

AMWG Stakeholders' Priorities and Comments: FY11-12 Budget and Budget Process April 27, 2010

NOTE: Text in gray font is from the budget AIF. Text in black font is from stakeholders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Comments on New Budget Process	1
Priorities and Comments on TWG Issues of Concern.....	2
Priorities and Comments among Deferred and Unfunded Items	6
Additional Priorities for Discussion on the FY11-12 Budget.....	7
Comments on AMWG Priorities Established in 2004.....	8

INTRODUCTION

In advance of the AMWG webinar scheduled for May 6, 2010, AMWG members were asked to identify four items: (1) priorities among the 17 issues of concern that TWG had identified, (2) any proposed changes to the budget process, (3) other budget items they wanted to discuss, and (4) any motions they were proposing. Ten AMWG members responded. This document is a compilation of the responses received.

COMMENTS ON NEW BUDGET PROCESS

Jennifer Gimbel, State of Colorado: TWG provided a new budget cycle document for discussion. There is a section entitled "hydrograph development" (section 3.7, page 4) that Colorado would like discussed on the AMWG call. Colorado would like this entire section deleted, as it does not belong in a budget cycle description document. At the very least Colorado would like the last three sentences of this section to be deleted.

Nikolai Lash, GCT: Regarding Item 2c [*proposed changes to the budget process*], we recognize the merits of having a two-year budget cycle, but are concerned about reducing the flexibility needed to implement Adaptive Management. Planning ahead is necessary and good, but I think it would be useful to explicitly recognize the potential to adjust priorities based on resources responses.

Steve Martin, NPS: Proposed changes to the budget process:

- The budget spreadsheet and work plan should include all activities within or associated with the AMP.
- Hydrograph development section is inaccurate and needs to be rewritten.
- TWG members should be able to bring priority changes to the table for the second year.
- Tribal consultation commitment should be described and folded into the budget process

PRIORITIES AND COMMENTS ON TWG ISSUES OF CONCERN

The following items have to do with TWG's concerns that the current budget may not be adequate, and concerns about the use of set-aside funds to make up for shortfalls:

Sam Spiller, USFWS: How to fund management and/or actions that AMWG may not support or funds currently are not adequate to address.

Leslie James, CREDA: Research and Monitoring to Management Actions: Need to prioritize establishing the criteria, agency responsibility and funding mechanisms for transitioning research and monitoring to management actions. This issue permeates many of the ongoing budget categories, such as 4, 5, 7, 13, and 14 from the TWG list.

3. TWG is concerned about the continued use of the experimental fund for other purposes within the budget. Without setting aside the experimental fund, it may be difficult to carry out flow experiments in the future. Should there be an HFE in FY11 or FY12, having this small amount of money available for data gathering and analysis would mean no meaningful study. The default would be determining the effect of an HFE through the monitoring program alone. An HFE should be only be conducted to answer direct science questions. Therefore, a science plan should be developed and funding should be identified for this purpose. (10/3/3)

Ann Gold, Reclamation: Use of experimental fund for other purposes within the budget. If another high flow event or other issues arise that AMWG decides is important and isn't in the current plan, there will be no funds to accomplish them

Clayton Palmer, Western: TWG item #3: Experimental fund being used by GCMRC: The experimental fund is being "tapped" in the 2011/2012 budget. Western does not oppose the use of this fund for monitoring and research activities. However, we believe that potential future HFEs are experimental and should be analyzed as to their ability to achieve the stated environmental goals. Funds should be available – either through the experimental fund or through another funding source.

Dennis Strong, State of Utah: This is one of top five priority items to discuss during the webinar.

4. (line 24) TWG is concerned about the continued use of the warm water nonnative fish contingency fund for other purposes within the budget. (no objection)

Ann Gold, Reclamation: Continued use of warm water non-native fish contingency fund for other purposes. If it is necessary to take some immediate action to deal with warm water non-natives, there will not be money available to do so.

Steve Martin, NPS: This is one of top five budget priorities that warrant further discussion: (#3-4, line 24)

Sam Spiller, USFWS: One of top five priorities for discussion on the budget: Number 04. TWG is concerned about the continued use of the warm water nonnative fish ... fund for other purposes
....

