NRCS would be unable to perform the work for the Task Force. That is where the issue sat until the February 2002 TAC meeting.

New Opportunity & Project Funding

When Dr. Andy Hansen attended the February 2002 TAC meeting and heard the TAC’s

recommendation to do a historic land-use mapping project, he offered to help out. Fortunately for the Task Force, Dr. Hansen is already working on a similar land use project in the full Yellowstone Ecosystem. Dr. Hansen is presently under contract with the EPA for that work—and given the priority of the Upper Yellowstone River project—the EPA is willing to expand his Star Grant (EPA Office of Research and Development) to include the desired historic land use mapping effort for the Task Force. The funding expansion is estimated at \$70,000, although a few more budget details still need to be finalized.

TAC & NRCS Recommendation

Although the TAC and NRCS agree that producing an historic land use map at the full watershed level (peak to peak) is preferred, time and funding constraints make that impossible. What they do recommend is producing an historic map of the corridor (valley floor and Pleistocene terraces between the confining mountains).

Hansen's New Proposal

Details for Dr. Hansen's historic land-use mapping project are as follows:

- Use historic photography with fine-scale resolution

- Use representative samples in valley:

 - 5 to 10 belts stratified using geomorphologic reach type

 - 3 time periods: 1948/49, 1970s, and 1999

 - Boundary: valley floor up to toe slopes

- Use same land use classifications as NRCS 1999 coverage

- Deliver product within 12/2002 timeframe set for other studies

Dr. Hansen could zero in on the valley bottom area, which would give some sort of a comparison between his work and the NRCS report. Hansen's study would complete the land use component that NRCS was unable to produce. This study would give comparisons of land use (past and present) and would be a useful data set. The Task Force would not need to find funding for this study, but Dr. Hansen would not proceed with the study if the Task Force didn't give approval. The study would be completed by December 2002, but preliminary data would be available by September 2002 in accordance with the project completion timeline already laid out.

Michelle Goodwine moved to “accept the TAC’s recommendation for Dr. Hansen’s Historic Land Use Mapping project.”

Ellen Woodbury seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

John Bailey reported that this project came about because Peter Ismert read the Task Force meeting minutes. The Task Force thanked Andy Hansen and Peter Ismert for their hard work in pulling all this together in such a short period of time.

VI. Task Force Partner Coordination Subcommittee

Liz Galli-Noble mailed the latest version of the draft MOU/MOA to Task Force members in advance of this meeting for their review. The Partner Coordination Subcommittee has taken the lead in drafting the MOU/MOA, and the subcommittee members present at the meeting identified themselves: Dave Haug, Andy Dana, Ellen Woodbury, Jim Woodhull, Allan Steinle, and Liz Galli-Noble. Jim Robinson was unable to attend the meeting.

Andy Dana: The intent of the MOU/MOA is to specify responsibilities and roles of the various agencies. Essentially, it contains pledges throughout that these agencies will consult with the

Task Force throughout the CEA and NEPA processes, that is, as much as the Task Force wants to be consulted. We have been trying to make it very clear that the agencies have a federally mandated role under the law, and the Task Force does not.

Having had time to review the document, Task Force members were asked to comment or make edits to the MOU/MOA. The following comments were made:

Dave Haug: This MOU/MOA will be more crucial at the end of the process; it will be a way to formalize the process. The Upper Yellowstone may end up forming a watershed group much like the Upper Shields. The Park Conservation District may have an issue with the language on Page 4, III.C. Instead of Park Conservation District being the sole lead agency identified when the Task Force ends, the City of Livingston, Park County, and other agencies should also be mentioned.

Edit: "If the Task Force is not extended, and if the work described herein remains uncompleted, the Lead Agencies agree to continue to seek guidance and public input through the Park Conservation District, **and other appropriate, interested parties.**"

When asked if the Park Conservation District would sign the MOU/MOA if the Task Force doesn't approve of the document, Dave Haug responded, "No, they would not sign."

Andy Dana: This is an odd agreement. The Task Force has been invited to participate in the process as a courtesy: to "snoop" on what agencies were doing in terms of NEPA analysis, to offer input, and to ensure that our activities would be integrated as much as possible into their procedure. Andy Dana personally appreciates the agencies inviting the Task Force to participate. His input throughout the writing of the MOU was to try and make sure that the Task Force was not identified as a party that was preparing the cumulative effects analysis, but also to confirm that to the extent possible that our studies and activities (which will lead to management recommendations) are helpful to the agencies and any other members of the public.

Jim Woodhull: The Task Force needs a mechanism or process to formulate their recommendations. He is worried that the Task Force is going to be overwhelmed when data starts coming in, if they do not have an agreed upon process by which to move along. Jim recommended that we go back and revisit our first Task Force meeting minutes. This would probably give the Task Force a first cut at the concerns and issues that are driving the process. Andy agreed with Jim's statements and suggestions.

Liz Galli-Noble: When the Task Force presents recommendations to the Governor in August 2003, the Corps' NEPA process will just be beginning. The MOU/MOA is a reflection of how the Corps wants and needs to continue to cooperate with locals and other agencies, even after the Task Force is terminated.

Duncan Patten: The Task Force is doing a "cumulative effects analysis" in lower case; while the Corps is doing a "Cumulative Effects Analysis" in upper case. The Task Force is conducting the investigation as a way of guiding management recommendations; to create a foundation upon which to evaluate and to ask questions of the researchers as data comes in. It may be a little early, but you need to think about this ahead of time. Final research presentations should not be just academic presentations, but also presentations aimed at what the Task Force's goals are. What are your concerns? What are your questions? What do you hope to learn from the data as a basis for recommendation development? You certainly can start asking questions now, without knowing the data.

