

Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Work Group
FINAL Meeting Minutes

Conducting: Michael Gabaldon, Secretary's Designee
Facilitator: Mary Orton

August 13, 2003
Convened: 9:30 AM

Committee Members:

Joe Alston, NPS
Perri Benemelis, ADWR
Brenda Drye, So. Paiute Consortium
Amy Heuslein, BIA
Loretta Jackson, Hualapai Tribe
Leslie James, CREDA
Arden Kucate, Pueblo of Zuni

Phillip Lehr, Colo. River Comm./NV
Clayton Palmer, WAPA
Andre Potochnik, GCRG
Ted Rampton, UAMPS
Nikolai Ramsey, Grand Canyon Trust
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office
Bruce Taubert, AGFD

Committee Members Absent:

D. Larry Anderson, UDWR
Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
John R. D'Antonio, NM SEO
Rick Gold, USBR
Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers
Rod Kuharich, CWCB

Leigh Kuwaniwsiwma, Hopi Tribe
Mark Steffen, Federation of Fly Fishers
State Supervisor, USFWS
Gerald Zimmerman, CRB/CA

Alternates Present:

Randall Peterson
D. Randolph Seaholm
Michael Yeatts
Sam Spiller
Jeff English
Marklyn Chee
Max Oeschlaeger
John Whipple

For:

Rick Gold, USBR
Rod Kuharich, CWCB
Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Hopi Tribe
State Supervisor, USFWS
Mark Steffen, Federation of Fly Fishers
Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers
John R. D'Antonio, NM State Eng. Ofc.

Interested Persons:

Jan Balsom, NPS/GRCA
Mary Barger, WAPA
Gary Burton, WAPA
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Tribe
Nancy Coulam, USBR
Jeffrey Cross, NPS/GRCA
Jonathan Damp, Pueblo of Zuni
Bill Davis, CREDA
Kurt Dongoske, TWG Chair/CREDA
Helen Fairley, USGS/GCMRC
Denny Fenn, USGS/GCMRC
Dave Garrett, M3Research
Steve Gloss, USGS/GCMRC
Lloyd Greiner, UAMPS
David Haskell
Norm Henderson, NPS
Glen Knowles, USFWS

Dennis Kubly, USBR
Mike Liszewski, USGS/GCMRC
Jeff Lovich, USGS/GCMRC
Robert Lynch, Attorney
Ted Melis, USGS/GCMRC
Don Metz, USFWS
Jim Odenkirk, AGFD
Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company
Bill Persons, AGFD
Ken Rice, USBR (Glen Canyon Dam)
Tom Ryan, USBR
Pam Sponholtz, USFWS
Larry Stevens, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
Chris Updike, NAU
Randy VanHaverbeke, USFWS
Linda Whetton, USBR
John Weisheit, Living Rivers

Recorder: Linda Whetton, USBR

Welcome and Introductions: Michael Gabaldon introduced himself as the Secretary's Designee and Chairman of the AMWG. He welcomed the members, alternates, and visitors to the meeting.

Roll Call: The members introduced themselves and identified whether they were a member or alternate. A quorum was established and attendance sheets (***Attachment 1***) were distributed.

Review of Action Items from May 28-29, 2003 Meeting.

All items were completed.

Review of May 28-29, 2003 Meeting Minutes.

Pending a few minor edits, and without objection, the minutes were approved.

Legislative Updates:

Energy Policy Act. Randy said there has been little progress on the Energy Policy Act for the past year and a half. The House passed H.R. 6 about six months ago which attempts to address the nation's energy issues. The Senate took that topic up in discussion a few months ago. Bob Lynch said the Senate passed S14 just before adjournment, by substituting bill language passed by the Senate last year which didn't contain the same language for assessment of maximization of hydropower that the House Bill did. The conference committee hasn't been named yet and won't be until after the recess. Randy said some controversial provisions have also been the electricity restructuring and development of electricity on tribal reservations.

AMWG Charter Revision. Randy reported that the Secretary's Office has made an amendment to the AMWG Charter and is in the process of formalizing it. He passed out a copy of an e-mail message (***Attachment 2***) which reflects the addition. The language addresses a conflict of interest provision of members who serve on Federal advisory committees. It will probably take several months before the charter is signed and Randy will provide copies when it is finalized. Reclamation will also need to discuss what the changes mean with the Department's Solicitor. Randy feels the new language could be read two ways: (1) members who vote on the budget proposals can't bid on the same proposals, and (2) if it's not a personal economic or financial interest but one that comes from just employment, current AMP budget processes might be acceptable. He will get a more specific interpretation of the language with respect to contract administration procedures and budget discussions conducted by the AMWG. One clear message that can be derived from the change is that the Federal regulatory guidelines for administering grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts are to be strictly followed and that the agency administering those agreements must not be pressured by FACA committee members.