5. (line 166) GCMRC has moved numerous projects out of the budget to an unfunded projects list. Many of these issues represent compliance requirements or other important projects that should be carried out

to further the goals of the GCDAMP. The AMWG should consider other mechanisms for acquiring funding for these projects, such as identified in the biennial budget process paper. (13/2/2)

Leslie James, CREDA: Line 166 (Unfunded Projects) – agree that a funding mechanism should be identified. This comment does not indicate support for everything on this list.

Clayton Palmer, Western: TWG item #5: The budget shortfall: significant unfunded projects; is the precursor to a discussion of the items below. Western would like to briefly take up the subject of budget development. This will likely overlap with the AMWG agenda item: BUDGET PROCESS. We'd be happy to have the "budget shortfall" discussed under this agenda topic.

16. TWG advises the AMWG that if a long-term experimental management plan EIS is undertaken in FY11 or 12 the amount of power revenues requested in the budget will increase. (no objection)

Ann Gold, Reclamation: Long-term experimental management plan EIS. BOR is looking at bringing some funding to the table for this EIS, but will not have enough to cover all expenses.

Clayton Palmer, Western: TWG item #16: LTEP EIS compliance in 2011 and 2012 appears to not be adequately funded.

The following items have to do with projects that have been deferred or not funded in the proposed budget:

2. (line 175) Humpback chub translocations above Chute Falls have been deferred by GCMRC. TWG believes this is an important compliance requirement, and a project that has shown great potential for positive effects on the LCR population and should be funded in FY11 and FY12. (no objection)

Leslie James, CREDA: Line 175 (HBC translocations) – should not be deferred.

Jennifer Gimbel, State of Colorado: HBC translocations (line 175, TWG item 2). This should not be deferred. This item is too important in terms of compliance. Several less important items should be reduced to accommodate this item. Some possible suggestions for reductions include the approximately \$1 million for water quality monitoring (line 86), the Kanab ambersnail monitoring, given recent reports that indicate that this species should be delisted or downlisted (line 77), or the monitoring of power generation and market values under current and future dam operations (line 98).

Ann Gold, Reclamation: 2. Humpback Chub translocations above Chute Falls. One of Reclamation's top five priorities to discuss.

Clayton Palmer, Western: TWG item #2: Chute Falls translocations: The representation by GCMRC and others of the science regarding Chute Falls translocation efforts indicates that this may be making a significant beneficial contribution to the Grand Canyon HBC population.

- Related to this topic is GCMRC's position that such things as conservation measures that stem from ESA consultation should not be funded as part of GCMRC's budget. This is a policy shift from previous years. Western would recommend differently.

Sam Spiller, USFWS: One of top five priorities for discussion on the budget: Number 02. Humpback chub translocations above Chute Falls have been deferred by GCMRC.

Dennis Strong, State of Utah: This is one of top five priority items to discuss during the webinar.

Stakeholders Budget Comments and Priorities, continued

9. (line 188) The FY11-12 budget/workplan should include \$89,568 to fund deferred project DASA 12.D9.10-11. This one-time study is needed to aid the AMP in quantifying a desired future condition for sediment resources. This work could be funded by reducing the DASA 12.D5.10 cooperative agreement by \$89,568 for one year or \$45,000 over two years. (11/3/2)

Steve Martin, NPS: This is one of top five budget priorities that warrant further discussion: (#9, line 188)

Dennis Strong, State of Utah: This is one of top five priority items to discuss during the webinar.

11. (line 168) Increased mainstem monitoring should be funded in FY 11 and 12. (no objection)

Mike Senn and Bill Stewart, AzGFD: There is on ongoing PEP analysis, which should be completed this summer. Results from this analysis should identify a need for additional monitoring. The proposed budget for this is ~\$240k for FY11 and ~\$240 for FY12. We are currently spending ~\$600-\$700k on mainstem monitoring. GCMRC hopes that if there is a need for increased mainstem monitoring, it can be accomplished by shifting work from the LCR to the mainstem. We believe that this issue should be revisited upon completion of the PEP analysis.

Sam Spiller, USFWS: One of top five priorities for discussion on the budget: Number 11. Increased mainstem fish monitoring should be funded in FY 11 and 12...

