

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	Response
Principle #6 - How is “operational flexibility” defined? Does this include legal as well as physical constraints of the dam?	Rick Johnson and Cliff Barrett will draft definitions for “operational flexibility” and “legal flexibility” for the glossary.
Some current and target levels seem unbelievable: for example, MO 2 goes from 5 gm/m <sup>2</sup> to 5000 gm/m <sup>2</sup>	The numbers have not been fully vetted and will be looked at more closely by the small groups.
MO 1 and MO 4, et al.: how can target levels be obtained from literature?	In some cases, they can’t; however, literature will give us guidelines. In these cases, it should read “IN,” and targets will be justified in terms of where we are headed. In other cases, the research has been completed; thus, we will obtain from literature.
How do we address the broad issue of what is within and what is without AMP boundaries?	Issue Paper C addresses this issue. MOs are what are needed to achieve Goals. Some MOs and MAs may be within the AMP, others may not be. These will be distinguished at the MA level.
Goal 2 - Ensure “remove jeopardy doesn’t mean “recovery” (glossary). Rick Gold: recovery would mean more money, and it shouldn’t just be power revenues. The goal does address viable populations. Recovery is not possible in Grand Canyon.	The Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) will address John Shields’ issue on whether ESA issues are part of the AMP. Issue Paper E will be further fleshed out.
MO 15 - What does % mean for current level?	This refers to the % of total fish captured.
Goal 3 - Discuss what “as feasible” means.	Feasibility includes biological, economic and technical factors.
MO 17 is inconsistent with MO 13.	Issue Paper B addresses this issue. The emphasis is on trout above the Paria, and native fish in the entire reach with emphasis below Paria.
Habitat needs of trout and native fish below Paria River should be differentiated.	Trout are not addressed at all below the Paria. Native habitat is addressed.
MO 17 – clarify as minimums the target levels for growth rate, abundance, and condition.	The AHC and small group will address this.
How can the target level be a “process” rather than specific objective? This is not measurable.	The definition of the Decision Process was distributed, discussed, and clarified. (see handout)

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	Response
MO 21 - what is 329,000 m <sup>3</sup> @ 35 sites) – what are we measuring?	These refer to standard study sites from a particular study. The data may not be sufficient, but it is what we have available. The sediment small group will address this issue.
Goal 6 – The proposed change is from “Increase fine sediment storage” to “Maintain or attain levels of sediment...” Maintain at what levels? Is this an Information Need?	The word “storage” will be added back into the goal.
“IN” could be set as a general description (philosophic) that would lead to specific numbers.	Qualitative targets will be prepared to guide the development of quantitative targets.
Has the KAS genetic research been completed?	No, it’s not complete but most folks are confident it’s a unique taxon. The AHC will continue to use KAS until the research is complete.
The KAS expert panel should cause a revision of levels.	The AHC concurs with this statement.
How do INs tie into experimental flows?	Experimental flows result from INs.
Does use of the phrase “within the framework of GCDAMP ecosystem goals” in a goal imply a hierarchy?	The reference in goal 8, “... in a manner consistent with riparian ecosystem goals,” and the references in goals 10 and 11, “...within the framework of GCDAMP ecosystem goals,” is intended to indicate a hierarchy or order of precedence. That is, the accomplishment of Goals 8, 10, and 11 should be undertaken in such a way that the likelihood of achieving the ecosystem goals is not impaired.
MO 39: – “maintain or enhance wilderness” – which is it?	Enhance means make a positive contribution to the resource, don’t let it degrade. “Attain or maintain” means we think we aren’t yet where we should be.
Goal 8 - Why does it say “consistent with <u>riparian</u> ecosystem goals” when other goals say “consistent with GCDAMP ecosystem goals”?	Either way works. The riparian ecosystem goal referred to in Goal 8 is Goal 9. The riparian ecosystem goal (Goal 9) is more appropriate because it would be most relevant for SWWF, but either approach could be used.
Goal 10 & MO 39 are inconsistent (managing as wilderness without motors)	The word wilderness does not mean “Wilderness Act” wilderness; rather, a wilderness experience. These are not mutually exclusive. It was not the intent of the AHC to get involved in the motors discussion.
Goal 11 – The terms “power and energy” are unclear (should it be	The AHC will replace “power and energy” with “capacity and energy generation.” Ted Rampton will provide definitions for the

