

Budget Flip Charts

Actual expenditure column in the budget table

Concern over terrestrial monitoring trips respecting tribal needs during trips

Terrestrial monitoring – budget decrease

In past, most tribal logistics were in PA budget. \$15K barely pays for the trip, but no analysis.

Hopi, Navajo, Paiute tend to take separate trips – integrating terrestrial monitoring by tribes with GCMRC transition from PA → terrestrial monitoring

Compliance = NEPA & ESA personnel. If not needed, can carry over.

Need to plan ahead on NEPA and ESA compliance – not let it hold up the process

TWG needs to give direction to PA

GRCA monitoring - GRCA can't do it for \$170K – take it out of GLCA and NN treatment to keep NPS monitoring whole

Intent of cultural monitoring is to ID sites that do not need monitoring to re-program \$ to treatment

Treatment plan should be throughout the river corridor.

More substance on impact of potential cuts

PA Group cannot make recommendation before 7/7/03. See comment in PA section.

Don't want to see treatment \$ going away.

Is it the PA's responsibility or TWG responsibility to make decision on budget?

Purpose of GLCA/NN treatment plan and some implementation – BOR's goal is to have a plan and begin implementation in 2004 compliance with NHPA – original was \$200K

Plan would include a site-by-site analysis and recommendation for action.

Data analysis and field work to maintain integrity of the program (pg. 3, A1)

B1 – Aquatic FB Monitoring – in house and cooperative agreement with NAU (combination)

Denny – in-house work won't continue

Lake Powell not in budget – funded by BOR – since part of the plan, should be part of the budget (ditto KAS taxonomy)

D4 – consolidation of salary to this line from other eliminated line

How much of other agencies' expenditures and work should be show in budget and work plan?

(D5) AMWG public outreach part of a BOR person (public affairs) – not NPS - concern it won't get done. → full-time person?

Hire someone on contract to get the word out on the program (D5).

B2 - \$856K should be higher to cover downstream of Diamond Creek - cut of \$36K, understates reality

C6 – schedule in work plan was not updated – hard to evaluate budget. Recommend it be dropped until processing catches up.

F6 – Aerial photography – consider reprogramming some of this line (may replace some labor-intensive river trips)

Should salaries be included in line items?

Need accounting for GCMRC personnel costs.

Replacement power costs - should be included (need # from Clayton Palmer)

Core monitoring costs – program needs to be agreed to.