

# **Comments on Strategic Plan from the Technical Work Group Meeting**

## **September 21, 2000**

### TWG Suggestions for the Strategic Planning Process and Timeline

### with Responses from the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning

<b>Comments from TWG Members</b>	<b>Responses from the Ad Hoc Committee</b>
Budgetary reality	#6 in the draft Outline of the Strategic Plan describes the Action Plan, which will be based on budgetary realities.
Long-term perspective	This will be achieved via the target levels and throughout the process.
Develop a plan outline of what is in the Strategic Plan	This draft is completed and was distributed for comment at the TWG meeting.
Develop a schedule of completion	This document is completed and was distributed for comment at the TWG meeting.
Responsibilities for various items in the Strategic Plan (both for writing and accomplishing)	Responsibility for writing the Plan is in the draft schedule, in March 2001. The specifics of who is responsible for accomplishing the plan will be laid out in the Action Plan, described in #6 of the draft Outline.
Tasks that need to be done to complete the outline	The Ad Hoc Committee asked for input on this from TWG members.
Items in plan outline listed in priority and sequence order	This will be done in the Action Plan, described in #6 of the draft Outline.
Use the web for publishing iterative versions of Strategic Plan	The Bureau will do this as attachments for the TWG meetings.
Don't reinvent the wheel – don't revisit decisions that have already been made	The draft Outline, under #2, Background, will list all the documents, laws, and "sideboards" under which the program operates.
Periodic review of decisions that have been made	#7 of the draft Outline specifies that the plan will undergo periodic review of the goals, MAs, and the operating criteria, to ensure we are moving in the right direction.
Avoid thinking inside the box – is there a better, cheaper, faster way?	It will be up to all stakeholders to apply their creativity, particularly in the Action Plan step of the planning process.
Avoid procrastination	We will respond to this at a later date.
List INs only if you are unable to come up with reasonable first cut at a target.	This was included in the directions to the small groups.
	Concur.

Comments from TWG Members	Responses from the Ad Hoc Committee
Develop a firm schedule for completion of the Strategic Plan and stick to it.	
Timeframe and cost to accomplish goals	This will be done in the Action Plan, described in #6 of the Draft Outline.
<p>The ad hoc committee was requested to send the Strategic Plan survey to:</p> <p>TWG, AMWG, GCMRC, Denny Fenn      Chip Groat, GC Researchers      Steve Gloss (NRC), KAS panelists      Kathleen Wheeler, Duncan Patten      David Wegner, Dave Garrett      House and Senate committee staffers      Other funders, Mark Schaefer      Signa Larralde (ALB Office)      Website, PA signatories      Navajo Nation - DC Office      PEP panel chairman and participants      Chairs of 2 NRC (Dick Marsoff and Bill Lewis)      Carl Walters, Kai Lee, THPO's      Science Advisory Board, NRC panelists      Senator McCain and George Miller</p>	The survey was sent to most of the people listed.

TWG Comments on Management Objectives  
with Responses from the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning

<b>Goal</b>	<b>TWG Comment</b>	<b>Ad Hoc Committee Response</b>
Goal 1	Consider using an index of biological integrity (IBI) for a qualitative target.	There may be an IBI that would work in Grand Canyon. The small group will consider this.
	Use conceptual model for indicators. If the conceptual model is only based on dam operations, use other influences, too.	The small group will be directed to use fish as an indicator unless they determine it should be changed.
	Just use foodbase measures as an indicator.	
Goal 2	The definition of “viable population” is very difficult. Start with Upper Basin ideas.	John Shields will give Upper Basin information and definition of “viable” to Pam for use in the small group.
	Look at draft recovery criteria for HBC.	Rick Johnson will get Douglas and Valdez studies on HBC recovery goals for the small group.
	It will be difficult to achieve viability for RZB.	See the comment for MO 14: “The target is the capability of the habitat to support the species.”
	MO 13: is there actual predation on native fish?	This will be posed to the small group.
	Propose to change “place” to “below Paria River” for Goal 2.	The AHC discussed this suggestion and agreed that the place would remain “CRE below GCD.”
Goal 3	No comments.	No response needed.
Goal 4	No comments.	No response needed.
Goal 5	The small group will focus on temperature, water quality, and human health.	No response needed.
	Why is SWWF targeted/associated with water quality?	Water quality degradation would affect the aquatic foodbase.
Goal 6	Cultural → “filling in arroyos” should be viewed as a placeholder – need more work. (From the “qualitative targets” document.)	There was some confusion among the AHC members as to the meaning of this suggestion. There was also discussion of the 1996 flood that retarded erosion. The small group will review this.
	Concerns about spawning habitat – should it be “above the Paria?”	The AHC agreed with this. However, spawning habitat is only one purpose of MO 21.
	No direction on priorities of resources * →ad hoc committee will address	MOs should be consistent with the Vision, Mission, Principles, and Goals and there

