

From: <jeffrey_lovich@usgs.gov>

To: <dkubly@uc.usbr.gov>, <jwhipple@ose.state.nm.us>, <jshiel@state.wy.us>, <ken_mcmullen@nps.gov>, <bpersons@gf.state.az.us>, <matt.kaplinski@nau.edu>, <farvana@commspeed.net>, <barger@wapa.gov>, <plehr@crc.nv.gov>, <randy.seaholm@state.co.us>, <robertking@utah.gov>, <force@grandcanyontrust.org>, <csharris@crb.ca.gov>, <chris_kincaid@nps.gov>, <az86515@yahoo.com>, <glen_knowles@fws.gov>, <j.damp@starband.net>, <michael.yeatts@nau.edu>, <dostler@uc.usbr.gov>, <amp.bdavis@ecoplanaz.com>, <cuszhman@yahoo.com>, <steffentlyrod@lycos.com>, <lgreiner1@mindspring.com>, <bwerner@adwr.state.az.us>, <Norm_Henderson@nps.gov>, <tmelis@usgs.gov>, <hfairley@usgs.gov>, <bralston@usgs.gov>, <mjliszew@usgs.gov>, <cfritz@usgs.gov>, <denny_fenn@usgs.gov>, <jkite@usgs.gov>, <cbeard@usgs.gov>, <rick.johnson@npgcable.com>

Date: Tue, Feb 15, 2005 11:33 AM

Subject: For distribution to the TWG

This week we are sending out a revised draft FY06 budget and workplan for the AMWG meeting. I want to take this opportunity to brief you, in advance of the meeting, on the major changes. On the basis of detailed budget meetings with BuRec and the GCMRC's budget analyst related to FY2004 project accounts and 1st quarter actuals in FY 2005, I have advised my program staff to implement several key revisions to the package we submitted earlier as follows:

- 1) Propose implementation of a system-wide, multi-spectral, orthorectified, digital overflight mission in late May 2005: not in FY06 as originally suggested.
- 2) Continue implementation of experimental Mechanical Removal treatment in FY 2006, as the fourth year of this treatment, as recommended by the GCMRC in its 2002 Experimental Flow plan.
- 3) Complete all field activities in 2005, that were proposed as research & monitoring elements (including studies related to the aeolian transport processes and cultural preservation sites) tied to the Fine-Grained Sediment storage change project (FY01-05, with EHF), using experimental funds approved in the FY 2004-05 budgets.

The proposed changes were not considered as viable alternatives at the time of the February 2-3, 2005, Technical Work Group meeting. A clearer perspective on available funding allowed us to make these recommended changes to the budget and workplan. Because this information was not available prior to the TWG meeting, various contingencies for the FY 2006 plan were not openly presented for discussion with members.

I believe that the above changes can be implemented within the fiscal constraints of the FY 2005-06 budgets and that the proposed changes better meet the desires and information needs of the Adaptive Management Program, with respect to priorities related to core monitoring, completion of experimental research and humpback chub initiatives requested by the Adaptive Management Work Group.