

Rationale for Revisions to 2004 Budget Proposal – Dec. 2, 2002

The TWG is being asked to recommend to the AMWG the entire 2004 line item budget, including power revenues and appropriations requests.

Holocene mapping – The budget ad hoc group, programmatic agreement group, and GCMRC support elimination of this project both in 2003 and 2004.

Captive breeding program evaluation is being accelerated to 2003 instead of 2004 and the 2004 costs of \$50,000 will now be shown in 2003 budget. We believe FWS should be tasked with evaluating conservation biology concerns, grow-out of young fish strategy, and physical facilities availability as part of that evaluation. The \$50,000 cost that was shown in the 2004 budget was zeroed out and those funds moved to the 2004 line item of experimental flows. We suggest keeping open the potential for the use of a refugium rather than captive breeding augmentation of existing population as the outcome of this evaluation. At the TWG meeting November 7, 2002, Don Metz (FWS) reported that the Albuquerque FWS office is agreeable to requesting appropriations for 2005 to implement the results of this evaluation.

Control Network and Channel Mapping – This project is ongoing and GCMRC concluded some reduction could be accommodated in 2004 to facilitate the experimental flow effort.

AMWG/TWG Unsolicited Proposals and Tribal Outreach Effort – In 2004, unsolicited proposals are expected to be minimal if the experimental flow proposal is implemented. GCMRC requested some amount of funding remain in this line item for emergency use.

The Tribal outreach effort was reduced as a result of GCMRC's offer to the tribes to be involved in experimental flow monitoring and research work.

Appropriations Requests – The request for USGS appropriations to support the GCDAMP is an action the AMWG has recommended for the last several years. The purpose of this recommendation has been both to augment existing monitoring and research activities and to support experimental flow activities. In the past we have identified specific line items that would benefit from any of these requested appropriations.

As explained in the cover memo, the current thinking of both GCMRC and the budget ad hoc group is that funding the science plan of the experimental flow proposal is of a higher priority than any of the research items identified in the July 2002 budget proposal. Those items are shown in Table 1, and include Kanab ambersnail taxonomy, captive breeding program, fine grained sediment storage and transport, LCR integrated studies, library operations, and the decision support system. Of the \$2.16 million in appropriations requested for 2004 in Table 2, \$475,000 is identified for tribal participation and consultation and the remaining \$1.685 million is targeted for experimental flow

monitoring and research, in line with the higher priority of the experimental flow science plan. All this is working within the “bottom line budget” of \$11.014 million recommended by the AMWG at their July 2002 meeting. **We recommend that the TWG recommend to the AMWG the line item details shown in Table 2, the “Revised 2004 Budget recommended by TWG Budget Ad Hoc Group (November 2002)”.**

If the decision is made to not carry out the proposed experimental flows outlined in the recently released Environmental Assessment, then the use of any USGS appropriations in 2004 changes dramatically. In that case, it probably makes sense to reconvene a discussion at the TWG level to address the most pressing research needs, weighing the importance of the research activities shown in Table 1 with the need to fund future experimental flows. Regardless of the budget situation, it does make sense to recognize that some degree of flexibility is needed in enacting the AMP budget, to respond to both changing resource conditions and to uncertain budget conditions. Adjustments to each year’s budget is carried out in a real-time manner, keeping an eye on the list of most important activities as defined by our many discussions, planning efforts, and research sequencing. We intend on doing a better job of keeping the TWG informed prior to budget recommendation decisions, and as always, appreciate your involvement in the AMP.

Table 1 - Original AMWG 2004 Budget (July 2002)

