

HBC AHG Report Comments (Flip Charts)

May 29, 2003

If no additional \$, what would fall off?

Science Advisory Board : How do they feel about changes and how it affects their capacity to do a good scientific job.

Review other plans: How it complicates or solves problems (population estimates, sediment trips, GCMRC plan)

Look at combinations of proposals that might be effective

Exp Flows: Project 7 – Task 6 is broad and open ended – sequence them well to take advantage of other flow programs

Factor in cost of replacement power for experimental flows
(cash outlay impacts – not profit impacts)

Show costs of projects for HBC – prioritize within that – go no further

Put list in priority order

Which are within scope of AMP and which are outside (for funding and scope)

PR Issue: Why not paying attention to other endangered species

Figure flows that disadvantage trout and don't cost power generation

Government-to-Government Consultation, RE: HBC management

More activity in PA Group to discuss/address this plan

What are social values of de-listing HBC?

Use conceptual model to ascertain impacts.

Factor in costs to recuperation: rafting and fishing

How urgent is the problem?

1D WIN-WIN Strategy for all stakeholders – try return to load following (larger fish, more productive system, more power revenues, less need for mechanical removal) – disadvantages rafting)

Good to address decline with comprehensive plan

Walters and Gloss recommend not moving to crisis mode – evaluate projects based on merit – “Bang for the buck” review.

River trip – late fall – develop program of experimentation

Good direction to reverse downward trend of HBC numbers – need to continue

Are we heading there fast enough?

Trade-offs – HBC Plan will take a lot of resources. AMWG should discuss the trade-offs

Budget is capped – we should come up with a realistic budget based on needs instead of accepting cap then produce those resources.

Recovery program makes sense – let AMWG do what it is charged to do

Cap is on power revenues, not on the budget

Non-federal stakeholders need to lobby for increased appropriations.

Before translocation above Chute Falls, briefing to several Navajo Departments by BOR or other agencies (concern about 9 projects)

Input from tribal representatives would be useful early in the process

Preliminary work with tribal councils

Time may be a problem – may happen between July and January

Consultation will occur!