

TWG Comments on Strategic Plan Document
Received at the February 13, 2001 Meeting
With Responses from the AMWG Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning

#	TWG Comment	Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) Response
Riparian Issue Paper		
1	Suggest deleting "the" in front of the type of community to indicate preservation of a <u>type</u> of community, not necessarily the community as it exists.	Concur.
2	The definition of "bare sand beach" community is different from mesquite/acacia.	Concur. All community types will be defined in Glossary. (Rick)
3	The phrase "bare sand beach vegetation" is oxymoronic.	We will delete the word "bare."
4	Does "bypasses" (second paragraph, second sentence) refer to total flow?	Yes. This now reads, "The resultant high releases ..."
5	Will issue papers be a part of the Strategic Plan?	Yes.
6	In the last sentence, the phrase, "the level at which the OHWZ is retained ... could vary:" does this mean it changes?	That is the hypothesis. It may be difficult to protect it where it is, and it may thrive at a lower stage level. The priority is the community, not the level.
7	<p>The Stevens, Kearsley paper moves away from NHWZ/OHWZ verbiage - should we adopt the new terms?</p> <p>If this is adopted, make consistent throughout the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>We should be consistent in our terms throughout all our documents. Support considering a change.</p> <p>The terms OHWZ/NHWZ should not be mixed with the term "bare sand beach."</p>	<p>The AHC decided not to adopt the new terminology at this time. However, they will describe the Stevens, Kearsley community types and provide a cross-reference with the current classifications in the glossary.</p>
Goal 6: Riparian and Spring Communities		
8	<p>MO 6.1, Place</p> <p>This ignores valuable habitat below Separation Canyon. Eliminate the redlined note.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This only excludes what is underwater. ▪ Riparian vegetation still exists and persists even when it is under water. <p>Does this conflict with the MSCP area – water level at 1229?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No, they have similar goals. ▪ We cannot affect Lake Mead levels. - 1996 flood did affect this area at RM 254. <p>The AMP should not stop at Separation Canyon.</p>	<p>The AHC clarified that the addition of the redlined words, "and above Lake Mead's dynamic water level," refers to the current water level. This was clarified to read, "CRE below GCD and above Lake Mead's <u>dynamic water level as it fluctuates due to Hoover Dam operations.</u>"</p>
9	<p>MO 6.1, Place</p> <p>Are we implying that if Lake Mead's water level is down, we will take a management action for the vegetation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no mandate to save this vegetation. ▪ We are just including this in the pool of what we consider. It is not a mandate. 	<p>The AMWG may decide to recommend management actions for any place within the CRE.</p>

#	TWG Comment	Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) Response
1 0	MO 6.1, Place We should address the reality of Lake Mead fluctuations, and define the vegetation as above Lake Mead water level. The current CRE definition is to the western-most boundary of GRCA – should we limit it to above water level?	See response to comment #8.
1 1	MO 6.1, Place Both the MSCP and the AMP now address this area.	Concur. The two programs may complement each other.
1 2	6.3, Qualitative Target, "... no loss of area." What is our ability to control this as it migrates? Is this achievable? Would it be better to say "no loss of species?" Suggest "no loss of native plant or animal species" to substitute for "no loss of area."	The AHC believes this is an achievable target. Principle 8 guides us if an MO is not achievable. The AHC decided not to change the qualitative target for abundance. However, they added "Target is no loss of native plant or animal species" to the MO on composition.
1 3	6.2, Patch Number and Distribution, Qualitative Target I am nervous about 1984 as the low point.	The AHC concurs with the current target. However, it was clarified to read: "The target is to allow for scouring of NHWZ vegetation to 1984 levels for patch number and distribution, and then allow its return through successional processes."
Goal 8: Sediment		
1 4	MO 8.3, Place We are missing eddy storage below 8000 cfs. There should be one MO for eddies < 8000 cfs, and one for eddies 8-25,000, to be consistent with MOs 8.1 and 8.2. ▪ Or, "eddies below 25,000" 8-25K = sandbars; 8K stored below low water level 8-25K form backwaters	Place was changed to "Eddies <u>below</u> 25,000."
Goal 9: Recreation		
1 5	MO 9.2, Comment What would be the purpose of the non-native fishing policy?	Currently, concessioners are not permitted to market fishing trips below Lees Ferry. Fishing can only be incidental to a river trip. The current contracts expire in a couple of years. A new policy to benefit native fish may include fishing as a marketed trip, and may include a catch-and-release prohibition for non-native fish.
1 6	MO 9.3, Quality, Target Level Where did the 8% slope come from?	This is a definition from Lisa Kearsley's research from 1992 to 1996.
1 7	MO 9.3, Distribution, Critical Reaches, Target Level Where did the target come from?	Grand Canyon River Guides counted beaches in the critical reaches in the year 2000.
1 8	MO 9.3, Distribution, Critical Reaches, Target Level Can we achieve this target?	These beaches exist already, and they have been persistent locations for sand deposition over time.
1 9	MO 9.3, Distribution, Critical Reaches Glen Canyon is not included in the specified critical reaches – should this be considered? (Kearsley did not consider this area. Her work focused on areas downstream of Lees Ferry.) ▪ How much need is there?	No critical reaches have been identified by Glen Canyon in this reach.

Goal 10: Power		
20	MOs 10.2 and 10.3 The two sets of emergency criteria should be defined.	Concur. The AHC will add these to the Glossary. (Randy)
21	MO 10.4 Regulation is the system's automatic capacity to fluctuate. ▪ This definition should be added to the Glossary.	Concur. The AHC will add a definition to the Glossary. (Clayton)
Goal 11: Cultural Resources		
22	MO 11.3, Qualitative Target This should be written in the positive instead of the negative: the AMP wants to allow, provide, be good for ...	Target was changed to: "The target is to provide meaningful consultation on AMP activities that might restrict or block access by Native American religious practitioners."
Goal 12: Adaptive Management Program		
23	MO 12.5, Attribute Should be modified to add the word "tribal:" effective <u>tribal</u> consultation.	Concur.
24	MO 12.5, Comment Change "government to government" to "tribal." This should be retained as "government to government."	We retained the use of "government to government."
25	MO 12.5, Footnote What is meant by "traditional western scientific approach"?	This points out the distinction between scientific methods whose results are intended to be independent of the observer <i>versus</i> a more subjective approach that is dependent on the observer, the particular tribe, and tribal values.
26	MO 12.6, Footnote The end of the third line should be changed to read "... conduct monitoring <u>and research</u> activities."	Concur.
27	MO 12.7, Qualitative Target How do financial exception criteria fit in here?	This is designed to answer the following question: If there were releases exceeding the ROD for financial reasons, what would be the result? This qualitative target presents a list of potential flows needing experimentation, not a mandated list. The AHC added the word "flows" for clarity.
28	MO 12.7, Qualitative Target Financial exception criteria flows should not be an experiment. It cannot be planned for in an experimental manner.	The AHC believes that the types of flows anticipated under financial exception criteria could be experimentally tested.
29	MO 12.8, Current Level Suggest adding "fishing regulations" and "among others."	"Fishing regulations" was added.
Overall		
30	In several of the previous responses to comments, the AHC indicated that the PEP would review certain issues. How will that intent to review be indicated in the final Strategic Plan?	Intent to review by PEP will not be indicated at each management objective in the Strategic Plan. However, information from the PEPs can be added to the Strategic Plan as it becomes available. GCMRC should extract all references of requests for information from the comments-and-responses tables and forward them to the PEP.