John Bailey: I have an issue with the language on Page 4, II.J. that states: "Lead agencies also agree to consult with the Task Force and its TAC in developing the CEA and any

subsequent regulatory program modification.” The Task Force is gone in August 2003, so how is this possible?

Subcommittee members acknowledged that this statement was supposed to have been deleted from an earlier version of the MOU, but must have been missed; it will be deleted.

Additional edits:

** Page 4, III.C.: This is a policy statement (referring to lead agencies), John doesn't think that we have the authority to do this.

The Task Force may make a recommendation in the end as to what happens after the Task Force is terminated. This language limits our options.

** Page 5, III. I. “When EO 21-01 expires, continuance of the TAC is at the discretion of its members.” What is the oversight of the TAC if the Task Force is gone? No Task Force, no TAC. It should read “researchers” instead of “TAC.”

** John always assumed that the Task Force would need to approve the MOU/MOA; the Task Force does have a say because of the Park Conservation District's involvement. The issue of approval needs to be fleshed out.

Allan Steinle: The Task Force doesn't need to approve the MOU/MOA, but any comments would be greatly appreciated. After the Task Force goes away, the Corps will need a citizen's group to coordinate with locally. The Corps wants the Task Force's recommendations in hand before beginning the NEPA process.

Ellen Woodbury: The MOU/MOA has to have a formal entity sign (for example, Park County, City of Livingston, or Park Conservation District); it can't be a citizen's group.

This MOU/MOA is a draft. The agencies involved have agreed to the MOU/MOA, but haven't signed it yet. The subcommittee has done as much as possible at this point. The subcommittee will make the suggested changes addressed at this Task Force meeting, and will bring the MOU/MOA back for final approval at a future date. A future Task Force meeting would also be an appropriate time to address the MOU attachments.

Spin Off Topic: How is the Task Force going to formulate recommendations?

Jim Woodhull: We do not have a lot of time to finish the recommendations before the Task Force appointment ends. Jim doesn't feel that there is enough time to complete the entire process of recommendations. We cannot afford to skip Task Force meetings this summer; we need to have those meetings to figure out what process will be used to formulate recommendations. We should be discussing this issue now, even before data is complete.

Laurence Siroky: He explained the process that the DNRC will go through in order to adopt the floodplain mapping ordinances. Once the floodplain maps are finalized by the USGS, the DNRC public process begins, which will include public meetings.

John Bailey: I am ready to do this. I am also very concerned that we need to address this issue.

Given that Task Force members requested one, John decided to have a June 2002 Task Force meeting. It would be a brain storming session, which would review the concerns and issues developed at the second (December 9, 1997) Task Force meeting. He stated that the Task Force may have new concerns that come from this brain storming session, and revisiting these issues may require more than just one meeting. We can also ask, are our studies addressing these issues?

It is hard for lay people to understand and remember the data as it becomes available—our research teams may need to come before the Task Force more than once.

Ellen Woodbury: Our original list may need to be narrowed down.

Andy Dana: Input is important.

Maybe at a later Task force meeting, we could look at examples of other public processes used to develop recommendations.

Liz was directed to pull together some of this information for a future meeting.

Duncan Patten: You need to articulate what your concerns are. What questions do you have about those concerns? That way the researchers can bring supporting data to address those specific concerns and questions.

VII. Data Dissemination—Printing and Distribution Costs

Liz Galli-Noble had been directed to draft a data dissemination survey to poll individuals on all of the Task Force mailing lists. She provided a draft of the *Public Participant/Research Data Needs Survey* (see *Attachment B*) to Task Force members and the public for their review and feedback. The Task Force has approximately \$25,000 in 319 Grant #4 for publications and distribution. The data will be available in public offices and on the Task Force website. Some of the final reports will come after the Task Force is done.

She asked: Is this what the Task Force wanted? How could it be improved?

Suggested edits made are:

1. Delete the option "I am interested in receiving all Task Force research reports/data."
2. Add: "I am not interested in receiving Task Force research reports/data."
3. Change: "I am interested in receiving 'the following' Task Force research reports/data; please specify:"
4. Explain in the introduction that all information will be available on our website.
5. Encourage people to use email to help reduce costs.
6. Further comments can be given to Liz; changes will be made and the survey will be mailed out with the next minutes.

VIII. Outreach and Education Activities Updates

CEA Workshop – April 28 to 30, 2002, Chico Hot Springs, hosted by MSU Big Sky Institute (Duncan Patten).

Purpose: To develop protocols for doing cumulative impacts studies on large rivers systems in the West. What are the major stressors? What should/can be measured? This will be a "working" workshop with breakout groups. Participants will also be asked to evaluate the Upper Yellowstone River investigation. Liz has been asked to be a recorder for one of the breakout groups. There will be a published document from the workshop.

Carleton College Interns – Two Carleton College interns are donating their time to five Task Force research teams from June 15 to August 15, 2002. They have their own funding and housing, and contacted Liz through the Billings office of The Nature Conservancy.

IX. Schedule Next Task Force Meeting

The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for:

There will be **NO MAY 2002 MEETING.**

The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, June 5, 2002** at the Yellowstone Inn at 7:00 pm.

X. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.