TABLE 2.2. FY-2004 Funding Sources

SUMMARY BY PROJECT	AMP Power Revenues	Other Funding	Appropriations Request
I. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION			
<u>A. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP</u>			
1. Personnel Costs	178,000		
2. AMWG Member Travel Reimbursement	13,000		
3. Reclamation Travel	18,000		
4. Facilitation Contract	25,000		
5. Other	9,000		
<u>B. TECHNICAL WORK GROUP</u>			
1. Personnel Costs	81,000		
2. TWG Member Travel Reimbursement	15,000		
3. Reclamation Travel	17,000		
4. TWG Chair Reimbursement	25,000		
5. Other	2,000		
<u>C. COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTS</u>	26,000		
<u>D. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION</u>	25,000		
II. TRIBAL CONSULTATION			
<u>A. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH TRIBES</u>			
1. Hopi Tribe			80,000
2. Hualapai Tribe			80,000
3. Navajo Nation			80,000
4. Pueblo of Zuni			80,000
5. Southern Paiute			80,000
<u>B. RIVER TRIP LOGISTICS COSTS TO GCMRC</u>			
1. Hopi Tribe			15,000
2. Hualapai Tribe			15,000
3. Navajo Nation			15,000
4. Pueblo of Zuni			15,000
5. Southern Paiute			15,000
III. PROGRAMMATIC AGMT. FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<u>A. WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Completion of HPP	50,000		
2. Reclamation Administration	50,000		
3. Treatment & Monitoring Preparation Plan & Implementation	400,000		
IV. EXPERIMENTAL FLOW FUND	500,000		1,000,000
ADMINISTRATIVE SUBTOTAL	1,434,000		1,475,000
I. SCIENCE PROJECTS			
<u>A. TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Terrestrial Ecosystem Monitoring	624,490		
2. Kanab Ambersnail Monitoring	86,100		
3. New Research in Terrestrial Ecosystems	69,250		
4. Mapping Holocene Deposits	112,850		
5. Cultural Data Base Plan	24,850		
6. Kanab Ambersnail Taxonomy	25,850		100,000
<u>B. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Aquatic Foodbase - External	179,600		
2. Aquatic Foodbase - In House	91,250		
3. Status and Trends of Downstream Fish	856,210		
4. Status and Trends of the Lee's Ferry Trout Fishery	161,660		

5. Integrated Water Quality Monitoring – Downstream	199,900		
6. Integrated Water Quality Monitoring - Lake Powell		309,000	
7. Native & Non-Native Fish Species	77,200		
8. Captive Breeding Program	50,000		100,000
<u>C. INTEGRATED ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Fine-Grained Sediment Storage	461,730		15,000
2. Streamflow and Fine-Sediment Transport	609,420		95,000
3. Coarse-Grained Sediment Inputs	145,275		
4. Sediment Transport Modeling	256,375		
5. Control Network	86,640		
6. Channel Mapping	125,900		
7. LCR Integrated Studies			200,000
<u>D. OTHER SCIENCE ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Unsolicited Proposals	78,880		
Adopt-a-Beach	10,000		
2. AMWG/TWG Requests	64,155		
3. In-House Research	22,000		
4. Tribal Outreach	34,850		
5. Public Outreach Involvement Plan Implementation	14,850		
6. Cultural Resource Synthesis & Status Report	10,850		
7. Oral Traditions	54,850		
II. ADMINISTRATIVE & TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES			
<u>E. ADMINISTRATIVE & MANAGEMENT</u>			
1. Administrative Operations	818,600		
2. Program Planning & Management	302,870		
3. AMWG/TWG Participation	55,390		
4. Independent Reviews	170,465		
<u>F. TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES</u>			
1. Geographic Information Systems	146,500		
2. Data Base Management	100,300		
3. Library Operations	75,800		25,000
4. Survey Operations	130,260		
5. Decision Support System			150,000
6. Systems Administration	261,450		
7. Aerial Photography (previously in Remote Sensing)	514,380		
8. Logistics (Distributed to Projects)			
GCMRC SUBTOTAL	7,111,000	309,000	685,000
TOTAL	8,545,000	309,000	2,160,000
TOTAL OF ALL SOURCES			11,014,000

Table 2 - Revised 2004 Budget recommended by Budget Ad Hoc Group (Nov 2002)

