

**Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group Meeting  
April 29-30, 2009**

**Motions Passed**

(Individual stakeholder votes recorded in the meeting minutes.)

**MOTION: AMWG recommends to the Secretary of the Interior that he approve the Strategic Science Plan revisions dated April 2009 and the Monitoring and Research Plan amendment dated March 24, 2009.**

Voting Results: Yes = 19      No = 2      Abstain = 0

Motion Passed.

-----

**MOTION:** In recognition of GCDAMP goals toward management of the Colorado River through an ecosystem approach, AMWG directs the TWG to establish the Species of Concern Ad Hoc Committee and requests the participation of GCMRC in that ad hoc committee, to provide a draft report to be presented to AMWG on or before May 1, 2011 that contains the following with regard to species of management concern in the CRE: A review of information about and assessment of the status of habitat needs and availability, and ecosystem roles of the species.

Passed by consensus.

-----

Note on the budget motion: AMWG considered each of the five enumerated paragraphs separately in the following motion. Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6 were agreed to by consensus. The votes approving paragraphs 1 and 2, and declining to approve new language for paragraph 2, follow the full motion.

**MOTION:** AMWG gives the following direction to the TWG as it continues to work with BOR and GCMRC to develop a proposed budget, workplan, and hydrograph for FY 2010-11 for consideration by AMWG at its next meeting:

1. Continue to develop a budget based on an annual operations hydrograph for FY 10 and 11 water years of MLFF with fall steady flows in September and October.
2. Move funding for "Mainstem Non-native Mechanical Removal" back to line 74 under the GCMRC budget and add funding for an additional removal trip, if TWG deems it necessary.
3. Develop scope and objectives for a geomorphological model that would evaluate dam effects on cultural sites, with no budgetary implications at this time for FY10-11.
4. Work with the CRAHG, GCMRC, and BOR to do the following:
  - a. Provide an explanation of current funding line items (more explicit description of accounting) and how they relate to the treatment plan and necessary compliance, including lines: 23, 31, 114, and relevant portions of lines 39-43.
  - b. Describe why the treatment plan cannot be fully implemented using the current line items described above, specifically the \$500,000 allocated in line 31 and ~ \$147,000 in line 23.
  - c. Discuss the necessity of the \$70,000 for the NPS (line 114).
5. Develop a discussion paper on the pros and cons of the two budget approaches described in Issue of Concern #9, for submittal to AMWG at its August meeting.
6. Continue to address the following issues of concern:
  - a. General comment on core monitoring: The budget assumes that we will have moved forward on core monitoring for a number of Goals under the AMP. Although this is reasonable to consider TWG believes it is premature. TWG will begin to consider the General Core Monitoring Plan this summer and from there will have a better idea what may constitute core monitoring. TWG should, within the core monitoring discussion, evaluate cost-effectiveness of current monitoring programs (precision, accuracy, cost trade-offs). GCMRC is planning a core monitoring workshop before the next TWG meeting to discuss the draft plan.
  - b. General comment on the workplan. TWG is looking for additional clarity in the workplan on staff funding including a current GCMRC organizational chart. TWG requests the following:

- (a) that staff time for individual projects be allocated under those projects, (b) time be allocated in the workplan such that a substantial amount of time, about 20%, is allocated to writing reports and publications, and (c) any new staff additions or deletions be clearly outlined in the budget introduction and appropriate projects.
- c. General comment on Goal 10. There is a lack of economic analysis capacity in the program to evaluate trade-offs or other economic concerns. Additional capacity should be considered. Unknown funding needs at this time.
  - d. Line 74: Priorities and funding under Goal 2. GCMRC should provide an explanation of where funding used in FY 2009 for Mainstem Non-native Mechanical Removal has been reallocated within the program.
 

GCMRC response: There are two primary budget items that received the money (\$141,023 in 2009) previously allocated for the mainstem removal project:

    1. The salaries at USFWS, AZGFD, and USGS are only going up each year. GCMRC always receives requests for more funding for salaries from the cooperators each year, and USGS salaries also increase.
    2. An additional \$25,000 was provided for the remote PIT tag project in 2010 to provide for more equipment and the expertise to install it. This project has, to date, received broad support from the fish cooperators (primarily FWS, AZGFD, GCMRC, and BOR) because of its potential to reduce personnel costs in the future to get the same, or even more, data on the tagged fish (primarily HBC) that use the LCR.
  - e. General comment on accounting. Currently, BOR does not have adequate staff resources to track reports due by GCMRC from the workplan. Thus, there is inadequate tracking of deliverables by the AMP for projects funded by BOR funds. BOR should investigate options to provide staff resources in tracking reports.
  - f. Goal 8: GCMRC should develop an on-the-shelf HFE science plan for a potential next HFE.
  - g. TWG understands that GCMRC will attempt to provide historical expenditures by project (going back 3 years) in the workplan.
  - h. Goal 2 (line 67): AMWG should be aware that the implementation of the warm-water non-native control plan efforts in 2011 may have budget implications (moving from the testing phase to non-native control implementation).
  - i. Goal 2: GCMRC should investigate research into determining the natal origins of trout in the LCR reach of the mainstem. This investigation should consider the feasibility of whether to specifically target juvenile fish that are not currently being tagged.
  - j. Budget general. GCMRC should disclose the total "burden" for each budget line item, the amount of carry-over for each budget line item, and that a crosswalk be provided from the 2009 budget to the 2010 and 2011 budget so that changes in the budget/workplan for each item can be understood.

Budget Motion, Paragraph 1:

**MOTION:** AMWG gives the following direction to the TWG as it continues to work with BOR and GCMRC to develop a proposed budget, workplan, and hydrograph for FY 2010-11 for consideration by AMWG at its next meeting:

- 1. Continue to develop a budget based on an annual operations hydrograph for FY 10 and 11 water years of MLFF with fall steady flows in September and October.**

Voting Results: Yes = 16    No = 1    Abstain = 2  
Motion Passed.

Budget Motion, Paragraph 2:

**MOTION:** AMWG gives the following direction to the TWG as it continues to work with BOR and GCMRC to develop a proposed budget, workplan, and hydrograph for FY 2010-11 for consideration by AMWG at its next meeting:

**2. Move funding for “Mainstem Non-native Mechanical Removal” back to line 74 under the GCMRC budget and add funding for an additional removal trip, if TWG deems it necessary.**

Voting Results: Yes = 11      No = 5      Abstain = 4

Motion Passed.

*Note: For the April 2009 AMWG meeting, the following stakeholders had no voting member present: Arizona Game and Fish Department, Navajo Nation, Pueblo of Zuni, and San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe.*