

**Technical Work Group
December 7, 2000
Phoenix, Arizona**

Presiding: Rick Johnson, Chairperson

FINAL

Committee Members Present:

Clifford Barrett, UAMPS
Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
Perri Benemelis, ADWR
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Tribe
Dave Cohen, Trout Unlimited
Wayne Cook, UCRC
William Davis, CREDA
Kurt Dongoske, The Hopi Tribe
Brenda Drye, So. Paiute Consortium
Christopher Harris, CRBC
Norm Henderson, NPS/GLCA

Nancy Hornewer, USGS
Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers
Matt Kaplinski, GCRG
Phillip Lehr, Colo. River Commission/Nevada
S. Clayton Palmer, WAPA
Don Metz, USFWS
Bill Persons, AGFD
Randall Peterson, USBR
D. Randolph Seaholm, CWCB
Robert Winfree, NPS/GRCA

Committee Members Absent:

Amy Heuslein, BIA
Robert King, UDWR
Jonathan Damp, Pueblo of Zuni

Nikolai Ramsey, GCT
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office

Alternates Present:

Andres Cheama
Wayne Cook

For:

Jonathan Damp, Pueblo of Zuni
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office

Other Interested Persons Present:

Gary Burton, WAPA
Nancy Coulam, USBR
Barbara Gerhart, Aide for R. Lynch
Barry Gold, GCMRC
Dennis Kubly, USBR
Jen Kunde, NPS/GCNP
Ruth Lambert, GCMRC

Mike Liszewski, GCMRC
Ted Melis, GCMRC
Mary Orton, Mary Orton Company
Andre Potochnik, GCRG
Barbara Ralston, GCMRC
Ted Rampton, UAMPS/CREDA
Jeff Sorensen, AGFD

Recorder: Linda Whetton, USBR

Meeting Opening and Administrative Items

Dec. 7, 2000: Convened: 8:10

WELCOME AND ADMINISTRATIVE:

The Chairperson welcomed the TWG members, alternates, and guests. All introduced themselves. The Chairperson determined there was a quorum established. Attendance Sheets were distributed (Attachment 1)

Action Items from Last Meeting:

1. PEP Integration - Randy Peterson said they are going to prepare some type of process diagram that describes PEP Integration. Dennis Kubly will present a flow chart model of that process at tomorrow's meeting. If it works okay, the PEP Integration would be the second process diagram that we would start. The goal is to clarify all the processes used in the AMP.
2. Distribution of "Law of the River" CD - Done. Randy passed out copies of the "Law of the River" CD. His intent is to publish all the documents pertaining to the AMP as well, i.e., the Strategic Plan, meeting notes, guidance document, etc.
3. Budget Timeline - Cliff Barrett has received only one budget timeline (from BOR). He needs the same from the other Federal agencies as soon as possible.
4. WAPA Rate Brochure - Clayton Palmer said the pamphlet was completed but he didn't bring any copies with him. He will e-mail/fax to the TWG as well as bring copies to the next meeting.
5. SWCA Report - Done. The report was sent to the Experimental Flows Ad Hoc Group members.
6. Tribal Executive Orders - Status unknown.
7. Linda will send the AMWG Comments & Response Document to AMWG Members. This was not done as previously reported. (The document was e-mailed to the AMWG members on Dec. 21, 2000.)
8. Linda will provide FWS web addresses/web location for Recovery Goals Document. Done.

Approval of TWG Sept. 20-21, 2000, Meeting Minutes. The following changes were noted:

S Page 4, first paragraph, change “this issue” to “the legislation”

S Page 8. Clayton Palmer is the chairperson for the Budget Ad Hoc Group.

Without objection, the Sept. 20-21, 2000, minutes were approved pending the above changes.

Approval of TWG Nov, 8-9, 2000, Meeting Minutes. The following changes were noted:

Cliff would like to submit a rewrite of his power economics presentation.

ACTION ITEM - Cliff will provide new language and a handout on his power economics presentation prior to the next TWG meeting.

Approval of the Nov. 8-9, 2000, meeting minutes will be put on the agenda for the next TWG meeting.

Legislative/Executive Updates. Randy reported the following:

1. The Salinity Bill has passed and been signed which increases the spending for salinity control measures in the basin. These cost-shared projects seek to reduce salinity in the Colorado River. Many of them involve on-farm improvements which reduce water use, improve efficiency, and reduce return flows which contain the contaminants that eventually get back into the River. This is a very proactive attempt to reduce salinity.

2. The Interim Surplus Criteria EIS should be released tomorrow. Copies have been sent to the EPA and it will also be available on the Lower Colorado Region web site on Dec. 15, 2000.

(<http://www.lc.usbr.gov>) as well as linked from the Upper Colorado Region web site

(<http://www.uc.usbr.gov>). If a paper copy is needed, contact Jayne Harkins at 702-293-8190.