12. (line 186) Since this geomorphological modeling project assists in the identification of the impacts of dam operation vs. the impacts of natural effects, this project should be funded. (no objection)

The following items have to do with additional projects to be funded, or additional funding for projects in the draft budget:

1. Implement a new start in the work plan for power economics, which will be carried out by WAPA in FY 2011 and 2012, as described in the proposal provided by WAPA dated 3/15/10. WAPA will perform these tasks with no cost to the GCDAMP, and will provide the actual cost as a cooperator in the budget spreadsheet. The work will be part of the work plan and coordinated and reviewed by GCMRC. The workplan would be developed by GCRMC and WAPA in coordination with the TWG. This will result in costs to GCMRC that will need to be provided to oversee and provide peer review of this project. (10/3/3)

Leslie James, CREDA: Concur with the recommendation to have WAPA/GCMRC develop a workplan at no cost to the AMP. Also recommend freeing up the funds in line 98 [*Monitor Power Generation and Market Values under Current and Future Dam Operations (Ongoing)*, \$8900 proposed in FY11, \$11,456 proposed in FY12] for use in a higher priority item (such as continuing the ecosystem modeling work by Walters, et al.). This recommendation was also made at the most recent TWG meeting, and in previous budget discussions.

Clayton Palmer, Western: Power economic analysis: Western supports adding a line in the 2011/2012 budget for this item.

Steve Martin, NPS: This is one of top five budget priorities that warrant further discussion: (#1)

Dennis Strong, State of Utah: This is one of top five priority items to discuss during the webinar.

7. (line 115) Add funding in FY 2011 for DFC support (\$60,000), including facilitation and decision support. (no objection)

Sam Spiller, USFWS: One of top five priorities for discussion on the budget: Number 07. Add funding in FY 2011 for DFC (Desired Future Conditions) support (\$60,000), including facilitation and decision support.

8. (line 71) The FY11-12 budget/workplan should include \$25,000 to fund an Extirpated Species Workshop to achieve the following:

1. Finalize and prioritize species list.
2. Assess current compliance environment for various implementation strategies.
3. Develop a strategic framework for implement extirpated species goal within AMP.

This work could be funded by reducing the DASA 12.D5.10 cooperative agreement by \$25,000. (12/3/1)

Jennifer Gimbel, State of Colorado: The Extirpated Species Workshop (line 71, TWG item 8) is not a priority, and it does not relate to important compliance issues, and it should be deferred.

Steve Martin, NPS: This is one of top five budget priorities that warrant further discussion: (#8, line 71)

10. (line 160) Evaluation of rainbow and brown trout movement . . . this funding is inadequate for the purpose of studying and implementing possible alternatives to lethal fish removal. We suggest an increase to \$200,000 to \$300,000. Alternatively, we suggest a budget correction after tribal consultation and resulting actions [are] identified. (no objection)

Mike Senn and Bill Stewart, AzGFD: This being a new project we need to develop a scope of work, cost, and principle investigators. Once this is completed we will have a better understanding of whether or not additional funds are necessary. If additional funds are needed perhaps the \$150K from the GCMRC experimental fund that is earmarked for FY11 mechanical removal could be redirected.

Leslie James, CREDA: Line 160 – need to fully fund this project, particularly given information that was presented at the recent workshop.

Jennifer Gimbel, State of Colorado: Non-native fish movement (line 160, TWG item 10). Adequate funding for this item should be secured. In addition, if the tribal consultations move quickly, is there a chance that non-native fish/mechanical removal could move forward in the next budget year?

Ann Gold, Reclamation: 10. Evaluation of trout movement. One of Reclamation's top five priorities to discuss.

Clayton Palmer, Western: TWG item #10: Trout movement funding. Alternative trout control mechanisms are being discussed as a result of concern expressed by the tribal representatives and others. Investigations into alternative means of managing non-native fish in order to achieve HBC goals need to be given top priority and adequate funding. Based on information recently presented to the TWG (at the Saguaro Ranch workshop), experimentation on control strategies should be developed and related research should be funded.