TABLE 2.2. FY-2004 Funding Sources

SUMMARY BY PROJECT	AMP Power Revenues	Other Funding	Appropriations Request
I. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION			
<u>A. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP</u>			
1. Personnel Costs	178,000		
2. AMWG Member Travel Reimbursement	13,000		
3. Reclamation Travel	18,000		
4. Facilitation Contract	25,000		
5. Other	9,000		
<u>B. TECHNICAL WORK GROUP</u>			
1. Personnel Costs	81,000		
2. TWG Member Travel Reimbursement	15,000		
3. Reclamation Travel	17,000		
4. TWG Chair Reimbursement	25,000		
5. Other	2,000		
<u>C. COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTS</u>	26,000		
<u>D. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION</u>	25,000		
II. TRIBAL CONSULTATION			
<u>A. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH TRIBES</u>			
1. Hopi Tribe			80,000
2. Hualapai Tribe			80,000
3. Navajo Nation			80,000
4. Pueblo of Zuni			80,000
5. Southern Paiute			80,000
<u>B. RIVER TRIP LOGISTICS COSTS TO GCMRC</u>			
1. Hopi Tribe			15,000
2. Hualapai Tribe			15,000
3. Navajo Nation			15,000
4. Pueblo of Zuni			15,000
5. Southern Paiute			15,000
III. PROGRAMMATIC AGMT. FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<u>A. WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Completion of HPP	50,000		
2. Reclamation Administration	50,000		
3. Treatment & Monitoring Preparation Plan & Implementation	400,000		
IV. EXPERIMENTAL FLOW FUND	790,155		1,685,000
ADMINISTRATIVE SUBTOTAL	1,724,155		2,160,000
I. SCIENCE PROJECTS			
<u>A. TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Terrestrial Ecosystem Monitoring	624,490		
2. Kanab Ambersnail Monitoring	86,100		
3. New Research in Terrestrial Ecosystems	69,250		
4. Mapping Holocene Deposits	0		
5. Cultural Data Base Plan	24,850		
6. Kanab Ambersnail Taxonomy	25,850		
<u>B. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Aquatic Foodbase - External	179,600		
2. Aquatic Foodbase - In House	91,250		
3. Status and Trends of Downstream Fish	856,210		
4. Status and Trends of the Lee's Ferry Trout Fishery	161,660		
5. Integrated Water Quality Monitoring – Downstream	199,900		
6. Integrated Water Quality Monitoring - Lake Powell		309,000	
7. Native & Non-Native Fish Species	77,200		

8. Captive Breeding Program	0		
C. INTEGRATED ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES			
1. Fine-Grained Sediment Storage	461,730		
2. Streamflow and Fine-Sediment Transport	609,420		
3. Coarse-Grained Sediment Inputs	145,275		
4. Sediment Transport Modeling	256,375		
5. Control Network	76,720		
6. Channel Mapping	76,400		
7. LCR Integrated Studies			
D. OTHER SCIENCE ACTIVITIES			
1. Unsolicited Proposals	60,000		
Adopt-a-Beach	10,000		
2. AMWG/TWG Requests	30,000		
3. In-House Research	22,000		
4. Tribal Outreach	20,000		
5. Public Outreach Involvement Plan Implementation	14,850		
6. Cultural Resource Synthesis & Status Report	10,850		
7. Oral Traditions	54,850		
II. ADMINISTRATIVE & TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES			
E. ADMINISTRATIVE & MANAGEMENT			
1. Administrative Operations	818,600		
2. Program Planning & Management	302,870		
3. AMWG/TWG Participation	55,390		
4. Independent Reviews	170,465		
F. TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES			
1. Geographic Information Systems	146,500		
2. Data Base Management	100,300		
3. Library Operations	75,800		
4. Survey Operations	130,260		
5. Decision Support System			
6. Systems Administration	261,450		
7. Aerial Photography (previously in Remote Sensing)	514,380		
8. Logistics (Distributed to Projects)			
GCMRC SUBTOTAL	6,820,845	309,000	0
TOTAL	8,545,000	309,000	2,160,000
TOTAL OF ALL SOURCES			11,014,000

Table 3 - Proposed Differences between Original AMWG 2004 Budget (July 2002) and November 2002 TWG meeting Presentation