Agenda Update. Randy provided an update on the Strategic Plan (Attachment 3) and reviewed the principles on page 2. In addition, the following handouts were provided as a basis for the members to use in reviewing the MOs today: Attachment 4, Deviations; Attachment 5, Definitions; and Attachment 6, Conceptual Framework for Managing Ecosystem Resources.

Mary Orton commented that the revised Strategic Plan document gives qualitative targets for each goal and each MO. She reminded the members that at last meeting they were working with two documents, one was the MOs document and the other was “development of qualitative targets for management objectives.” Those documents were integrated into the current document. She told the members that as the targets are discussed today, they will be advising the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning on what they want to see in the document.

Rick said that in budgeting for the small group presentations, there will be 15 minutes allotted for

each goal. He requested that comments be held until the afternoon.

Goals 1, 2, 4 (Barry Gold/Pamela Hyde)

Barry reported that the small group met on Nov. 2-3 and exchanged one e-mail message. He reviewed the changes made. Refer to Goals 1, 2, and 4; (Attachment 7). He also mentioned that a paper on "Aquatic Foodbase" (Attachment 8) was included with the goals as well as a paper with "Additional Comments" from Bill Persons and Gary Burton (Attachment 9).

Goals 7, 8, 9 (Bob Winfree)

Refer to Goals 7, 8, and 9 (Attachment 10). Bob passed out copies of: the *revised* Kanab Ambersnail Management Objectives (Attachment 11), Southwest Willow Flycatcher Management Objectives (Attachment 12), and *revised* Riparian Management Objectives (Attachment 13). He also mentioned the documents provided by Dennis Kubly: Jeff Sorensen Comments dated 11/17/00; Responses to KAS Review Panel Recommendations; and Position Statement by Jeff Sorensen, Clay Nelson, and Michael Demlong (Attachment 14). In addition, the flip chart notes from a meeting held on 11/21/00 were also provided (Attachment 15).

Goal 9, MO 33 (Kurt Dongoske)

Kurt referred to Goal 9, MO 33 and passed out copies of the Flip Chart Notes from the Cultural Resources Meeting held on 10/19/00 (Attachment 16).

Goal 12

Kurt directed the members to look at the Comments section and what were penned as the qualitative targets.

Goal 10 (Andre Potochnik). Refer to Attachment 17.

Goal 6 (Andre Potochnik). Refer to Attachment 18. Note corrections to MO 22 and MO 23. Andre also passed out a Summary of Comment Received (Attachment 19).

Goal 5 (Wayne Cook). Refer to Attachment 20.

Wayne said this would be discussed in the afternoon.

Bill Vernieu's "Water Quality Below Glen Canyon Dam - Water Year 2000" report (Attachment 21) was provided as a handout at the meeting.

Goal 11 (Ted Rampton). Refer to Attachment 22. Ted explained the current situation in California for potential rolling blackouts.

Goal 13 (Pam Hyde). Refer to Attachment 23.

Mary asked the members to consider the presentations they heard and come to some resolution on how the group can move forward. At the end of the day there should be a clear understanding on where there is consensus and if not, then they will need to look at the various pros and cons. The major discontinuities will need to be addressed at a later time. Her suggestion was to ask for the major issues that cross several goals. Those will be captured and then the group will go through goal by goal to try and resolve. She anticipates that the document will be in good shape for presentation to the AMWG in January 2001.

Comments on the individual goals were captured on flip charts. (Attachment 24).

Mary said there are some goals that are a means to an end. It is cleaner if the goals are ends rather than means. Bob said it would be important to say what they are. He has some difficulty with sediment storage in the river channel. He thinks we want sediment storage above water level. Our goal is a healthy native fish population or a sandy beaches, etc. We need to be clear in our discussions. Randy said it would be good to keep those in mind as we go through them tomorrow.

Adjourned: 5:15 p.m.

**Technical Work Group
December 8, 2000
Phoenix, Arizona**

Presiding: Rick Johnson, Chairperson

FINAL

Committee Members Present:

Clifford Barrett, UAMPS
Perri Benemelis, ADWR
Andres Cheama, Pueblo of Zuni
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Tribe
Dave Cohen, Trout Unlimited
Wayne Cook, UCRC
William Davis, CREDA
Kurt Dongoske, The Hopi Tribe
Brenda Drye, So. Paiute Consortium
Christopher Harris, CRBC
Norm Henderson, NPS/GLCA

Nancy Hornewer, USGS
Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers
Matt Kaplinski, GCRG
Phillip Lehr, Colo. River Commission/Nevada
Don Metz, USFWS
S. Clayton Palmer, WAPA
Bill Persons, AGFD
Randall Peterson, USBR
D. Randolph Seaholm, CWCB
Robert Winfree, NPS/GRCA

