

PRIMARY ASSUMPTIONS MADE DURING FY2002 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

INFRASTRUCTURE

NUMBER	ASSUMPTION
1	Staff for AEAM assumed 0.25 FTE for FY 2002 due to late date of developing PD's
2	Transferred CDFG administration costs from wier project to administration section (Task I-15
3	Groups responding to simplified tasks in "recommendations" sheet should refer to the hypothesis based worksheets to ensure those hypotheses are addressed in their study plan

IMPLEMENTATION

NUMBER	ASSUMPTION
4	Design, permitting, and inventory surveys would occur for two years worth of sites (16)
5	Pre construction inventory surveys done by BLM/USFS will occur in addition to hypothesis based monitoring at these sites (could save money if these two were coordinated)
6	Bank rehab sites will be designed, environmental docs, and permitted in 2002; No sites will be implemented with FY 2002 funds, will use FY 2003 funds for implmentation of 8 sites
7	Bridge design, engineering, permitting will be done with FY 2002 funding, construction of bridges in FY 2002 depends upon CDFG funding to Trinity County, remaining bridges constructed using FY 2003 funding (and hopefully CDFG grants)
8	Watershed restoration implementation is low priority in FY 2002 budget, focusing instead on evaluation of past program and developing priorities for future.

MONITORING

NUMBER	ASSUMPTION
9	FY 2002 funding would only include baseline documentation of bank rehab sites
10	Cost assumes that bird, amphib, geomorphic, riparian, and fish biology hypothesis based monitoring would be done at 8 sites together, + 4 existing control sites. This could change as a result of the workshops.
11	More intensive fish habitat modeling would occur at two control sites and two project sites (pre-construction)
12	Salmonid production model (e.g., SALMOD) development/refinement would be mostly deferred until FY2003, with \$40,000 for a workshop and \$40,000 for data incorporation provided in FY 2002. Workshop will provide guidance for production model in FY 2003.