<b>Goal</b>	<b>TWG Comment</b>	<b>Ad Hoc Committee Response</b>
		should be no conflicts with those docs.
	2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence from the qualitative targets document - “Given limited sediment inputs...” This sounds like a goal in itself. (BHBF & HMF)	The AHC changed the qualitative targets document to read:  The target is enough sediment to achieve biological, recreational, and cultural goals. Given limited sediment inputs, we need to <u>to retain</u> enough sediment in the system to <u>facilitate reworking by BHBFs and habitat maintenance flows</u> <u>achieve ecosystem patterns</u> in Goals 1-4, 7-10, and 12. [The rest is unchanged.]
	2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: add “any other tools to move sediment” in addition to HMF & BHBF.	
	Should conform to biological (esp. Native fish) goals.	
	Concern about implication that we can control supplies – focus on retaining and storage.	
Goal 7	Question about necessity/viability of translocated populations of KAS. - PEP report vs. Biological Opinion - The BO has been changed as to the amount of take and the “AZ” requirement.	We will keep the document as it is pending evaluation of the PEP recommendations. (TWG has yet to review them.)
	There may not be target levels for translocated populations.	The small group is expected to come up with a target.
	This may be outside of AMP, but still important.	No response needed.
Goal 8	MO 26 abundance: the target should be habitat.	The AHC considered this and decided to leave the target as it is.
	Source of the current level? (12 breeding pairs)	The small group will vet this number.
	MO 26 should be included under extirpated species.	SWWF exists in the Canyon.
	Critical habit is 70 miles in upper canyon. The issue is “suitable, but not critical” habitat.  There is habitat that is occupied, though not critical.	“Suitable, but not critical,” habitat is influenced by Lake Mead. There are mostly tamarisks in this habitat.  If we create or protect the habitat and the birds do not come, we should figure out why. If it is not in our control, we move on.  Rick will check with Debra Bills on occupied and critical habitat for SWWF.  Goal 8 numbers will be built on the habitat resulting from Goal 9. Habitat is what is developed under the Goal 9 regime.

<b>Goal</b>	<b>TWG Comment</b>	<b>Ad Hoc Committee Response</b>
Goal 9	<p>Question about how to maintain OWHZ.</p> <p>Use language that avoids specific cfs levels for BHBFs → other management actions → put linkages to principles and issue papers.</p> <p>Question about basing importance of retaining OHWZ just because it is hard to maintain.</p> <p>Prioritize the four riparian communities.</p>	<p>All four communities are important for maintaining the diversity of wildlife. The Old High Water Zone is <u>important a high priority</u> because of the <u>difficulty of maintaining threat of losing</u> it. <u>We see One way of maintaining it is through BHBFs at greater than 45,000 cfs high flows</u>, which may have a negative effect on marshes and New High Water Zones. <u>Be sure to eConsidering the legal and regulatory mandates of the NPS to protect natural landscapes and native species and communities (which does not include New High Water Zone), and regenerative capabilities, the other three zones are a lower priority</u>. Also, recognize the dynamic and successional nature of these communities. <u>Linkages: Riparian Vegetation Issue Paper, Principles 6 and 7.</u></p>
	Need to define “native” species.	Rick Johnson will prepare a definition for the AHC to review.
	“Naturalized” is proper term for carp, etc.	No response needed.
Goal 10	Concern about the legality of “absorbing” impacts. Is there a better word?	The goal specifies that the ecosystem is the priority.
Goal 11	No comments.	No response needed.
Goal 12	What is the overlap between agency responsibility and AMP actions?	The responsibility for each MO – inside or outside the AMP – will be defined at a later stage in the Strategic Planning process.
	MO 41-42: what does “preserve” mean?	“Preserve” holds the legal meaning under applicable laws.
Goal 13	Why no biological, etc., data in addition to socioeconomic data?	Biological data are noted in the other goals that address biological issues.
	Tribal participation is not just a cultural issue.	We agree.
	Revise “externally funded investigators” (PI?).	“Externally-funded investigators” will be replaced with “Investigators funded outside the AMP.”