Committee Members Absent:

Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
Amy Heuslein, BIA
Robert King, UDWR

Clayton Palmer, WAPA
Nikolai Ramsey, GCT
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office

Alternates Present:

Gary Burton
Wayne Cook

For:

Clayton Palmer, WAPA
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office

Other Interested Persons Present:

Nancy Coulam, USBR
Barry Gold, GCMRC
Dennis Kubly, USBR
Jen Kunde, NPS/GCNP
Ruth Lambert, GCMRC
Mike Liszewski, GCMRC

Ted Melis, GCMRC
Mary Orton, Mary Orton Company
Andre Potochnik, GCRG
Barbara Ralston, GCMRC
Ted Rampton, UAMPS/CREDA

Recorder: Linda Whetton, USBR

Meeting Opening and Administrative Items

Dec. 8, 2000: Convened: 8:10

WELCOME AND ADMINISTRATIVE:

The Chairperson welcomed the TWG members, alternates, and guests. All introduced themselves. The Chairperson determined there was a quorum established. Attendance Sheets were distributed (Attachment 1)

The Chairperson said he would suspend the agenda and continue the discussion from yesterday.

Management Objectives. Mary commented that there were some great discussions yesterday and reminded the TWG that they are providing input to the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning. She said there was a group that worked late last night and would like to present something on the riparian goals.

Barry said the group talked about the MOs and the difficulty in filling out the tables. They thought it would be useful to develop a context to look at the goals. He passed out a "Draft Narrative of Desired Future Resource Conditions" (Attachment 25). He suggested that a small group be put together to flesh this out and add to the package at a later date.

People interested in participating in this process:

Randy Peterson
Barry Gold
Norm Henderson
Rick Johnson
Cliff Barrett
Andre Potochnik
Dennis Kubly
Nancy Coulam

Mary said that the TWG must have something to send to the AMWG on Tuesday. If the sticking point is the target, she suggested they agree on the wording of the MO and leave the target blank. She advised going through the MOs quickly and identifying which ones need more discussion and that the ones with just a concern on targets be left to the end. She suggested the following priorities: power,

riparian vegetation, and the remaining MOs.

Cliff said the power goal was rewritten and now includes six MOs; some they were doing under the existing ROD and some new ones.

The members continued reviewing the MOs and identified some of the bigger issues requiring more discussion. (Refer to Attachment 24).

LSSF Presentation. Barry Gold cautioned that the information he will be presenting should be treated as preliminary (Attachment 26).

The GCMRC is in the process of preparing a bibliography of all the reports that have come in under the GCMRC tenure. It should be completed within the next few weeks and mailed out. He would like to start a series of technical presentations so people can get up to speed on the information.

Barry also reported that there has been a lot of interest in the SWCA Report on Endangered Fish Flows which was used as the basis for designing the LSSF test. The report has undergone a peer review with no substantive changes made. They need to get the contractor to move it from a Final Draft to Final. He hopes to get that mailed as soon as possible.

B.O. Amendment for KAS in Arizona

Dennis Kubly asked how many people understood what incidental take is as determined by the Fish and Wildlife Service. He read a portion of the law: "Incidental take is defined as take that is incidental to and not the purpose of carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of Section 7(b)(4) and 7(o)(2) taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered to be prohibited under the Act provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental statement." So the amount of incidental take is the estimate by the FWS of that take that would be an incident of the proposed action. In the case of the Kanab ambersnail in 1996, the FWS estimated there would 10%. His understanding was that the 10% was not a biological impact they were assessing, it was the amount of habitat that would be lost from the proposed action. The reasonable and prudent measures were the measures the Service assigned that needed to be accomplished in order to minimize the take as they are required to do under the Endangered Species Act. There is a whole lot more that is legal than biological in that determination. He thinks the Kanab ambersnail expert panel really took it as a biological statement rather than a legal statement. In their amendment to the 1995 biological opinion dated July 12, 2000, the Service acknowledges that the 10% level of incidental take given in the 1995 biological opinion could be revised. The flow of 45,000 cfs, one in every five years on average, as included in the Preferred Alternative would have likely always taken more than 10% of the habitat. A better estimate would have been somewhere between

