

## Attachment 10

Ms. Orton said each item would be discussed but no decision would be made on any one item until the group had gone through all the proposed changes.

Western Area Power Administration's Proposal. Ms. Kyriss introduced Western's budget and said the money to fund their proposal would come from carryover funds.

1. Change the source for the additional \$20,000 for the Science Advisors (SAs) to FY2010 carryover. The money is to be used for improved decision-making processes in the GCDAMP.
  - This supports the TWG recommendation for an additional \$20,000 for the SAs, and changes the source from Administrative Support (publications) to carryover.
2. Move \$275,138 from line 156 (forego preparing a SCORE Report) in FY 11 and FY12 to the Experimental Flow Fund.
  - This proposal was considered and failed at the TWG. We support having substantial money in the experimental fund to support HFES.
3. Fund recommendations by the Socioeconomic TWG ad hoc, accepted by the TWG (\$55,000 in FY2011 and \$45,000 in FY2012):
  - Power economics base case and change case analyses, to begin in FY 2011 and complete change case in FY 2012.
  - "Economics 101" for TWG and AMWG (FY 2011)
  - Recreation expenditure study (FY 2012)

These will be paid for by eliminating the following:

- GCMRC angler recreation survey study (\$25,000 in 2011 and \$25,000 in 2012)
  - GCMRC review of GT Max model. (At the last AMWG meeting, Dave Garrett indicated that he could manage the peer review within the current SA budget. Then this study becomes irrelevant and can be eliminated, leaving \$30,000 in 2011 and \$20,000 in 2012.)
4. Include a budget line item for Power Economics studies to be completed by Western.
    - Cost of Base case analysis (FY 2011) \$106,950
    - Additional power economic studies may be identified and completed by Western in FY 2011 - 12

Fish and Wildlife Service Proposed Changes. Mr. Sam Spiller presented the following changes:

1. Remove #2 from the existing budget motion that reduces funding for aquatic food base.
2. Change #3 in the existing budget motion to read: "Move funding for the Nonnative Fish Suppression Fund for Fy11 to the Experimental Fund, and retain such funds until the Nonnative Fish Control EA process is completed and funds are needed. (line 43)"
3. Restore \$20,000 to the Science Advisors budget (line 169 in FY11 and FY12) from a source in GCMRC.
4. In place of the two proposed fall fish monitoring trips (line 90), FY11 only), conduct one spring electrofishing monitoring trip and one fall mainstem HBC aggregation monitoring trip, with the additional cost of \$27,000 to be taken from funding set aside in the Reclamation budget for nonnative fish control (line 43).
5. Implement editorial changes in the work plan from Attachment 1 (Hamill memo dated August 6, 2010) for BIO 2.M1.11-12 (LCR HBC monitoring), BIO 2.M3.11-12 (HBC translocations), and HYD 10.R2.11-12 (GTMax model).

Reclamation Proposal. Ms. Gold said Reclamation will be working very closely with the tribes on the Canyon Treatment Plan project. She introduced the following changes:

1. Increase administrative support for NPS permitting (line 38) to \$122,040 in FY11 and \$123,847 in FY12 from the items to be determined by Reclamation and GCMRC.

Hopi Tribe Proposal. Mike Yeatts introduced the following changes:

1. Increase Public Outreach Ad Hoc Group funding to \$56,184 in FY11 and \$57,870 in FY12 (line 28), increases of \$28,092 and \$28,935 to be funded from nonnative fish contingency fund.
2. Restore Cultural Resources compliance (line 48) to \$505,838, increase of \$300,000 to be funded from compliance (line 37).
3. Tribal funding (lines 62-66) is not adjusted by CPI.

WAPA. Ms. Kyriss said that GCMRC was in agreement to their change.

