

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
FC 1	Principle #6 - How is “operational flexibility” defined? Legal as well as physical constraints of the dam?	Glossary will include definition of Operational Flexibility to include both.
	Some current and target levels seem unbelievable: for example, MO 2 goes from 5 gm/m ² -> 5000 gm/m ²	The numbers have not been fully vetted and will be looked at more closely.
	MO 1 and MO 4, et al.: -> how can target levels be obtained from literature?	In some cases, they can’t – literature will give us guidelines. In these cases, it should read “IN,” and targets will be justified in terms of where we are headed. In other cases, the research has been completed; thus, we will obtain from literature.
	How do we address the broad issue of what is within and what is without AMP boundaries.	Issue Paper C addresses this issue. MOs are what are needed to achieve Goals. Some MOs and MAs may be within the AMP, others may not be. These will be distinguished at the MA level.
	Goal 2 - ensure “remove jeopardy doesn’t mean “recovery” (glossary)	Rick Gold - recovery would mean more \$ - shouldn’t just be power revenues. Goal does address viable populations. Recovery not possible in Grand Canyon. The ad hoc committee will address John Shields’ issue on whether ESA issues are part of the AMP. Issue Paper E will be further fleshed out.
FC 2	MO 15 - what does % mean for current level?	Refers to the % of total fish captured.
	Goal 3 - discuss what “as feasible” means.	The ad hoc committee will discuss moving the concept of “as feasible” to a MO. It will also consider defining “feasible” in both biological and financial terms.
	MO 17 is inconsistent with MO 13.	Issue Paper B addresses this issue. The emphasis is on trout above the Paria, and native fish in the entire reach with emphasis below Paria. Viable populations are not identified by species. Ad hoc committee will revise definition of “viable” and “native fish” in the glossary.
	differentiation of habitat needs of trout and native fish below Paria River	Trout are not addressed at all below the Paria. Native habitat is addressed.
	MO 17 clarify as minimums the target levels for growth rate, abundance, and	Ad hoc committee will address this.

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
	condition	
	How can target level be a “process” rather than specific objective? Not measurable.	Decision Process definition was discussed and clarified. (see handout)
FC 3	MO 21 - what is 329,000 m ³ @ 35 sites) what are we measuring?	Standard study sites from a particular study. The data may not be sufficient, but it is what we have available.
	Goal 6 – The proposed change is from “Increase fine sediment storage” to “Maintain or attain levels of sediment...” Maintain at what levels? Is this an Information Need?	The Ad Hoc Committee will consider adding back in the word “storage.”
	“Information need” could be set as a general description (philosophic) that would lead to specific numbers	will be considered for the next iteration
	Has KAS genetic research been completed?	No. It’s not complete but most folks are confident it’s a unique taxon. The Ad hoc will continue to use KAS until research is complete.
	KAS expert panel should cause revision of levels	Yes.
	How do IN’s tie into experimental flows?	Now it’s at MO 50 – need to address impacts on recreational users
FC 4	Does the phrase “within the framework of GCDAMP ecosystem goals” in a goal imply a hierarchy?	In a sense, yes. Addresses balancing and ecosystem approach. Want to balance goals to achieve the purpose.
	MO 39: – “maintain or enhance wilderness” – which is it?	#39. Enhance means make a positive contribution to the resource, don’t let it degrade, even if the numbers don’t need to be maintained. “Attain or maintain” means we think we aren’t yet where we should be. Consider putting definitions in the Glossary.
	Goal 8 - why does it say “consistent with <u>riparian</u> ecosystem goals” when other goals say “consistent with GCDAMP ecosystem goals”?	Either way works. Riparian is more specific because it would be most relevant for SWW but could be changed.
	Goal 10 & MO 39 are inconsistent (managing as wilderness w/o motors)	The word wilderness does not mean “Wilderness Act” wilderness; rather, a wilderness experience.

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
		These are not mutually exclusive. It was not the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee to get involved in the motors discussion.
	Goal 11 - terms “power and energy” unclear (capacity and energy?)	Capacity and energy = power “capacity and energy generation” are target levels for both
	How does “river corridor” fit within the charge for the AMP? (scope issue)	Scope already established - overall and for each MO
FC 5	Goal 12: “Past” generations - how do we inspire and benefit them?	Addresses ancestral concerns of Native Americans
	“APE” definition should be in the glossary	Ad hoc committee will address
	How does MO 41 address protect of canyon resources?	Grand Canyon as a traditional cultural property. Our charge may be smaller Ad hoc committee will address.
	MO 46 - maintain <u>and</u> attain? (MO 47–49)	Multiple attributes in MO 46. Some are one, some another
	MO 46 - is N/A appropriate for “at some place”?	Yes, because we’re discussing data
	MO 46 - tribal view is being segregated, shouldn’t isolate	no change proposed but the values should be considered throughout
	MO 41 - preserve or treat	the committee will consider this
FC 6	MO 49 - target level is more than \$ figure - what does full tribal participation mean?	This may be more appropriate as a management action. Ad hoc committee will address (Bob Winfree). Keep 49 and rewrite funding participation (MO 53). Switch element and attribute?
	MO 50 - any idea of what information need might be?	Experiments and flows to test, in order to achieve the GCPA
	MO 50 - should include hydropower generation in comments column	Ad hoc committee will address. This may be expanded.
	MO 51 - “APE” instead of “CRE”?	Ad hoc committee will address. Contact Robert Begay for concerns
	MO 26 - 12 breeding pairs accurate?	Data represents a given point in time - AHC needs to address confidence intervals and which

	Flip Chart Comment	Action
		point in time we're going to choose. Geographic scope is also an issue -- are they LAME or CRE?
FC 7	Goal 2 - how do we remove jeopardy from razorback sucker if none exist in the Canyon?	Since we have a BO on razorback sucker, it's here and not in goal 3 (which addresses extirpated species). Address in issue papers. If consistency is not possible, then what?
	Goal 1 - what are the desired species?	AHC will address (justification of MOs)
	Keep MOs 52, 53, 54 as part of Goal 14	AHC will address. These are distinct activities (Randy Seaholm).
	MO 10 - does BO require 1 add'l population of HBC?	Yes? "spawning aggregation" - comments section
	be consistent with recovery goals of FWS Region 6	Issue Paper

Other notes from the AMWG meeting:

- Build in a feedback loop
- Will all objectives be measurable?
- Targets may change as we learn more.
- Current and target levels may be a range.