Administrative Items:

New Personnel at GCMRC. Mike introduced Jeff Lovich with the GCMRC. Jeff said he looking forward to working with the AMWG and TWG. He then introduced Helen Fairley as the new cultural resources program manager at the GCMRC.

Grand Canyon Wildlands Council Representation. Larry Stevens said the Grand Canyon Wildlands Council has been in business since 1998 and is based in Flagstaff. Their mission is to provide information to land managing agencies to help improve land management in northern Arizona and southern Utah. Larry will be serving as the TWG representative. Pam Hyde will continue as the AMWG member.

Max Oeschlaeger said he is the Council Chair for the Community Cultural Environment Program at NAU and presently acting director of the Museum of Northern Arizona. He is a member of a variety of NGO's, mostly those concerned with the scientific research related to the management of public lands. He has been asked by Pam Hyde to be her AMWG alternate.

Federal Procurement Process. Bruce Taubert said that during the AMWG Conference Call held on August 8, he requested that someone from Reclamation present information on the Federal procurement process, RFPs, etc. at today's meeting. Given the short time frame, he didn't know if it could be done but he does have an assistant attorney general who would like to be present for that discussion. Mike said that issue would be part of the budget discussion scheduled for later in the day and advised Bruce his guest could attend at that time.

GCMRC Experimental Flows Update. Steve Gloss said GCMRC would provide a preliminary update on the status of resources and results of the first six months of the experimental flows and mechanical removal and non-native fish control framework. He said there was an expectation that the AMWG would receive an update twice a year during the two-year experiment and that would be the purpose for his PowerPoint presentation (**Attachment 3**).

Bruce asked who did the stranding work and Steve said it was done by EcoPlan Associates (**Attachment 4**). Steve said their plan to not continue to do that work in 2004 was based upon budget concerns and that there was relatively little stranding demonstrated. In the 1980s there were hundreds of fish that died and there was great concern. GCMRC felt it was necessary to demonstrate whether stranding was an issue and that it obviously happens, but it is not significant in terms of numbers and not a big factor.

Jeff English said he has been a fishing guide at Lees Ferry for the last 13 years. When the 5,000-20,000 cfs flow regime was initiated, the fish did not do their normal spawning in December and January. The fish found the flows so difficult to spawn in that they basically put spawning on hold. He feels it is important that people understand that rainbow trout were determined to try and exist but found the fluctuating flows too offensive to their process of spawning. This is the first year he has seen spawning occur so late. When that water stopped rising and falling, within 3 or 4 days, the traditional spawning areas in the Lees Ferry reach received the populations of spawning fish normally seen in December, January, and February. He thinks that when a flow is instituted and the fish are unable to spawn, they will just put spawning on hold. A lot of the fish went into deeper waters and sought spawning opportunities there.

GCMRC Fine Sediment Resources Update on Status of Sand Inputs vs. Export and Sand Storage Changes. Ted Melis said he gave a presentation approximately two years ago on the state of the sediment resources below Glen Canyon Dam and the message at that time was that there was only about 10% of the original annual sand supply inputs available below the Dam and that the flows, even after implementation of ROD operations, were actually exporting that 10% remaining supply at faster rates that they would have predicted or hoped for. No sand was being stored in the system despite having had average inputs from the Paria River for about 10-11 years. He then proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation (**Attachment 5**).

Randy Peterson said there has been some anxiousness about conducting a high flow test because it is the mechanism by which the sandbars can be exported. In the past it didn't make sense to do a high flow test unless it was timed with an input. He asked if that was still Ted's opinion or whether a high flow test should be done now even without the input. Ted said the sediment scientists still advocate that the best thing to be tested right now is a high flow in a fall season following inputs, meaning a high flow that follows the inputs within a month or two months, October-November, without trying to readjust the volumes in months like June, July and August. Ted said the sediment scientists have been pretty clear that continuing to repeat the implementation of the 1996 flow without sediment inputs just increases the export of sand.