FWS. Mr. Spiller said he would ask GCMRC to speak to their recommendations. Mr. Hamill said they would review the budget later in the year after the CPI is known and after the budget is reconciled and take the money from some place. He thought they could find \$20K somewhere in their budget. He cautioned that if the CPI is around 1.2%, it means another \$100K from the budget. CPI could be around 1.2% which would take \$100K from the budget.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wasn't sure all the changes were consistent. He wanted to have an understanding of the relationship of the entire budget and how it would be impacted by the changes. Ms. Orton said the motion on the agenda along with the four changes from TWG represent a balanced budget. Mr. Capron said the end result of the TWG budget would unbalance it because of the reduction in the foodbase program of \$100K, but there would be a positive of about \$80K. He said the TWG felt that was a big problem if there couldn't be a way to spend it. Ms. Orton told Mr. Zimmerman that if he were to reject everything that's on the screen and then vote in favor of the motion (below) as it was given by TWG, then there would be a budget that was in the black by \$80K. She said that each one of the changes either keeps that balance or moves it to a completely balanced budget because each of the items indicate where the money would come from or designates someone to make a decision.

Proposed Motion. The following proposed motion is based on the recommendation from the TWG. However, no motion is presumed to be made unless and until an AMWG member makes the motion in accordance with the AMWG Operating Procedures.

The AMWG recommends that the Secretary of the Interior adopt the FY 2011-12 Draft Budget (tables provided by GCMRC dated June 28, 2010) and Work Plan (dated June 11, 2010) with the following changes:

1. Fund \$505,838 for the Treatment plan in FY11, unless Reclamation can maintain necessary compliance with \$205,838 in FY 11, as demonstrated to AMWG. (line 50)
2. Reduce funding for Aquatic Food Base monitoring by \$100,000 in FY11. (line 84)
3. Move funding for the Non-native Fish Suppression Fund for FY11 to the Experimental Fund until the Non-Native Fish Control EA process is completed and funds are necessary. (line 45)
4. Restore \$20,000 to the Science Advisors budget (line 171) in FY11 and FY12 from Administrative support (line 165).

Ms. Orton said that Ms. Castle asked that #1 not be part of the motion because it was an internal DOI issue that they are going to handle. However, Mike Yeatts put it back into the motion but identified a different source for getting the money.

Discussion:

- ❖ Restore \$20K to SAs budget. Ms. Orton asked if there was any discussion about changing the source for the \$20K to FY10 carryover. She said the FWS suggested changing it to a line item or a line item to be determined by GCMRC. No further discussion.
- ❖ SCORE Report Funding. Move \$275,138 from line 156 for preparing a SCORE Report in FY10-11 and move those funds to the Experimental Flow Fund. Ms. Kyriss said that Western believes the SCORE Report is important but also believe money is needed to support HFEs and need to have good science to get the benefits. Mr. Hamill said the money was also going to be used for a Knowledge Assessment in FY11 and a SCORE Report in FY12. He said the rationale for including in the budget is that the last SCORE report was done in 2005 and the MRP suggests that the report will be done on a 5-year basis. He also feels those documents will support assessment for an EIS.
- ❖ Power Economic Studies. Ms. Kyriss said the dollar amount would be shown in the budget but as an "in-kind credit." Mr. Lash said he thought the program would be better served by having the studies completed independently of Western. He didn't feel they were the people who should do the study.
- ❖ Reduce Aquatic Foodbase Funding. Mr. Spiller said the FWS feels the money needs to be restored and its very important to supporting adaptive management. Mr. Stevens said the project was funded and then GCMRC wanted to move \$100K more into the project and there wasn't clear justification for that. Mr. Hamill said the proposal was part of their high flow science plan to enhance foodbase monitoring to make it consistent with the level of monitoring that has been done in conjunction with the March 2008 high flow where they did monthly sampling in Lees Ferry and Diamond Creek. He said that level of sampling is necessary to protect the possible changes to the foodbase. He said this program has been one of the targets for cutting and they felt that given their discussions with Dr. Walters and the use of that information in evaluating the last HFE, that restoring this to a level where they could detect changes in foodbase was an appropriate change. Ms. McKenzie clarified that this item would not add an additional \$100K to the line item.
- ❖ Move Funding for NN Fish Suppression Fund to the Experimental Fund. The addition is "and retain such funds" until the NN EA is completed and funds are needed as opposed to necessary. Mr. Spiller said in proposing the changes FWS was trying to be responsive to needs for funding in the immediate future but at the same time they want to be responsive in the event of cold water non-native fish (trout) or warm water fish expand. He would like to see something that works for everyone, including tribal concerns. Mr. Jordan said it sounds like people are still feel on the compliance need is a determinant, and the need is not based on the status of native fish (HBC) but rather on the numbers of RBT. He sees that as a concern because the focus is on managing the numbers of trout rather than HBC. Mr. Shields asked Mr. Spiller how the funds would move out of the EFF absent the wording that he has in the amendment. Mr. Spiller said it was an attempt to maximize their response to the tribes' concerns about non-native control and not degrade the sacred quality of that area. Mr. Hamill said this was an attempt to hold this as a sub-account within the EFF for non-native fish control subject to a determination under the EA.
- ❖ Fish Monitoring Changes. In place of the two proposed fall fish monitoring trips (line 90, FY11 only), conduct one spring electrofishing monitoring trip and one fall mainstem HBC aggregation monitoring trip with the additional cost of \$27,000 to be taken from funding set aside in the Reclamation budget for non-native fish control. Mr. Jordan asked which of the two alternatives would provide the best measure of the HBC population. Mr. Hamill said that most of the actual estimates of the HBC population are based on sampling done in the LCR. This provides an index of native and non-native fish throughout the entire 250 mile reach of the river.
- ❖ Increase Admin Support for NPS Permit (line 38) \$122,244 in FY11 and \$123,847 in FY12 for line items to be determined by Reclamation and GCMRC. Mr. Hamill said that after talking with NPS personnel it was decided to leave it in at its full funding level in FY11 and FY12. Reclamation and GCMRC will look for ways to make up the difference partially with [Reclamation] appropriated dollars and AMP power revenues from GCMRC's budget. Mr. Martin clarified that it's not an increase to the budget but just restores what has previously been funded in that line item.
- ❖ Restore POAHG Budget to \$56,184 in FY11 and \$57,870 in FY12 (line 26), increases of \$28,092 and \$28,935, to be funded from nonnative fish contingency fund. Mr. Yeatts said this is an attempt to "restore" the budget from what GCMRC recommended. He said the funds will be used for continued maintenance of the products that have been done, work related to the two new EAs being developed and public outreach involved with those. Mr. Senn said outreach on the additional impacts from the two actions would be beneficial and AGFD would be supportive of restoring the funds. Mr. Martin

suggested the POAHG be rejuvenated with new representation and possibly a new charge. Mr. Spiller said he would like to have 15 minutes reserved for discussion on the POAHG work. He said the AMP needs to be responding to the Marble Canyon community and tribal needs. Ms. Orton reminded the group that an action item was established at the last AMWG meeting asking for the POAHG to have a workgroup session. Ms. Castle said she would like the POAHG to look at how to rejuvenate the process, and how to deal specifically with the HFE and the education and outreach that has been described. She asked that it be done by the next AMWG meeting. Mr. Knowles pointed out that in this motion and the earlier motion the plan was to draw from the non-native fish contingency fund which got moved to the EFF. Mr. Senn asked if it would be more appropriate to move the \$80K unallocated if GCMRC would be amenable as opposed to the non-native fish contingency fund. Mr. Hamill said they don't have \$80K unallocated. Ms. Orton said if the FWS proposal to restore \$100K to the aquatic foodbase monitoring fails, then there will be about \$80K to use.

- ❖ Restore Cultural Resources Compliance (line 48) to \$505,838, increase of \$300K to be funded from compliance (\$250K, line 37) and from experimental fund (\$50K, line 40). Mr. Yeatts pointed out that they don't know what all their compliance needs will be. Ms. Gold said they are having some issues with the contract and understand that they need to go back with the tribes very specifically on moving forward. She said it was their thought that they wouldn't need the entire amount mostly because it will take time as they move forward and if they go with a different contract. She felt the \$200K would suffice for what needs to be done next year. Ms. Castle stated consultation will be done with the SHPOs and THPOs. Since there is only \$250K in the line item, Ms. Orton asked where Mr. Yeatts would like the other \$50K to come from. He said he just thought the \$300K was moved over and wasn't sure where Mr. Hamill ended up splitting it. Mr. Hamill said there is \$250K in the compliance for the LTEMP EIS support and carryover that Reclamation may have that is also being set aside for compliance or from EFF. Motion is to increase \$250K from compliance (line 37) and from \$50K from experimental fund (line 40).
- ❖ Tribal Funding (lines 62-66) is not adjusted by CPI; reflect this in the work plan and correct the column headings in budget table to show this.