Steve Martin, NPS: This is one of top five budget priorities that warrant further discussion: (#10, line 160)

Sam Spiller, USFWS: One of top five priorities for discussion on the budget: Number 10. Evaluation of rainbow and brown trout movement ... purpose of studying and implementing alternatives to lethal fish removal

Amy Heuslein, BIA: Line #160 New Evaluation of Trout Movement Natal Origins and Alternatives (one of six top priorities for discussion)

Dennis Strong, State of Utah: This is one of top five priority items to discuss during the webinar.

13. (lines 38-42) Recommend that DOI and DOE meet with the tribes to discuss including a CPI increase for tribal participation to those tribes that utilize their allocation, consultation, and tribal monitoring programs. Another tribal entity may participate in FY11 and additional funding may be necessary. (no objection)

The following issue could mean major changes the budget:

17. TWG recognizes that it does not have a formal process for evaluating and identifying a proposed hydrograph to the AMWG, intends to undertake that development in this budget cycle, and requests feedback from AMWG on how to proceed. (8/7/1)

Nikolai Lash, GCT: Regarding Item 2b [*top five priorities*], we have one priority we've identified and that is number 17 addressing the development of the 2011 hydrograph. (We are putting all five of our red stickers on this priority!)

Steve Martin, NPS: Discussion of process to develop hydrograph for FY11 – Item 17 - AMWG should provide clear direction to TWG for it to develop a hydrograph development process for 2011 and bring a 2011 recommendation to the AMWG for its August meeting. Following is a TWG budget item that was voted on and not passed that we believe need to be brought forward to the AMWG for further discussion and consideration.

GCT Motion #3. The TWG recommends to the AMWG that if sediment inputs exceed the current BHBF trigger before March 2011, then dam operations will immediately switch to equalized monthly volumes and steady flows (if this is not already the operating scenario), and a BHBF will be implemented in March 2011.

The following issues do not involve additional funding:

14. (line 29) Develop methodologies to integrate tribal perspectives into the treatment plan. (no objection)

Amy Heuslein, BIA: Line #29 Canyon Treatment Plan and Implementation (one of six top priorities for discussion)

15. The budget spreadsheet and workplan should include other projects being undertaken by cooperators using funds outside of the GCDAMP funding. (7/6/3)

The following issue was forwarded to AMWG for information, not for action:

6. Although GCMRC has designated projects in the spreadsheet as core monitoring (COR), TWG has only provisionally approved the sediment-related programs at this time and will be considering the other programs over the next few years. (no objection)

PRIORITIES AND COMMENTS AMONG DEFERRED AND UNFUNDED ITEMS

Jennifer Gimbel, State of Colorado: The expanded ecosystem modeling should not be deferred (line 187) as this work is directly related to compliance.

Lynn Hamilton, GCRG: GCRG requests the currently deferred item, on line 184, "Phase I -Results of Economic Value Workshop" be funded for \$117,273, in lieu of the Mechanical Removal trip that will not be funded. Phase I includes Hydropower Analyses and Economic Effects of Resource Use. The need for economic analysis capacity has been identified by the Science Advisors and by previous NAS/NRC reviews. The Protocol Evaluation Panel, as well as the final report of the socioeconomic workshop made this recommendation as well. This information is critical as a foundation for meaningful discussions about tradeoffs in managing the Glen Canyon Dam for the benefit of downstream resources, as required by the Grand Canyon Protection Act.

The answers from this process will be important for AMWG Priority Questions Priority 1 and 2, and critical to determining Priorities 3-5

Priority 1: *Why are the Humpback chub not thriving, and what can we do about it? How many Humpback chub are there and how are they doing?*

Priority 2: *Which cultural resources, including TCPs, are within the APE, which should we treat, and how do we best protect them? What are the status and trends of cultural resources and what are the agents of deterioration?*

Priority 3: *What is the best flow regime?*

Priority 4: *What is the impact of sediment loss and what should we do about it?*

Priority 5: *What will happen when we test or implement the TCD? How should it be operated? Are safeguards needed for management?*

Because of the lag in funding research and obtaining final answers, it is critical and urgent to fund this work in FY 11, so that results can be available as soon as possible. The requested amount of \$117,273 is less than 1½ percent of the program budget, and will give the program a strong return on this investment. To reiterate: these funds are available because of the cancellation of this year's mechanical removal trip.