Proposed Modification to Non-Native Mechanical Removal. Steve said GCMRC made a proposal to modify the mechanical removal non-native fish control project. There was a conference call held on August 8 related to the proposed modification and the consensus from those AMWG members participating on the call was to let the proposed modification expansion of the non-native fish control area go forward for the August and September 2003 river trips and that there would be more discussion at today's meeting for plans in 2004 and beyond. He referenced the material sent out in preparation for the conference call (**Attachment 6a**) as well as the reports prepared by Mike Yard and Lew Coggins (**Attachments 6b and 6c**).

Clayton complimented the GCMRC on doing the first year of experimentation and evaluating their results but said it was unfortunate they had to go through the compliance hoops. He feels that further experimentation recommended by the AMWG could have some flexibility so that modifications could be discussed with the AMWG and be implemented without going through unnecessary procedural hoops. Bruce said the compliance and permitting wasn't timely. They were done but put real stress on the agencies involved. He said if compliance had been done in a timely manner, they could've allowed some latitude. Clayton said that in the future some latitude should be built in so that there is time for review and that GCMRC and the AMWG may have the flexibility to adjust as the design is implemented. Dennis said he would like to know if there is any difference of opinion among the AMWG in constructing future proposals more broadly so that they have the flexibility to do that. One of the public participants on the conference call made that same comment. The AMWG should be led by the science. He felt it would be important to know if the AMWG supports that concept. Dennis said that it is the intent of the Federal action agencies to write future action proposals more broadly to provide flexibility as recommended by the AMWG.

Captive Breeding for HBC. Steve said there has been considerable interest in understanding the feasibility of developing a captive breeding population for the endangered humpback chub and the feasibility of augmenting the population in the Grand Canyon in other ways. GCMRC commissioned a feasibility report (**Attachment 6d**) by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in December 2002. Steve said the report is going through an external review and the final will be available in January 2004. Randy VanHaverbeke was the lead author along with Rob Simmonds on the report. Randy VanHaverbeke requested additional concerns or comments on the report be provided to him (e-mail: randy_vanhaverbeke@fws.gov). Steve gave a PowerPoint presentation on the "Humpback Chub Captive Breeding/Refugia Feasibility Report" (**Attachment 7**).

Bruce said he would like more information on what the timeframe triggers might be in relation to using a TCD. Steve said they didn't ask the Service to provide that information in their report but felt they would probably be willing to include some comments in their final report. Bruce said that if the TCD is scheduled for completion in 2007, there needs to be a certain amount of lead time and data needed in order to start a hatchery. His concern is that if a decision is made that 2007 is a TCD start date, then certain things have to be done – secure a facility, capture fish, raise fish, resolve disease concerns, etc.

John Shields asked what was the “bottom-line” of the 70-page report. He’s not sure if the question has been answered as to whether humpback chub population augmentation is feasible or not in the minds of the authors. Steve said that with respect to translocation of fish from the LCR into other tributaries in Grand Canyon, the report says the work can proceed as soon as the management agencies are ready. John asked what the optimum size recommended by the authors in terms of guidance to the AMP. Steve said he thought the report identified an optimal size of 150-200 mm. Steve said it is feasible but questioned if the AMP wants to commit to doing it. There is concern about survival of the fish as they may be compromised by the hatchery experience when they are released back into the wild. John said he doesn’t feel the report gives the AMWG a recommendation as to what they should be doing. While it contained a very thorough analysis of all of the aspects (more expensive to raise them to a larger size, notice of behaviors that would be created), he’s not sure it adds a whole lot in terms of synthesizing the existing knowledge. Steve encouraged John to send his written comments to the authors. Bruce added that if the fish are needed in 2007-2009, then action needs to be taken soon with money directed toward the work.

Press Release. Jeff English said he would like to see a little more language included in the press release so the public doesn’t confuse the trout killing effort with the Lees Ferry Reach. He feels stronger language is needed to indicate that Lees Ferry is being protected. He would also like to see a statement that addresses the number of trout in the Grand Canyon. Throughout the last year, the trout fishery was attacked because it was falsely reported that there were a million fish were being killed in the Grand Canyon. He feels providing accurate information to the public would create a win-win situation for everyone. Dennis advised that any changes to the press release would have to be agreed to by the full AMWG and asked that Jeff and he discuss proposed changes.