Ms. Orton asked the members to sit at the table in preparation for a hand vote on each item. She asked if there were any public comments on the proposed changes.

### **Public Comments:**

*Mr. Dongoske (Pueblo of Zuni): I just want to underscore Hopi's concerns for the changes. One is the money for the treatment plan. You reinstated the \$500K because Reclamation has not provided the signatories for the PA with any sort of concrete data. Reclamation has told us they believe there will be a reduction in the amount of activity for staying in compliance with the PA but they haven't told us exactly what they plan to do to stay in compliance. I'm hesitant to just accept their word without seeing a detailed plan of how they plan to remake compliance with the Treatment Plan. Until we do, I think we should continue to fund the Treatment in its original amount of 500,000+ dollars. My other comment would go to the Fish and Wildlife Service's change of language for the change of funding that goes to the Experimental Fund. I think using the word "needed" as a change to the word that was in the original language that says "necessary" in my mind makes it more pre-decisional outcome for the EA regarding non-native fish control and making it more of a mechanical removal outcome so that gives me great concern.*

*Jim Garrison (State Historic Preservation Officer for Arizona): I think my office is in agreement that it would be very difficult for Reclamation to maintain necessary compliance if that budget is reduced as Kurt was talking about. We certainly haven't had the discussions of how much tweaking needs to be done to the current plan in order to know what's going to happen so we're on the side of restoring that budget.*

Mr. Spiller supported using the word "necessary" versus "needed." The change was accepted.

The AMWG voted on the individual budget items:

#### Western Area Power Administration's Proposal

1. Change the source for the additional \$20,000 for the Science Advisors (SAs) to FY2010 carryover. The money is to be used for improved decision-making processes in the AMP.

- This supports the TWG recommendation for an additional \$20,000 for the SAs, and changes the source from Administrative Support (publications) to carryover.

**FAILED 1-14**

2. Move \$275,138 from line 156 (forego preparing a SCORE Report) in FY 11 and FY12 to the Experimental Flow Fund.
  - This proposal was considered and failed at the TWG. We support having substantial money in the experimental fund to support HFEs.

**FAILED 6-13**

3. Include a budget line item for Power Economics studies to be completed by Western.
  - Cost of Base case and change case analysis (FY 2011) \$106,950
  - Additional power economic studies may be identified and completed by Western in FY 2011 - 12

**PASSED 14-2**

#### U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Budget Proposals

1. Remove #2 from the existing budget motion that reduces funding for aquatic food base.
 

**FAILED 6-12**
2. Change #3 to read: "Move funding for the Nonnative Fish Suppression Fund for FY11 to the Experimental Fund, and retain such funds until the Nonnative Fish Control EA process is completed and funds are necessary. (line 43)"
 

**PASSED 20-0**

3. Restore \$20,000 to the Science Advisors budget (line 169) in FY11 and FY12 from a source in GCMRC's budget to be determined by GCMRC.

**PASSED 15-2**

4. In place of the two proposed fall fish monitoring trips (line 90, FY11 only), conduct one spring electrofishing monitoring trip and one fall mainstem HBC aggregation monitoring trip, with the additional cost of \$27,000 to be taken from funding set aside in the Reclamation budget for nonnative fish control (line 43).

**PASSED 18-1**

5. Implement editorial changes in the work plan from Attachment 1 (Hamill memo August 6, 2010) for BIO 2.M1.11-12 (LCR HBC monitoring), BIO 2.M3.11-12 (HBC translocations), and HYD 10.R2.11-12 (GTMax model).

