FLIP CHARTS - MARCH 14, 2001

Flip Chart 1

Goal 8 - MO 8.3 - Place:
(1) Split: 8-25K - "Beachfront property" below 8K   **TO AHC**
   to target the level for monitoring

Goal 6 - Place - drop "as it fluctuates
(2) due to HD drops" - to mean "Full pool" **OKAY AS IS**

(3) Goal 6.2 - Comment - remove "to 1984 levels"   **TO AHC**

MO 9.5 - switch order of attribute and element   **TO AHC**

 (4) - Place - clarify   **TO AHC**

Flip Chart 2

9.5 - Comment - Incompatible with types of beaches in 9.3
(6) types of beaches in 9.3

RESPONSES

(1) ROD allows to 5K - how long this affect 8K?
        - We used 8-265 for margins - for eddies, we felt clear distinction didn't exist
        - Wait to IN phase - split it out then
        - We split everything out with biomass, not necessary to monitor
        8-25 being eroded by water's edge, doesn't happen below 8000

Flip Chart 3

(1) continued
- Does Goal 9 - camping beaches - address this? No.
- If Matt it should be separated, we should follow his advice.

(2) Whether our program overlaps pool of Lake Mead - MSCP folks concerned - governede by court decree - can't manage LM for SWWF habitat
- habitat exposed is important, we don't want to write it off
- recognize overlapping management - effects flow from GCD can have on habitat
use black/white/grey format?

Flip Chart 4

(2) continued

- Don't want to limit - support current language
- MSCP - amend GCPA to take out the overlap between the 2 programs.
- Recognize overlaps in this document
- Up to 1229 - full pool, considering to go to Separation, not GCD
- current language recognizes flexibility

OKAY AS IS

Flip Chart 5

(3) Attempt to provide a bottom limit -
        target still TBD
- Agree - discomfort with ambiguous target - 1984 there because we feel we know what that was, and it is within reason
- "target is at or above 1984"
- 1984 is still an IN -
- Put 1984 in Target Level
- What is high end of range
- "A Guide for IN development " instead of "the target is"

Flip Chart 6

- Question is - What is acceptable for scouring? AHC felt 1984 was acceptable -
- 1984 is qual. level - hasn't been quantified - until quantified, not a target yet
- Why not to level of natural variability?
- MOs aren't fixed - we can revisit. Discomfort going beyond 1984 - more scouring than we're likely to achieve in AMP for a long time.
- 93K in same range as pre-dam

Flip Chart 7

(5) **TO AHC**
- "CRE" within GRCA" and GLCA - Place for MO 9.5
- Glen Canyon has attributes of wilderness, too
- Hualapai Tribe - leave it to the Park
- If they are managing for the attribute - should be included
- Separate MO for GLCA?

(6) Wilderness experience …lack of management - manage for a type of experience for recreational users - jetties, stabilizing walls, etc. - not natural character - beaches are.

Flip Chart 8

Targets will be ranges.
A. IN - what native fish need to survive
Goal 12 - Navajo Nation should not be consulted on Navajo Nation land -

LCR - should be given consent.
Should be consulted on resources outside of Navajo Nation land
Boundary - 1934 Act
N. bound of LCR, south bank of mainstem
"CRE exclusive of tribal lands"
no - Hopi will want to address issues on Navajo Nation land

Flip Chart 9
Goal 12
Goal pt. to indicate difference between "consent" and "consultation" - difficulty with boundary disputes
- focus on how to manage resources
- Sovereign rights must be protected
- Disputed area - edge of river to 1/4 mile from river - rim vs. river
- 1888 San Juan to Colo. River
- Also 1906, 24, 34, Executive Orders and Acts
- Navajo Nation will not stand in way of AMP
- AMP should be sensitive - no work on NN or Hopi Land without permission

AHC COMMENTS ON ABOVE

MO 8.3 - spilt "at some place" to below 5,000 cfs
        between 5,000 and 25,000 cfs

MO 8.2 - Change "place" to from 5,000 to 25,000 cfs

MO 8.1 - Change "place" to below 5,000 cfs

MO 9.5   change "at some place" to 2:
        - CRE in Grand Canyon NP
        - CRE below GCD in Glen Canyon NRA