Science Advisors’ TCD Risk Assessment – Based on a request from the AMWG that the science advisors do a risk assessment of the Temperature Control Device, the science advisors were engaged by November 2002. They had an information gathering meeting in March and a subsequent meeting in which they brought in other experts. They also convened on two other occasions. Their report (***Attachment 8a***) was included in the pre-meeting packet. Dave Garrett presented a PowerPoint presentation entitled, “Guiding Mission for TCD Implementation, Enhance Habitat for Native Fish Chub” (***Attachment 8b***). Questions and comments were captured on flip charts (***Attachment 8c***). Dave concluded by saying that that the advisors believe the AMWG should move forward with putting a TCD on Glen Canyon Dam.

Dennis asked the Reclamation engineers to look at a more flexible external frame design to maintain appropriate temperatures regardless of reservoir elevation. The NEPA evaluation of the TCD has been waiting for the risk assessment requested by AMWG and can now move forward. One concept being considered is the construction of a 2-pinstock pilot project to test the concept of warming the releases.

MOTION: Recommend to the Secretary of the Interior to direct the Bureau of Reclamation to expeditiously complete the NEPA process for implementation of the TCD.

Motion seconded.

Discussion.

Public Comments: None

Voting Results: Yes = 21 No = 0 Abstained = 0

Motion passed.

Ad Hoc Committee for What’s In and Out of the AMP (AHCIO) Report – Randy Seaholm said the AHCIO was formed in April 2002 with the specific charge: “The AMWG form an ad hoc

committee to make a recommendation to the AMWG regarding criteria for MOs and INs determined inappropriate for the AMP and report back to the AMWG at its July 2002 meeting.” The AHCIO has been working on that with Mary Orton facilitating those discussions. He asked Mary to present the AHCIO Report (**Attachment 9a**). Mary reported that in January 2003, the AMWG charged the AHCIO with applying the criteria for whether an IN was in or out of the program. The two criteria approved were: (1) an information need would be out if it contributed nothing to the vision and mission, or (2) if it described how an agency should develop information needed for the AMP instead of describing information that the AMP needed. Mary said the AMWG also approved three categories of funding for the INs and directed the AHCIO to apply to each IN and those were:

Category A = Information needs that are appropriate for funding by power revenues and for accomplishment by GCMRC,

Category B = It could be addressed by GCMRC but not with power revenues, and

Category C = Power revenues should not be used and GCMRC should not accomplish that particular information need.

She reminded the AMWG of what has been completed on the Strategic Plan (**Attachment 9b**)

In January 2003, the AMWG approved the criteria and the categories and told the AHCIO to apply them to the INs as they are now written. They also received a recommendation from the TWG that they had amended quite a few of the INs and had put them in sequence order. Instead of approving the INs and their sequence order, in January the AMWG agreed to wait until the AHCIO had finished its work before approving the INs. The INs have not been forwarded to the Secretary. Mary went through the AHCIO report and pointed out the substantive changes. Comments were captured on flip charts (**Attachment 9c**).

MOTION: Accept recommendation and report of the AHCIO as a working document, change wording from ‘exploration of new techniques may not result in an RFP’ to ‘exploration of new techniques and methods might not result in an RFP,’ in Goal 12, and assign Category C to RIN 2.6.1.

Motion seconded.

Discussion.

Voting Results: Yes = 18 No = 1 Abstained = 1

Motion passed.

Nikolai Ramsey (voting no): I’m just concerned about making a bright-line distinction. Why do we even have to decide what is appropriate and not appropriate for power revenues? We make those calls all the time. We don’t do it logically or philosophically. We do it practically.

Andre Potochnik (abstaining): I’m basically in agreement with the suggested language but it became a little bit more fuzzy as we discussed. I think it is workable the way it is. I’m not particularly in favor of it but I’m not going to fall on my sword over it.

Humpback Chub Ad Hoc Group Comprehensive Plan – Sam Spiller distributed the latest version of the HBC AHG Comprehensive Plan (**Attachment 10a**). The direction to the HBC AHG was to consider actions to implement a comprehensive research and management program for the humpback chub and to make a recommendation to the AMWG. He provided copies of the funding recommendations (**Attachment 10b**). He listed some of the problems that came up:

- Potential need for establishing a recovery program and funding issues
- The need to raise fish (received letter from Hualapai Tribe stating their support)
- Question about RIPSWG (Recovery Implementation Program Scientific Work Group). Sam said his regional director, Dale Hall, convened small group and empowered them to develop a recovery document for endangered native fish in the Lower Basin and provide it to him. Mr. Hall has not finished reviewing the report. Sam said he heard some

concerns about the intent of FWS working with the AMWG and the Lower Colorado River MSCP. After review by Dale Hall, it will probably be released for more participation.