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	Response
“capacity and energy”?)	Glossary.
How does “river corridor” fit within the charge for the AMP? (scope issue)	The scope already established, overall and for each MO.
Goal 12: “Past” generations - how do we inspire and benefit them?	This addresses the ancestral concerns of Native Americans. The small group will address this issue.
“APE” definition should be in the glossary	The small group to define this for Glossary.
How does MO 41 address the protection of canyon resources? (overlap between our charge and the APE)	Grand Canyon is a traditional cultural property. Our charge may be smaller. The small group will address this issue.
MO 46 - maintain <u>and</u> attain? (MO 47–49)	There are multiple attributes in MO 46. Some are one, some the other.
MO 46 - is N/A appropriate for “at some place”?	Yes, because we’re discussing data.
MO 46 – The tribal view is being segregated, and it shouldn’t be isolated.	No change is proposed but the values should be considered throughout.
MO 41 - preserve or treat?	The small group will consider this.
MO 49 – The target level is more than a dollar figure. What does full tribal participation mean?	The Ad Hoc Committee decided to switch the element with the attribute. The cultural small group will address this issue.
MO 50 – any idea of what the IN might be?	The note in the Comments column is changed to read, “Target level is the experiments needed to gain critical understanding of ecosystem function under different dam operations.”
MO 50 - should include hydropower generation in the comments column.	The note in the Comments column is changed to read: “Target level is the experiments needed to gain critical understanding of ecosystem function under different dam operations.”
MO 51 - “APE” instead of “CRE”?	The small group will address this issue.
MO 26 – Is 12 breeding pairs an accurate number?	These data represent a given point in time. The AHC needs to address confidence intervals and which point in time we’re going to use. Geographic scope is also an issue – are they LAME or CRE? This will be resolved through development of the quantitative targets.
Goal 2 - How do we remove jeopardy from razorback sucker if none exist in the Canyon?	Jeopardy is removed by the completion of the RPAs of the BO.

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	Response
Goal 1 - what are the desired species?	There is no need to enumerate desired species, but fish are used as an indicator of ecosystem health.
Keep MOs 52, 53, and 54 as part of Goal 14.	The AHC discussed this recommendation and decided to retain these MOs under Goal 13.
MO 10 - does the BO require one additional population of HBC?	Yes, an additional "spawning aggregation" is required.
Be consistent with recovery goals of FWS Region 6.	See Issue Paper E.

Other notes from the AMWG meeting:

- Build in a feedback loop
- Will all objectives be measurable?
- Targets may change as we learn more.
- Current and target levels may be a range.