Steve Martin, NPS: Following is a TWG budget item that was voted on and not passed that we believe need to be brought forward to the AMWG for further discussion and consideration:

(line 184) The FY11-12 budget/work plan should include \$117,273 to fund deferred project HYD 10.tbd, "Phase I – Results of Economic Value Workshop."

ADDITIONAL PRIORITIES FOR DISCUSSION ON THE FY11-12 BUDGET

Sam Spiller, USFWS:

2. Native Fishes: Nonnative Control Plan Science Support and NEW Evaluation of Trout Movement, Natal Origins and Alternatives for Controlling Rainbow Trout Populations Near the LCR
4. Rainbow Trout
2. Native Fishes: Mainstem & LCR Monitoring
3. Extirpated Species
6. Springs / Riparian

Clayton Palmer, Western: Please consider this addition (it's hard to overemphasize the interest generated by the scientific presentations at Saguaro Ranch as it relates to this topic)

Mainstem nonnative fish management: Mechanical removal is currently being considered by DOI/DOE and the tribes and between USBR and the F&WS under the ESA. Certainly, a

considered effort will be devoted to nonnative fish management in 2011 and 2012. Still, the funding allocated in the budget is for only one trip is proposed in 2011 and the project is deferred in 2012 completely.

The scientific information recently presented at Saguaro Ranch and to the TWG suggests that: (a) trout are increasing throughout the system and may be at numbers comparable to 2003 when removal was initiated, (b) a plausible hypothesis and some analysis suggest that most of the production of trout occurs in the Lees Ferry reach and then fish migrate down to the LCR reach, (c) immigration rates to the LCR reach are likely to be high and comparable or greater than those observed in the 2003-2005 removal effort, and (d) recent analyses suggest that humpback chub recovery may be sensitive to trout predation (brown and rainbow trout).

Thus, we suggest that the removal and/or management effort be of the same magnitude as what was done during the 2003-2006 program. We are interested in experimenting with other programs that could be initiated and expedited to control trout in the LCR reach as is described under issue #10 (e.g., interception fishery below Lees Ferry, population control in the Lees Ferry reach). The cost of the removal program was on the order of \$800,000 per year. Such a management effort would likely need to be carried out for an extended time period.

Steve Martin, NPS: Following is a TWG budget items that was voted on and not passed that we believe need to be brought forward to the AMWG for further discussion and consideration:

(line 66) The FY11-12 budget/work plan should initiate the development of a nonnative fish (NNF) control implementation plan that will include elements that will be scoped at the March 31, 2010 NNF workshop.

Nikolai Lash, GCT: Regarding Item 2a on the Task List [*additional priorities or motions*], we would like to see the sediment modeling begun by GCMRC finished (the mass balance modeling that was recently presented at the Saguaro Lake Modeling Workshop). I believe that GCMRC has suggested this will have no budget implications. I mention it here in case it does.

Amy Heuslein, BIA: The BIA's top priorities for the budget discussion on the May AMWG conference call/webinar are as follows (in addition to line 29 and line 142 noted above):

Line #37 Cooperative Agreements with the Tribes

Line #67 Non-native Control Plan Science Support

Line #101 Cultural Research and Development towards Core Monitoring Phase II (FY06 - FY12)

Line #140 Near Shore Ecology/Fall Steady Flows (FY08 - FY12)

COMMENTS ON AMWG PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED IN 2004

Leslie James, CREDA: Recommend that the 2004 “priorities” that were included in the AMWG request be revisited and revised to reflect more recent science information and management priorities. This effort could help inform not only the DFC work, but as well the future monitoring, research and budget priorities.

Jennifer Gimbel, State of Colorado: The 2004 identified AMWG priorities are no longer as relevant as they were then...These “top priorities” should be revisited or no longer recited every time we have a budget discussion.

Clayton Palmer, Western: Western believes that the questions distributed to the AMWG; questions that should guide our budget priority setting - are out of date. We certainly support the idea that a budget should be prepared that is consistent with strategic goals and overriding science questions. Western was involved in the preparation of these questions and - I guess - that's why it's easy to recognize that we have come a long way in our understanding and in our development of priorities. We suggest an AMWG review and revision of these strategic questions.

Steve Martin, NPS: Budget priorities need to be updated and adapted based on current science understanding and management needs.