- Regarding population estimates, Sam quoted from a letter from Tom Czaplak: "The Service still considers a reliable estimate as one that is based on a multiple mark recapture model. Closed population, multiple mark recapture estimators are recommended for deriving population point estimates to guide development of sampling designs that conform to these models. The accuracy and precision in each point estimate will be assessed by the Service in cooperation with the respective recovery or conservation program in consultation with investigators conducting the point estimates and qualified statisticians and population ecologists. Monitoring must be designed to determine if the demographic criteria in the recovery goals are being met. "

Dennis asked Sam to portray the position of the HBC AHG and the TWG with regard to the evaluation of population estimates. Steve clarified that the HBC AHG, in a conference call meeting around April 2003, concurred in a recommendation to ask the AMWG science advisors to undertake an independent review of the methodologies being employed in the Upper Basin Recovery Implementation Program and the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program to estimate demographic characteristics, population numbers, etc., for humpback chub. The idea was that the science advisors would probably convene an independent panel comprised of outside experts with no prior experience in the basin so they would be free to invite testimony and information from a number of scientists and/or other individuals. The HBC AHG and TWG concurred with that strategy and to have a report completed and submitted to the AMWG by January 2004.

Nikolai asked if the HBC projects had been totally scoped out and if the budget implications had been resolved. He said that the Grand Canyon Trust has retained Williams and Jennings in Washington, DC to do some lobbying to benefit resources in the Grand Canyon and to try and get funds for sediment augmentation and experimental actions through the USGS budget.

Having received the HBC AHG Final Report, it was decided the next step would be for the AMWG to look at how the projects and associated costs could be integrated into the FY 2004 budget during the budget discussion later in the day.

Budget Presentation. Bruce said that in the late 1980s and early 1990s they were told that any work to be accomplished would need to go through the Federal procurement process. Arizona Game and Fish Department was told that because there could be a conflict of interest between the process of developing RFPs, study plans, etc., and bidding on any RFPs. In January 2000 Barry Gold talked about the roles and function of the GCMRC and how they utilize RFPs. In looking at the current budget Bruce said it appears that GCMRC has a very large part of the budget they are accomplishing with in-house staff and that during the last 3-4 years many of the tasks that GCMRC has conducted have not gone out under the Federal procurement process. There seems to be a lack of process on their part for determining who does it. A lot of the budget is tied up in personnel and services that the GCMRC is providing. From the AGFD's perspective, they feel the process is not open enough and doesn't meet the tenet of the process that has been in place for the past 12-15 years. He feels the AMWG needs to understand the process and include everyone is working under the same rules, procedures, and vision. It's a budgetary issue because if GCMRC could do mechanical removal of trout in Grand Canyon at a cost of \$500,000 while AFGD could hire a consultant to do the same work for \$365,000 then there would be a savings of \$135,000 to the program. The issue was remanded for further discussion during the budget presentation scheduled for tomorrow.

Adjourned: 5 p.m.

Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Work Group
FINAL Meeting Minutes

Conducting: Michael Gabaldon, Secretary's Designee
Facilitator: Mary Orton

August 14, 2003
Convened: 8:00 AM

Committee Members:

Joe Alston, NPS
Perri Benemelis, ADWR
Brenda Drye, So. Paiute Consortium
Amy Heuslein, BIA
Loretta Jackson, Hualapai Tribe
Leslie James, CREDA
Arden Kucate, Pueblo of Zuni

Phillip Lehr, Colo. River Comm./NV
Clayton Palmer, WAPA
Andre Potochnik, GCRG
Ted Rampton, UAMPS
Nikolai Ramsey, Grand Canyon Trust
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office
Bruce Taubert, AGFD

Committee Members Absent:

D. Larry Anderson, UDWR
Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
John R. D'Antonio, NM SEO
Rick Gold, USBR
Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers

Rod Kuharich, CWCB
Leigh Kuwaniwsiwma, Hopi Tribe
State Supervisor, USFWS
Mark Steffen, Federation of Fly Fishers
Gerald Zimmerman, CRB/CA

Alternates Present:

Randall Peterson
D. Randolph Seaholm
Michael Yeatts
Sam Spiller
Jeff English
Marklyn Chee
Max Oeschlaeger
John Whipple
Christopher Harris
Randall Peterson

