

GCMRC FY 2004 MONITORING AND RESEARCH WORK PLAN
Comments and Proposed Revisions from Technical Work Group
on the first draft of the 2004 Work Plan dated April 26, 2002
Comments in red added following 10/22/02 Budget Ad Hoc Conference Call

General Comments and Recommendations		
Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
Budget Ad Hoc Group Meeting May 15, 2002		
Pg. 1, Introduction – Geographic and Institutional Scope	“100,000 cfs” needs to be changed. Substitute with verbatim language from the Strategic Plan.	Action: Text revised as recommended, see pages 1 and 3.
Pg. 33, Chapter 2 – Scientific Activities – Cultural Resource Monitoring	Where is the cultural monitoring shown? Is not shown in GCMRC budget but is shown under PA Program	At present, cultural monitoring is being conducted by the NPS and the funds are part of Reclamation’s budget. Cultural Projects in GCMRC budget are shown as part of Terrestrial Monitoring or Integrated Ecosystem Activities. In future work plans Cultural projects will be identified as an explicit part of the Scientific Activities in the Narrative.
Pg. 46, A1 – Terrestrial Logistical Costs	Questioned the increase from FY02-FY03	Action: Steve will check into this and report back to the Budget AHG. This apparent increase in logistics costs is mostly the result of GCMRC shifting to full cost accounting for project activities in FY03. Logistics costs previously budgeted separately were included as project costs beginning in FY03. In addition some increase in the actual logistical costs are reflected due to increased trip length owing in part to these being non-motorized trips as part of GCMRC/NPS agreement to reduce motor use when possible.
Pg. 67, B3 Status & Trends of Downstream Fish	Questioned continued \$100K increase after 2003.	Action: Steve will look into this and report back to the Budget AHG. Not sure this is the correct page number. However there is actually a decrease in the total cost of downstream fish monitoring from FY03 to FY04. A portion of this work has been proposed for appropriated funds in FY02 & 03 and those funds have come from reprogrammed or carry

General Comments and Recommendations		
Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
		over funds in those years. In FY04 all funds are requested from AMP funds due to the critical importance of this work in long term monitoring. There is also an increase in GCMRC staff costs from 03-04. Contract costs for this effort in FY02 were Arizona GFD-\$255,175; SWCA-\$161,284; USFWS-\$249,967
Pg. 79, B6 – IWQP Lake Powell	Why no reduction for Lake Powell Monitoring since GCMRC staff time was moved into downstream water quality.	Steve is not sure but he expects costs to go down but hasn't evaluated. Steve said he can't fully project until they get the Lake Powell modeling results. Amy Cutler (USBR-SLC) needs to extend modeling. Steve gave Amy a list of action items on 5/16/02. *Consider having Amy do a modeling presentation to the TWG. Until the IWQP database and current modeling effort are finished the project is budgeted at its current level.
Pg. 82, B8 Captive Breeding Program	In light of AMWG motion, need to reprogram some FY02 money.	Action: Steve has asked Kerry C. to get some information on Hualapai hatchery. A recent report regarding planning for hatchery and rearing facilities in the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fishes Program has been obtained and some preliminary discussion begun with AGFD regarding capacity in their hatchery system at Bubbling Springs. This project is being advanced to FY03 and will be eliminated from the FY04 workplan unless there is carryover activity. USFWS is preparing a proposal too outline conservation biology concerns w/captive breeding, grow out strategy for young fish from LCR, and physical facilities availability.
General Comment	Consider combining trips to collect information → improve efficiency.	Action: Recommendations under discussion with GCMRC Logistics Coordinator and program staff.
Pg. 137, D8 Experimental Flows	Need better explanation of proposed experimental flows.	Action: As recommended additional text and Table 2.4 added to plan.
Pg. 141, Admin & Procurement costs	Question about need for GCMRC to “purchase” USGS administrative support? Is this a	Action: All USGS Cost Centers pay for regional administrative support. These costs are normally paid

General Comments and Recommendations		
Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
	common practice with other USGS regional offices?	through an assessment. Because GCMRC funding is not subject to USGS assessment, Regional Administrative support is paid directly. Regional administrative support includes warranted contracting services and human resources. Note: GCMRC also paid for Regional Support when they were in the Bureau of Reclamation.
Pg. 160, F7 Aerial Photography	Is it offset somewhere else? If Lidar shown in 03 & 04, is it needed every year? Need for Vegetative Monitoring. Could it be done through remote sensing?	Action: Mike will check into required frequency & report back to the Budget AHG. (see attached table: Estimated periodicity of overflight data sets by project.) Mike is in the process of finalizing reports. Once the reports are done, he'll give to the Program Managers and they will determine their needs. In future work plans the budgets for the aerial photography/remote sensing will recognize in a footnote the cost to WAPA and Power Consumers of providing the necessary low flow conditions to facilitate these flights.
		Action: TWG needs to provide comments to Ted by May 30 so revisions can be made in time to meet mid-June mailing to AMWG.
TWG Comments on FY2004 Budget – May 17, 2002		
Pg. 36,	Table 2.3 – Cultural Affiliation Study, Summing Error -> rounding	Corrected
Pg. 57-59	Cultural data base plan, unclear if this will develop data management. Protocols.	Clarification made on pg. 58.
Pg. 129, D4	Whole concept is vague, re: tribal outreach, training -> unequal communication re: tribal views as opposed to western science	Additional detail added on pg. 130
	Cultural Resource synthesis and status report to be done in-house (GCMRC) → just part of GCMRC responsibility / funds are for workshops to help bring in new data for	This is correct.

General Comments and Recommendations		
Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
	SCORE Report.	
Pg. 135, D7	Cultural Affiliation Study is poorly conceived, tribes not involved in study design → should drop study.	Please see the revised project description on pg. 140.
	Tribes & GCMRC should meet soon to talk about this proposal.	Comment noted and continue to attempt to establish meeting schedule.
	50-60% of aquatic PEP recommendations already completed.	Comment noted.
B7	Project already complete.	GCMRC is uncertain what this comment is about and whether further response is necessary.
General Comment	INs should be identified in tables, cost to accomplish, time to complete.	GCMRC has resolved not to include INs with within Annual Plan documents until INs are finalized by TWG/AMWG. Only goals and MOs which have been approved by AMWG are included within project table.
General Comment	Need to figure out how to incorporate IN sequencing into work plan.	GCMRC has resolved not to include INs with within Annual Plan documents until INs are finalized by TWG/AMWG. Only goals and MOs which have been approved by AMWG are included within project table.
General Comment	Program needs to find financial flexibility to accomplish research requirements (reduce monitoring \$?).	Reduction of monitoring activities to support additional research is better addressed once INs have been finalized and sequencing completed.
C2	Need to reprogram \$ to install Paria warming system.	This additional monitoring element is tied directly to experimental flow research and is currently not supported under CORE monitoring. Reprogramming of existing funds to support this element to be considered upon successful completion and testing of early alert system.
	Experimental flows budget should be better defined (multi-year).	Action: Text has been revised within the plan and budget table has been added. Multi-year experimental activities are not yet clearly defined, but are expected to require minimum level of funding per year as shown in budget table. A footnote will be added in future descriptions of the experimental flows budget item to recognize that there is a cost or benefit to Power

General Comments and Recommendations		
Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
		Consumers and WAPA of these flows.
	Need some evaluation of mudsnail w/respect to food base sampling	Addition language regarding the New Zealand mudsnail has been added to the Aquatic Resources under Current Knowledge in Chapter 1 as well as in the project description for Project B.1.

June 17, 2002
 Revised 10/23/2002