

Minutes of Technical Work Group Meeting
January 14, 1998

FINAL

Presiding: Robert Winfree, NPS (Chairperson)

Committee Members Present:

Mark T. Anderson, USGS
Clifford Barrett, RW Beck & Assoc.
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Nation
Dave Cohen, Trout Unlimited
Wm. Davis, EcoPlan Assoc./CREDA
Kurt Dongoske, The Hopi Tribe
Owen Gorman, US FWS
Norm Henderson, GCNRA
Amy Heuslein, BIA
Pamela Hyde, American Rivers
Gene Jencsok, CWCB
Tom Moody, Grand Canyon Trust
Bruce Moore, USBR
Carlos Mayo, Southern Paiute Consortium

Committee Members Absent:

Alan Downer, Navajo Nation
Christopher Harris, ADWR
Bill Persons, AGFD
Andre Potochnik, GCRC
John Shields, Wyoming State Engineer's
Office
Fred Worthley, CRBC
Phillip S. Lehr, CRCN
Joe Dishta, Pueblo of Zuni
Wayne Cook, UCRC
Robert King, UDWR
Clayton Palmer, WAPA

Alternates Present:

Tim Hoffnagle, AGFD

Alternate For:

Bill Persons, AGFD

Other Interested Persons Present:

L. David Garrett, GCMRC
Dennis Kubly, AGFD
Steven Lloyd, USBR
Anthony G. Morton, USBR

Recorder: Steven Lloyd, USBR

1/14/98: Convened: 12:23 p.m. **Adjourned:** 4:50 p.m.

Welcome/Introductions: Robert Winfree welcomed committee members and guests.

Attendance Sheet: Official members or their alternates are to sign in on the yellow sheet; all other attendees are to sign in on the white sheet. Sixteen members were present constituting a Quorum.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Federal Register Notice: A notice of the meeting was published in the Federal Register on December 18, 1997.

Review of Minutes: Minutes of the TWG meeting held December 10-11, 1997 will be reviewed at the TWG Meeting on January 20, 1998.

Kanab Ambersnail Working Group: Dennis Kubly with Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), Non Game Branch, spoke of the conservation of the *Kanab ambersnail*. The AGFD is involved in the *Kanab ambersnail* recovery through the Kanab Ambersnail Working Group. The group is an independent informal ad hoc group which include the NPS, FWS, Reclamation, and BLM and are interested in the recovery of the *Kanab ambersnail*. They would need to establish 10 populations in order for non listing to occur. They are looking for support from this group in funding the establishment of a second population. They have completed site evaluations and are ready to move into the compliance phase. The Center would be willing to work with Reclamation to find additional funds or by working this into the current FY98 budget. Costs will be reduced by providing space on currently planned river trips scheduled by the GCMRC. The estimate to do this work is approximately \$30,000. They are looking to the TWG for their support up through the AMWG. Salaries are being funded through the Bureau of Reclamation's Provo Area Office and would not be a concern of the TWG.

The Kanab Ambersnail Working Group is not part of the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) but is also working on repopulation of this species. They have looked at approximately 130 sites and have found there are not many undiscovered populations of this species. They have been performing genetics studies on this species and have determined that there are four distinct species in southern Utah. The scope of this project includes: 1. Biological Opinion related activities 2. Other recovery activity 3. ESA coordination activities. They are proposing approximately eight trips which will be used to establish a second population of the snail. Follow up monitoring would be performed in the fall. All of these trips will satisfy BO requirements. They will evaluate 12 sites, three of which will be selected to transport and establish new populations. NEPA will be performed by AGFD and NPS. GCMRC can support this function but they will need more funding. The Center would consider reprogramming funds should no additional funds be found. This effort is a combined effort with NPS, USBR, USFWS and AGFD and there should be some consideration as to what portion of the program funding belongs to each agency. Reclamation feels that this effort is meeting the requirements of the BO. GCMRC is performing monitoring and research in relation to the BO and there is some duplication of effort but GCMRC is trying to avoid duplication where possible. Even though this effort will not be able to establish the second population before the spring BHBF, it will demonstrate sufficient progress has been made toward accomplishing this requirement to proceed with a spring BHBF.

Establishing a second population is important to satisfy the 1997 BO and needs to be performed in relationship to the BHBF this spring. Three sites will be used because it is not known whether they will be successful at all of the sites, even though the habitat is compatible.

Recommendation: The TWG will add this topic to the January 20-21, 1998 meeting agenda. Dennis Kubly will develop a one-page information sheet on the scope of the project, how it relates to the BO and a cost breakdown including what portion of the costs are the responsibility of AMP.

Research and Monitoring Associated with a March 1998 BHBF: David Garrett presented a handout including a cost breakdown sheet on the science monitoring plan of the spring BHBF.

(Attachment 1). The GCMRC has been working on the BHBF monitoring plan and cost details but have not yet completed it. They will complete the plan and present it at the January 28, 1998 planning group meeting. The Center will address biological impacts for running the BHBF in the months of May-June. At this time they believe the impacts in the later time frame will increase but would not result in a "no go" conclusion. The GCMRC confirmed there is sufficient sand in the system and it will be maintained through June. Concern was expressed about the humpback chub and impacts to the young-of-year. NEPA will be performed but it would be a minimal effort based upon previous work. The ESA issue and the second population of the *Kanab ambersnail* will be the most critical element of the plan. Satisfying the NEPA requirements in May-June will be more difficult than in the March-April time frame. Reclamation and USFWS are currently working out details to accomplish the NEPA/ESA requirements. One proposal would be for FWS, Reclamation, and the GCMRC to meet and write required documents together. Currently the forecast has not triggered a January-February flow. Should the weather stay dry then there may be a possibility the BHBF would not occur this year and since releases from the dam are high now there could be a possibility of low steady flow occurring this summer. Reclamation is now formulating plans to be able to facilitate the low flow possibility.