For:

Rick Gold, USBR
Rod Kuharich, CWCB
Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Hopi Tribe
State Supervisor, USFWS
Mark Steffen, Federation of Fly Fishers
Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers
John R. D'Antonio, NM State Eng. Ofc.
Gerald Zimmerman, CRB/CA
Rick Gold, USBR

Interested Persons:

Jan Balsom, NPS/GRCA
Darryl Beckmann, USBR
Mary Barger, WAPA
Gary Burton, WAPA
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Tribe
Nancy Coulam, USBR
Jeffrey Cross, NPS/GRCA
Jonathan Damp, Pueblo of Zuni
Bill Davis, CREDA
Kurt Dongoske, TWG Chair/CREDA
Helen Fairley, USGS/GCMRC
Denny Fenn, USGS/GCMRC
Dave Garrett, M3Research
Steve Gloss, USGS/GCMRC
Lloyd Greiner, UAMPS
David Haskell
Norm Henderson, NPS
Glen Knowles, USFWS

Dennis Kubly, USBR
Mike Liszewski, USGS/GCMRC
Jeff Lovich, USGS/GCMRC
Robert Lynch, Attorney
Ted Melis, USGS/GCMRC
Don Metz, USFWS
Jim Odenkirk, AGFD
Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company
Bill Persons, AGFD
Ken Rice, USBR (Glen Canyon Dam)
Tom Ryan, USBR
Dean Saugee, Hualapai Tribe
Pam Sponholtz, USFWS
Larry Stevens, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
Chris Updike, NAU
Randy VanHaverbeke, USFWS
John Weisheit, Living Rivers

Welcome and Introductions: Michael Gabaldon introduced himself as the Secretary's Designee and Chairman of the AMWG. He welcomed the members, alternates, and visitors to the meeting.

Roll Call: The members introduced themselves. A quorum was established and attendance sheets were distributed.

FY2004 Budget Discussion – Randy Peterson said they have spent almost two years working on the FY 2004 budget due to confounding influences, tasks, or additional funding needs. The financial needs of the experimental flows made it very difficult to come to terms with what they would recommend as part of their ordinary monitoring and research activities. Even as the experimental flows were approved in December 2002 and initiated in January 2003, the funding sources were still a little bit uncertain because they depended upon appropriations. Last spring, they worked on the Humpback Chub strategy that the AMWG directed the ad hoc group to pursue, which also required more funding to balance between the various component parts. And about the same time, the USGS implemented a new overhead rate for funds transferred to their agency. These three things have made it very difficult to come to a final decision on what funds can be spent and on the 2004 budget.

Randy said a plan would be presented to the AMWG which represents the best thinking of the experimental flow effort, the Humpback Chub AHG, the Technical Work Group Budget Ad Hoc Group, and the Technical Work Group. All four groups have been through the budget review process and the document represents their approval. The overall strategy is to complete the current experiment fully funded, implement the HBC strategy, work on the next step in terms of experimentation, and recognize there will be reductions to other parts of the program. They applied a 15% reduction in all of the administrative costs, the cultural monitoring and research costs, the PA administrative costs. Also included were large reductions in the typical GCMRC monitoring and research activities to the tune of over \$1 million and finally elimination of other activities conducted by GCMRC such as TWG/AMWG requests, and unsolicited proposals.

He presented a budget strategy summary (**Attachment 11a**) and the FY 2004 budget table (**Attachment 11b**) and said Denny would go through it line item by line item.

Randy noted that thus far the \$167,000 contributions from NPS and FWS have not occurred in FY 2003. Denny has worked with the Washington staff but there is no guarantee, so there is the potential that the program is a third of a million dollars short in appropriations. There is a little bit of ambiguity and uncertainty. He feels the AMWG can move forward with the budget today with the option of making some revisions if FY04 appropriated funds are different than we have portrayed. There is no question that the program is at a transition point. Significant dollars have been dedicated to monitoring and research and the budget is going to have to shift to management actions to address resource concerns. He said there are no additional dollars coming into the program so if AMWG members propose an addition, then a reduction has to be made in another area to make up for the cut.