TABLE 2.2. FY-2004 Funding Sources

SUMMARY BY PROJECT	AMP Power Revenues	Other Funding	Appropriations Request
I. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION			
<u>A. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP</u>			
1. Personnel Costs			
2. AMWG Member Travel Reimbursement			
3. Reclamation Travel			
4. Facilitation Contract			
5. Other			
<u>B. TECHNICAL WORK GROUP</u>			
1. Personnel Costs			
2. TWG Member Travel Reimbursement			
3. Reclamation Travel			
4. TWG Chair Reimbursement			
5. Other			
<u>C. COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTS</u>			
<u>D. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION</u>			
II. TRIBAL CONSULTATION			
<u>A. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH TRIBES</u>			
1. Hopi Tribe			
2. Hualapai Tribe			
3. Navajo Nation			
4. Pueblo of Zuni			
5. Southern Paiute			
<u>B. RIVER TRIP LOGISTICS COSTS TO GCMRC</u>			
1. Hopi Tribe			
2. Hualapai Tribe			
3. Navajo Nation			
4. Pueblo of Zuni			
5. Southern Paiute			
III. PROGRAMMATIC AGMT. FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<u>A. WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Completion of HPP			
2. Reclamation Administration			
3. Treatment & Monitoring Preparation Plan & Implementation			
IV. EXPERIMENTAL FLOW FUND	+290,155		+685,000
ADMINISTRATIVE SUBTOTAL	+290,155		+685,000
I. SCIENCE PROJECTS			
<u>A. TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Terrestrial Ecosystem Monitoring			
2. Kanab Ambersnail Monitoring			
3. New Research in Terrestrial Ecosystems			
4. Mapping Holocene Deposits	-112,850		
5. Cultural Data Base Plan			
6. Kanab Ambersnail Taxonomy			-100,000
<u>B. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>			
1. Aquatic Foodbase - External			
2. Aquatic Foodbase - In House			
3. Status and Trends of Downstream Fish			
4. Status and Trends of the Lee's Ferry Trout Fishery			
5. Integrated Water Quality Monitoring – Downstream			
6. Integrated Water Quality Monitoring - Lake Powell			
7. Native & Non-Native Fish Species			

8. Captive Breeding Program	-50,000	-100,000
<u>C. INTEGRATED ECOSYSTEM ACTIVITIES</u>		
1. Fine-Grained Sediment Storage		-15,000
2. Streamflow and Fine-Sediment Transport		-95,000
3. Coarse-Grained Sediment Inputs		
4. Sediment Transport Modeling		
5. Control Network	-9,920	
6. Channel Mapping	-49,500	
7. LCR Integrated Studies		-200,000
<u>D. OTHER SCIENCE ACTIVITIES</u>		
1. Unsolicited Proposals	-18,880	
Adopt-a-Beach		
2. AMWG/TWG Requests	-34,155	
3. In-House Research		
4. Tribal Outreach	-14,850	
5. Public Outreach Involvement Plan Implementation		
6. Cultural Resource Synthesis & Status Report		
7. Oral Traditions		
II. ADMINISTRATIVE & TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES		
<u>E. ADMINISTRATIVE & MANAGEMENT</u>		
1. Administrative Operations		
2. Program Planning & Management		
3. AMWG/TWG Participation		
4. Independent Reviews		
<u>F. TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES</u>		
1. Geographic Information Systems		
2. Data Base Management		
3. Library Operations		-25,000
4. Survey Operations		
5. Decision Support System		-150,000
6. Systems Administration		
7. Aerial Photography (previously in Remote Sensing)		
8. Logistics (Distributed to Projects)		
GCMRC SUBTOTAL	-290,155	-685,000
TOTAL	0	0
TOTAL OF ALL SOURCES		0

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

General Comments and Recommendations

Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
Pg. 67, B3 Status & Trends of Downstream Fish	Questioned continued \$100K increase after 2003.	<p>possible.</p> <p>Action: Steve will look into this and report back to the Budget AHG.</p> <p>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 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</p>
Pg. 79, B6 – IWQP Lake Powell	Why no reduction for Lake Powell Monitoring since GCMRC staff time was moved into downstream water quality.	<p>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.</p> <p>*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.</p>
Pg. 82, B8 Captive Breeding Program	In light of AMWG motion, need to reprogram some FY02 money.	<p>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</p>

General Comments and Recommendations

Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
		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 common practice with other USGS regional offices?	Action: All USGS Cost Centers pay for regional administrative support. These costs are normally paid 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	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

General Comments and Recommendations

Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
	done through remote sensing?	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 view3s 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 SCORE Report.	This is correct.
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	Comment noted and continue to attempt to establish

General Comments and Recommendations

Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
	about this proposal.	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

General Comments and Recommendations

Reference (section; pg. #, etc.)	TWG Comments/Proposed Revisions	GCMRC Recommendation (for GCMRC use)
		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 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