The GCMRC proposed the BHBF to be named an experimental flow. The word "experimental" was objected to by the power interests.

Dave Garrett presented a hydrograph of the proposed BHBF. They would produce aerial photography before and after during a short period of uniform flow (approximately three days each period). GCMRC proposed entering the BHBF with a short period of fluctuating flow and coming out with fluctuating flows as a possible alternative. They would not use low flows as in the past. This period would give them information on all the beaches and photograph the entire canyon. They would propose 2000 to 3000 cfs fluctuations. Ramping would be within the limits specified in the ROD.

Through monitoring, the GCMRC would determine in the field, the disposition of the sediment and direct the duration (2 or 4 days) as they observe whether desired sand movement has been achieved. They will use 3 or 4 sites for continuous monitoring. The decision on achieved sand movement will be made based on predetermined criteria. The focus will be upon Marble and Glen Canyons. Additional sites will be determined later, if needed. Sediment input from the Paria and LCR will not be evaluated in this monitoring plan. It would possibly double the costs to monitor sediment inputs. Dave Garrett asked the group to consider asking the AMWG to direct the TWG to look at fluctuating flows above 25,000 cfs.

Existing contracts will be amended to perform BHBF monitoring and research work. Data integration and information management will be performed by GCMRC within their current budget. All studies performed will include a final report from each contractor performing work.

This plan is based upon the scientist's decision of what monitoring would need to be done to answer the information needs. Bill Davis asked whether we should do any research this time and if we already have enough data on these flows from the 1996 BHBF? This BHBF would produce

different results than the 1996 BHBF when there was coarse sand in the system. A two-day event would deposit much finer sediment due to the sediment input from the Paria.

Future monitoring for BHBF's would require even less monitoring and would cost approximately \$450,000 for a 45,000cfs. The Biological, Cultural/Socioeconomic and logistical portions of the plan are required but, some of the work of the other areas are needed to answer questions still remaining in those areas. Should there not be enough money to perform the work, monitoring could be done and the analysis would be performed the following year. The current program has been cut to the minimum and is the least cost monitoring plan which answers the information needs. The Center is concerned that they are currently working with only one point on the graph. Good science would dictate monitoring three events to verify results from the 1996 BHBF.

As a minimum, we must perform monitoring related to T&E species. The group would like to see monitoring costs of flow events integrated into the annual plan in future years. They want adaptive research kept in the program. As more information is collected, some projects may not need monitoring in the future. GCMRC should document what has been done in past high flow events and what is being repeated. They should also seek funding for the current BHBF Science Plan. The current plan is a list of information needs which must be answered. It is the minimal amount of monitoring for which good science can be achieved. Should the AMWG recommend this science plan, Reclamation would then seek funding to perform the work. Funding would be reprogrammed from WAPA, Reclamation and GCMRC funds. This is the minimum package which should be accepted. The TWG will need to set priorities if funding is not available.

There was still some concern about the details of each of the elements in the plan.

Recommendation: The AMWG should accept this program as currently outlined. Agencies should work to reprogram funds to perform this work. The TWG should work with the Center to further refine the monitoring plan. Recognize that full funding may not be available to perform all of the work.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

There being no further business, the Chairperson adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Lloyd, USBR

Key to Acronyms

ADWR - Arizona Department of Water Resources
AGFD - Arizona Game & Fish Department
AMWG - Adaptive Management Work Group
AOP - Annual Operating Plan
BHBF - Beach/Habitat-Building Flow
BHTF - Beach/Habitat Test Flow
BIA - Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM - Bureau of Land Management
BO - Biological Opinion
BOR - Bureau of Reclamation
CAPA - Central Arizona Project Assn.
Center (the) - GCMRC
CRBC - Colorado River Board of California
CRCN - Colorado River Commission of Nevada
CREDA - Colorado River Energy Distributors Assn.
CRSP - Colorado River Storage Project
CWCB - Colorado Water Conservation Board
EA - Environmental Assessment
EIS - Environmental Impact Statement
ESA - Endangered Species Act
FACA - Federal Advisory Committee Act

FWS - United States Fish & Wildlife Service
FY - Fiscal Year
GCD - Glen Canyon Dam
GCMRC - Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research
Center
GCNRA - Glen Canyon National Recreation Area
GCPA - Grand Canyon Protection Act
IEDA - Irrigation and Electrical Districts Association of
Arizona
LCR - Little Colorado River
MAF - Million Acre Feet
NAU - Northern Arizona University (Flagstaff, AZ)
NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA - National Historical Preservation Act
NPS - National Park Service
PA - Programmatic Agreement
Reclamation - United States Bureau of Reclamation
RFP - Request For Proposal
RPA - Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
SAB - Science Advisory Board
T&E - Threatened and Endangered (species)
TWG - Technical Work Group (Glen Canyon)
UCR - Upper Colorado Region (of the USBR)
UCRC - Upper Colorado River Commission
UDWR - Utah Division of Water Resources
USBR - United States Bureau of Reclamation
USFWS - United States Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS - United States Geological Survey
WAPA - Western Area Power Administration