Denny discussed Line 178, USGS appropriations. He said the reason it is \$1.1 million is because Director Chip Groat committed \$1 million to the AMWG two or three years ago plus \$95,000 for the USGS' share for tribal participation in the AMP. He said the House appropriations bill has been passed contains that funding. It's part of a \$3 million DOI science support increase that the President requested for the USGS. The Senate subcommittee has reported out to the full committee who then reported back to the full Senate that that money not be approved and they rejected the President's request so it is not currently in the Senate version. Unless someone proposes an amendment on the Senate floor that changes that, the Senate is likely to pass a budget sometime in the next two or three weeks which will not contain money to support that activity. At that point it would have to go to the conference committee

and then the conference committee of the House and Senate would resolve the issue. Denny said that even if the bill is not passed, Director Groat has told him that he intends to take the money off the top of the USGS' \$989 million appropriations and put it in the AMP to fulfill his commitment to the AMWG.

Denny distributed a supplement (**Attachment 11c**) to the budget and proceeded to go through the line items. Comments and proposed reductions and additions were captured on flip charts (**Attachment 11d**).

The following additions and subtractions were discussed:

Page/Line	+ (added)	- (subtracted)
(PA) P2, Line 3&4	(A) 34,000	
P3, APE Study	(B) 25,000	
P5, Line 5		(C) 34,000
P5, L 19		(D) 40,000
P2, Exp Flow, L 14,15		(E) 159,000
P2, Exp Flow, L 10		(F) 50,000
P3, D5, Outreach (for tribes and Govt. agencies – not PR firm)	(G) 15,000	
P5, HBC, L2 Genetics Develop plan before implementation	(H) 425,000 40,000	
P5, L8, Sed Aug	(I) 460,000 135,000	

Proposed Consensus Recommendation: Recommend to the Secretary of the Interior to direct FWS to fund P5, Line 19 (Genetics Management Plan). If it is funded outside the AMP, this line will be cut.

Revised Consensus Recommendation: Recommend to the Secretary of the Interior to direct FWS to fund P5, Line 19.

Voting Results: Unanimous consensus

The AMWG reviewed each of the proposed budget modifications, voting on whether or not to modify that budget line:

Voting Results:

Item A:	Yes = 11	No = 5	Abstained = 6	Passes
Item B:	Yes = 13	No = 5	Abstained = 4	Passes
Item C:	Yes = 5	No = 8	Abstained = 9	Fails
Item D:	Yes = 16	No = 7	Abstained = 0	Passes
Item E:	Yes = 16	No = 5	Abstained = 2	Passes
Item F:	Yes = 19	No = 3	Abstained = 0	Passes
Item G:	Yes = 20	No = 0	Abstained = 2	Passes
Item H:	Yes = 16	No = 5	Abstained = 1	Passes
Item I:	Yes = 7	No = 12	Abstained = 1	Fails

MOTION: Recommend to the Secretary approval of the 2004 budget with the changes made by the majority be adopted. Those changes are:

- Adding \$34,000 (Page 2, under Programmatic Agreement, lines 3&4)
- Adding \$25,000 for an APE Study under Programmatic Agreement
- Adding \$15,000 to outreach effort
- Adding \$40,000 for a refugium plan

- **Subtracting \$40,000 for a genetics management plan (responsibility of FWS)**
- **Subtracting \$159,000 (Page 2, Exp. Flows, Lines 14 & 15)**
- **Subtracting \$50,000 (Page 2, Exp. Flows, Line 10)**

Motion seconded.

Discussion. Clayton said he would like to add a comment or footnote added on page 6 stating that "WAPA's contribution to experimental flows through purchased power is estimated at \$2.5 million."

Voting Results: Yes = 23 No = 0 Abstained = 0

Yes = 23

No = 0

Abstained = 0

Motion passed.

The changes were included in the revised budget table (**Attachment 11e**).

Mike said he had some concerns about the budget process. He has heard a lot of criticism on how the budget was reviewed and he wondered if the AMWG wanted to take a few minutes to talk about how it could be handled better. He said the TWG was sanctioned to review it and asked if that needed to be done away with and have just the AMWG look at it. Bruce said they tried to have the AMWG deal with it once but that effort failed. There was a feeling that the AMWG members didn't want to get involved to that level of minutia. Therefore, they went with the TWG Budget Ad Hoc Group to review. He suggested there be more opportunity to discuss the specifics of their recommendations rather than just three hours. He thought a six-hour meeting or AMWG retreat would be better. He also felt a retreat would facilitate having a better understanding of Native American issues and perhaps include some presentations by the Native American stakeholders as well.