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	ActionResponse
Principle #6 - How is “operational flexibility” defined? <u>Does this include</u> <del>Legal</del> as well as physical constraints of the dam?	<del>Glossary</del> Rick Johnson and Cliff Barrett will <del>include draft</del> definitions for “operational flexibility” and “legal flexibility.” <u>for the glossary.</u>
Some current and target levels seem unbelievable: for example, MO 2 goes from 5 gm/m <sup>2</sup> <del>→to</del> 5000 gm/m <sup>2</sup>	The numbers have not been fully vetted and will be looked at more closely <u>by the small groups.</u>
MO 1 and MO 4, et al.: <del>→</del> how can target levels be obtained from literature?	In some cases, they can’t; <u>however,</u> —literature will give us guidelines. In these cases, it should read “IN,” and targets will be justified in terms of where we are headed. In other cases, the research has been completed; thus, we will obtain from literature.
How do we address the broad issue of what is within and what is without AMP boundaries? <del>?</del>	Issue Paper C addresses this issue. MOs are what are needed to achieve Goals. Some MOs and MAs may be within the AMP, others may not be. These will be distinguished at the MA level.
Goal 2 - <del>E</del> nsure “remove jeopardy doesn’t mean “recovery” (glossary). Rick Gold: <u>recovery would mean more money, and it shouldn’t just be power revenues. The goal does address viable populations. Recovery is not possible in Grand Canyon.</u>	<del>Rick Gold—recovery would mean more \$—shouldn’t just be power revenues. Goal does address viable populations. Recovery not possible in Grand Canyon.</del> The ad hoc committee will address John Shields’ issue on whether ESA issues are part of the AMP. Issue <u>paper E</u> will be further fleshed out.
MO 15 - <del>W</del> hat does % mean for current level?	<u>This r</u> efers to the % of total fish captured.
Goal 3 - <del>D</del> iscuss what “as feasible” means.	<del>The ad hoc committee will revise this response.</del> <u>Feasibility includes biological, economic and technical factors.</u>
MO 17 is inconsistent with MO 13.	Issue Paper B addresses this issue. The emphasis is on trout above the Paria, and native fish in the entire reach with emphasis below Paria. <del>Viable populations are not identified by species. Ad hoc committee will revise definition of “viable” and “native fish” in the glossary.</del>
<del>differentiation of h</del> Habitat needs of trout and native fish below Paria River <u>should be differentiated.</u>	Trout are not addressed at all below the Paria. Native habitat is addressed.
MO 17 <u>clarify</u> as minimums the target levels for growth rate, abundance, and condition.	<u>The a</u> Ad hoc committee <del>will address this</del> and small group will address this.

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	<u>ActionResponse</u>
How can <u>the</u> target level be a “process” rather than specific objective? <u>This is n</u> Not measurable.	<u>The definition of the</u> Decision Process <del>definition</del> was <u>distributed,</u> discussed, and clarified. (see handout)
MO 21 - what is 329,000 m <sup>3</sup> @ 35 sites) <u>–</u> what are we measuring?	<u>These refer to s</u> Standard study sites from a particular study. The data may not be sufficient, but it is what we have available. <u>The s</u> Sediment small group will address <u>this issue.</u>
Goal 6 – The proposed change is from “Increase fine sediment storage” to “Maintain or attain levels of sediment...” Maintain at what levels? Is this an Information Need?	The word “storage” will be added back into the goal.
“Information need” could be set as a general description (philosophic) that would lead to specific numbers.	Qualitative targets will be prepared to guide the development of quantitative targets.
Has <u>the</u> KAS genetic research been completed?	No. <del>–</del> It’s not complete but most folks are confident it’s a unique taxon. The <del>Ad hoc</del> <u>AHC</u> will continue to use KAS until <u>the</u> research is complete.
<u>The</u> KAS expert panel should cause <u>a</u> revision of levels.	<u>Yes</u> <u>The AHC concurs with this statement.</u>
How do IN <sup>2</sup> s tie into experimental flows?	Experimental flows result from IN <sup>2</sup> s.
Does the phrase “within the framework of GCDAMP ecosystem goals” in a goal imply a hierarchy?	The reference in goal 8, “... in a manner consistent with riparian ecosystem goals,” and the references in goals 10 and 11, “...within the framework of GCDAMP ecosystem goals,” is intended to indicate a hierarchy or order of precedence. That is, the accomplishment of Goals 8, 10, and 11 should be undertaken in such a way that the likelihood of achieving the ecosystem goals is not impaired.
MO 39: – “maintain or enhance wilderness” – which is it?	Enhance means make a positive contribution to the resource, don’t let it degrade. “Attain or maintain” means we think we aren’t yet where we should be. <del>Consider putting definitions in the</del> <u>Glossary.</u>
Goal 8 - <u>W</u> why does it say “consistent with <u>riparian</u> ecosystem goals” when other goals say “consistent with GCDAMP ecosystem goals”?	Either way works. The riparian ecosystem goal referred to in Goal 8 is Goal 9. The riparian ecosystem goal (Goal 9) is more appropriate because it would be most relevant for SW <u>W</u> F, but either approach could be used.
Goal 10 & MO 39 are inconsistent	The word wilderness does not mean “Wilderness Act”