14%, the actual take, and 17% the estimated take. Those are just differences in what was actually measured while people were down there and what was later estimated. For the flow of 45,000 cfs, the 25,000 cfs level is important because vegetation continues to encroach on down the side of the Vaseys Paradise talus slope if flows don't rise and remove it. Given that the 10% incidental take figures should be reassessed to more accurately represent the stage discharge relationship with the beach habitat building of the preferred alternative, the reasonable and prudent measures and associated terms and conditions require that the 10% figures exceeded should also be reassessed. So there are two steps: 1) revise the incidental take, the percentage of habitat expected to be taken under the Preferred Alternative, and 2) change the associated reasonable and prudent measures. The table provided shows you that the change in incidental take has been to raise it from 10% to 17%, the new estimate of 45,000, and that reasonable and prudent measure #2, which required establishing or finding a second population before another beach habitat-building flow, has been deleted. In terms of effects, there was no jeopardy that was called on the 45,000 at 10% and the Service would anticipate no change in that determination in an ensuing event at the same level as 17%. Dennis said he would provide a copy of the FWS memo dated July 12, 2000, Subject: Biological Opinion Amendment for Kanab ambersnail in Arizona (Attachment 27) and requested that it be sent to the members as well as posted to the Bureau of Reclamation web site.

Action: Linda will send the memo to the TWG and also post on the Bureau of Reclamation web site.

Meeting Review:

Positive

Negative

focus on technical issues
people remained civil
took time to understand
open discussion

tough to finish
unrealistic expectations (agenda)
handouts somewhat confusing
time management -> finish each item sequentially
philosophy discussion first
MO materials weren't coordinated
outside help on scientific leadership
use conceptual model, w/narrative
frame issues on paper

Future Agenda Items:

1. Agenda items not presented at today's meeting may be e-mailed/faxed to TWG members, depending on need. Some items may be presented at the next TWG meeting.
2. LSSF test results

Adjourned at: 12:15 p.m.

General Key to Adaptive Management Program Acronyms

ADWR - Arizona Department of Water Resources	KAS - Kanab ambersnail (endangered native snail)
AF - Acre Feet	KAWG - Kanab Ambersnail Work Group
AGFD - Arizona Game & Fish Department	LCR - Little Colorado River
AGU - American Geophysical Union	LCRMCP: Little Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program
AMP - Adaptive Management Program	MAF - Million Acre Feet
AMWG - Adaptive Management Work Group	MA - Management Action
AOP - Annual Operating Plan	MO - Management Objective
BA - Biological Assessment	NAAO - Native American Affairs Office
BE - Biological Evaluation	NAU - Northern Arizona University (Flagstaff, AZ)
BHBF - Beach/Habitat-Building Flow	NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act
BHMF - Beach/Habitat Maintenance Flow	NGS - National Geodetic Survey
BHTF - Beach/Habitat Test Flow	NHPA - National Historical Preservation Act
BIA - Bureau of Indian Affairs	NPS - National Park Service
BO - Biological Opinion	NRC - National Research Council
BOR - Bureau of Reclamation	NWS - National Weather Service
CAPA - Central Arizona Project Assn.	O&M - Operations & Maintenance (USBR funding)
cfs - cubic feet per second	PA - Programmatic Agreement
CRBC - Colorado River Board of California	PEP - Protocol Evaluation Panel
CRCN - Colorado River Commission of Nevada	Powerplant Capacity - 31,000 cfs
CREDA - Colorado River Energy Distributors Assn.	Reclamation - United States Bureau of Reclamation
CRSP - Colorado River Storage Project	RFP - Request For Proposals
CWCB - Colorado Water Conservation Board	RPA - Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
DBMS - Data Base Management System	SAB - Science Advisory Board
DOI - Department of the Interior	Secretary(ies) - Secretary of the Interior
EA - Environmental Assessment	SWCA - Steven W. Carothers Associates
EIS - Final Environmental Impact Statement	TCD - Temperature Control Device (for Glen Canyon Dam water releases)
ESA - Endangered Species Act	TCP - Traditional Cultural Property
FACA - Federal Advisory Committee Act	TES - Threatened and Endangered Species
FEIS - Final Environmental Impact Statement	TWG - Glen Canyon Technical Work Group (a subcommittee of the AMWG)
FRN - Federal Register Notice	UCR - Upper Colorado Region (of the USBR)
FWS - United States Fish & Wildlife Service	UCRC - Upper Colorado River Commission
FY - Fiscal Year (Oct 1 to Sept 30 each year)	UDWR - Utah Division of Water Resources
GCD - Glen Canyon Dam	USBR - United States Bureau of Reclamation
GCMRC - Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center	USFWS - United States Fish & Wildlife Service
GCNP - Grand Canyon National Park	USGS - United States Geological Survey
GCNRA - Glen Canyon National Recreation Area	WAPA - Western Area Power Administration
GCPA - Grand Canyon Protection Act	WY - Water Year (a calendar year)
HBC - Humpback Chub (endangered native fish)	
HMF - Habitat Maintenance Flow	
HPP - Historic Preservation Plan	
IEDA - Irrigation and Electrical Districts Association of Arizona	
IN - Information Need (stakeholder)	
IT - Information Technology (GCMRC program)	