Comments on Budget Process

- Six-hour meeting on budget → retreat?
- Either TWG should address budget, or not at all
- SAB examine best processes
- \$135,000 left on table. Not really, \$167,000 more than available show in budget table
- Income is uncertain – how much authority do we give GCMRC and agencies?
- First time for consensus on budget

Federal Procurement Process. Bruce suggested that he, Mike, GCMRC, and whoever else wants to discuss the process should stay after the meeting for a few minutes to discuss.

Basin Hydrology. Tom Ryan said copies of the basin hydrology graphs (**Attachment 12**) were available and he would also have them posted to the AMP website next week.

Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Group Report. Mary Orton said the SPAGH's recommendations on the Tribal Consultation Plan (**Attachment 13**) were included in the pre-meeting packet.

Update on Multi-Attribute Trade-off Analysis (MATA) Workshop. Dennis said the workshop has been postponed and will probably be convened in November. He will send an e-mail message requesting availability.

NEXT MEETING:

(Wed) January 7, 2004 9:30 – 5 p.m.

(Thu) January 8, 2004 8:00 – 2 p.m.

LOCATION:

Bureau of Indian Affairs
2 Arizona Center
400 N. 5th Street
12th Floor, Conference Rooms A&B
Phoenix, Arizona

Adjourned: 12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Linda Whetton

Linda Whetton
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

General Key to Adaptive Management Program Acronyms

ADWR – Arizona Dept. of Water Resources	MO – Management Objective
AF – Acre Feet	MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
AGFD – Arizona Game and Fish Department	NAAO – Native American Affairs Office
AGU – American Geophysical Union	NAU – Northern Arizona University (Flagstaff, AZ)
AMP – Adaptive Management Program	NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
AMWG – Adaptive Management Work Group	NGS – National Geodetic Survey
AOP – Annual Operating Plan	NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act
BA – Biological Assessment	NPS - National Park Service
BE – Biological Evaluation	NRC - National Research Council
BHBF – Beach/Habitat-Building Flow	NWS - National Weather Service
BHMF – Beach/Habitat Maintenance Flow	O&M - Operations & Maintenance (USBR funding)
BHTF – Beach/Habitat Test Flow	PA - Programmatic Agreement
BIA – Bureau of Indian Affairs	PEP - Protocol Evaluation Panel
BO – Biological Opinion	Powerplant Capacity - 31,000 cfs
BOR – Bureau of Reclamation	Reclamation - United States Bureau of Reclamation
CAPA – Central Arizona Project Assn.	RBT – Rainbow Trout
cfs – cubic feet per second	RFP - Request For Proposals
CRBC – Colorado River Board of California	RPA - Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
CRCN – Colorado River Commission of Nevada	SAB - Science Advisory Board
CREDA – Colorado River Energy Distributors Assn.	Secretary(=s) - Secretary of the Interior
CRSP – Colorado River Storage Project	SWCA - Steven W. Carothers Associates
CWCB – Colorado Water Conservation Board	TCD - Temperature Control Device (for Glen Canyon Dam water releases)
DBMS – Data Base Management System	TCP - Traditional Cultural Property
DOI – Department of the Interior	TES - Threatened and Endangered Species
EA – Environmental Assessment	TWG - Glen Canyon Technical Work Group (a subcommittee of the AMWG)
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement	UCR - Upper Colorado Region (of the USBR)
ESA – Endangered Species Act	UCRC - Upper Colorado River Commission
FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act	UDWR - Utah Division of Water Resources
FEIS – Final Environmental Impact Statement	USBR - United States Bureau of Reclamation
FRN – Federal Register Notice	USFWS - United States Fish & Wildlife Service
FWS – United States Fish & Wildlife Service	USGS - United States Geological Survey
GCD – Glen Canyon Dam	WAPA - Western Area Power Administration
GCMRC – Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center	WY – Water Year (a calendar year)
GCNP – Grand Canyon National Park	
GCNRA – Glen Canyon National Recreation Area	
GCPA – Grand Canyon Protection Act	
GUI – Graphical User Interface	
HBC – Humpback Chub (endangered native fish)	
HMF – Habitat Maintenance Flow	
HPP – Historic Preservation Plan	
IEDA- Irrigation and Electrical Districts Association of Arizona	
IN – Information Need	
IT – Information Technology (GCMRC program)	
KAS – Kanab ambersnail (endangered native snail)	
LCR – Little Colorado River	
LRRMCP – Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program	
MAF – Million Acre Feet	
MA – Management Action	