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	<u>ActionResponse</u>
(managing as wilderness <u>with/out</u> motors)	wilderness; rather, a wilderness experience. These are not mutually exclusive. It was not the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee to get involved in the motors discussion.
Goal 11 — <u>The</u> terms “power and energy” <u>are</u> unclear ( <u>should it be</u> “capacity and energy”?)	<u>The AHC w</u> ill replace “power and energy” with “capacity and energy generation.” <u>Small-group Ted Rampton</u> will provide definitions for the Glossary.
How does “river corridor” fit within the charge for the AMP? (scope issue)	<u>Se</u> <u>The scope</u> already established — overall and for each MO.
Goal 12: “Past” generations - how do we inspire and benefit them?	<u>This a</u> ddresses <u>the</u> ancestral concerns of Native Americans. <u>S</u> <u>The small group</u> will address <u>this issue</u> .
“APE” definition should be in the glossary	<u>The s</u> mall group to define <u>this</u> for Glossary.
How does MO 41 address <u>the</u> protection of canyon resources? ( <u>overlap between our charge and the APE</u> )	Grand Canyon <u>as-is a</u> traditional cultural property. Our charge may be smaller. <u>Ad-hoc-committee</u> <u>The small group</u> will address <u>this issue</u> .
MO 46 - maintain <u>and</u> attain? (MO 47–49)	<u>M</u> <u>There are</u> multiple attributes in MO 46. Some are one, some <u>the another</u> .
MO 46 - is N/A appropriate for “at some place”?	Yes, because we’re discussing data.
MO 46 — <u>The</u> tribal view is being segregated, <u>and it</u> shouldn’t <u>be</u> isolated.	No change <u>is</u> proposed but the values should be considered throughout.
MO 41 - preserve or treat?	The small group will consider this.
MO 49 — <u>The</u> target level is more than \$ <u>a dollar</u> figure. — <u>w</u> hat does full tribal participation mean?	<u>The Ad Hoc Committee decided to s</u> witch <u>the</u> element <u>with the</u> <u>and</u> -attribute. The cultural small group will address <u>this issue</u> .
MO 50 – any idea of what <u>the</u> information need might be?	The note in the Comments column is changed to read, “Target level is the experiments needed to gain critical understanding of ecosystem function under different dam operations.”
MO 50 - should include hydropower generation in <u>the</u> comments column.	The note in the Comments column is changed to read: “Target level is the experiments needed to gain critical understanding of ecosystem function under different dam operations.”
MO 51 - “APE” instead of “CRE”?	<u>The s</u> mall group will address <u>this issue</u> .
MO 26 — <u>Is</u> 12 breeding pairs <u>an</u> accurate <u>number</u> ?	<u>These d</u> ata represents a given point in time. <u>The</u> — AHC needs to address confidence intervals and which point in time we’re

Comments on the Strategic Plan Document from the AMWG  
July 2000

Flip Chart Comment	<u>ActionResponse</u>
	going to <del>choose</del> <u>use</u> . Geographic scope is also an issue – are they LAME or CRE? <del>This will be r</del> Resolved through <u>development of the</u> quantitative targets.
Goal 2 - <del>H</del> how do we remove jeopardy from razorback sucker if none exist in the Canyon?	Jeopardy <u>is</u> removed by <u>the</u> completion of <u>the</u> RPAs of <u>the</u> BO.
Goal 1 - what are the desired species?	<u>There is n</u> No need to enumerate desired species, but fish are <u>used as</u> an indicator of ecosystem health.
Keep MOs 52, 53, <u>and</u> 54 as part of Goal 14.	<u>The Ad Hoc Committee discussed this recommendation and decided to R</u> retained <u>these MOs</u> under Goal 13.
MO 10 - does <u>the</u> BO require <del>1</del> <u>one</u> <del>add</del> <u>1 additional</u> population of HBC?	Yes-, <u>an additional</u> “spawning aggregation” <del>—comments section.</del> <u>USBR will check on BO language. is required.</u>
Be consistent with recovery goals of FWS Region 6.	See Issue Paper E.

Other notes from the AMWG meeting:

- Build in a feedback loop
- Will all objectives be measurable?
- Targets may change as we learn more.
- Current and target levels may be a range.

R:\WEB\twg-00sep20\FC Changes.doc