**PASSED 17-0**

#### Bureau of Reclamation

Restore "Administrative support for NPS permitting" (line 38) to \$120,240 in FY11 and \$123,847 in FY12, from line items to be determined by Reclamation (from Reclamation appropriated dollars) and GCMRC (from AMP funds).

**PASSED 20-0**

#### Hopi

Restore Public Outreach Ad Hoc Group to \$56,184 in FY11 and \$57,870 in FY12 (line 26), increases of \$28,092 and \$28,935, to be funded from nonnative fish contingency fund.

**PASSED 15-5**

Restore Cultural Resources compliance (line 48) to \$505,838, increase of \$300,000, to be funded from compliance (\$250,000 line 37) and from experimental fund (\$50,000 line 40).

**PASSED 17-2**

Tribal funding (lines 62-66) is not adjusted by CPI and that should be reflected in the document.

**PASSED 21-0**

**Final Budget Motion** (Proposed by Larry Stevens, seconded by George Caan):

The AMWG recommends that the Secretary of the Interior adopt the FY 2011-12 Draft Budget (tables provided by GCMRC dated June 28, 2010) and Work Plan (dated June 11, 2010) with the following changes:

1. Fund \$505,838 for the Treatment plan in FY11 (line 50) to be funded from compliance (\$250,000 line 37) and from experimental fund (\$50,000 line 40).
2. Reduce funding for Aquatic Food Base monitoring by \$100,000 in FY11. (line 84)
3. Move funding for the Non-native Fish Suppression Fund for FY11 to the Experimental Fund and retain such funds until the Non-Native Fish Control EA process is completed and funds are necessary. (line 45)
4. Restore \$20,000 to the Science Advisors budget (line 171) in FY11 and FY12 from a source in GCMRC's budget to be determined by GCMRC.
5. Include a budget line item for Power Economics studies to be completed by Western with independent oversight by GCMRC.
  - a) Cost of Base case and change case analysis (FY 2011) \$106,950
  - b) Additional power economic studies may be identified and completed by Western in FY 2011 - 12
6. In place of the two proposed fall fish monitoring trips (line 90, FY11 only), conduct one spring electrofishing monitoring trip and one fall mainstem HBC aggregation monitoring trip, with the additional cost of \$27,000 to be taken from funding set aside in the Reclamation budget for nonnative fish control (line 43).
7. Implement editorial changes in the work plan from Attachment 1 (Hamill memo August 6, 2010) for BIO 2.M1.11-12 (LCR HBC monitoring), BIO 2.M3.11-12 (HBC translocations), and HYD 10.R2.11-12 (GTMax model).
8. Restore "Administrative support for NPS permitting" (line 38) to \$120,240 in FY11 and \$123,847 in FY12, from line items to be determined by Reclamation (from Reclamation appropriated dollars) and GCMRC (from AMP funds).
9. Restore Public Outreach Ad Hoc Group to \$56,184 in FY11 and \$57,870 in FY12 (line 26), increases of \$28,092 and \$28,935, to be funded from nonnative fish contingency fund.
10. Reflect in the document that tribal funding lines 62-66 are not adjusted by CPI.

Roll call vote:

Stakeholder	Vote	Stakeholder	Vote
Arizona	Y	Hualapai Tribe	Y
Arizona Game and Fish Department	Y	National Park Service	Y
Bureau of Indian Affairs	Y	Navajo Nation	Absent
Bureau of Reclamation	Y	Nevada	Y
California	Y	New Mexico	Y
Colorado	Y	Pueblo of Zuni	Y
Colorado River Energy Distributors Association	Y	Southern Paiute Consortium	Absent
Federation of Fly Fishers	Y	Utah	Y
Fish and Wildlife Service	Y	Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems	Y
Grand Canyon River Guides	Y	Western Area Power Administration	Y
Grand Canyon Trust	N	Wyoming	Y
Grand Canyon River Wildlands Council	Y	San Juan Southern Paiute	Vacant
Hopi Tribe	Y		

Voting Results: Yes = 21      No = 1      Abstaining = 0      Total Voting = 22      2/3 = 15				
<b>Motion Passes</b>				

Ms. Castle said the motion would be passed along to the Secretary together with the hydrograph that was voted on yesterday.