

## FY 2004 Budget – Increase/Decrease Table

(p:\amp\twg\mtgs\03jun30\budget inc-dec tbl.doc)

#	+	-	Comments
1		HBC 5 \$25,000	Should be part of the HBC comprehensive plan, not AMP funding
2		HBC 8 \$50,000	Should be part of the HBC comprehensive plan, not AMP funding
3		HBC 19 \$40,000	Should be part of the HBC comprehensive plan, not AMP funding. → absent a recovery plan, AMP is only source.
4	A1, p3 \$100,000 (Terr. Mon.)  \$100,000 (Exp. Flows)	E6, p4 \$200,00	Aerial photography to experimental flows and terrestrial monitoring – only monitoring should be covered. Not clear the need of the other dollars. Wait for results before testing new methodology. Experimental flows now covered 100%. Should be contingency or project specific. → GCMRC hoped to link to core monitoring need with remote sensing solution. Need to run ground and remote concurrently to test. → Value of aerial photography. → Recommend any new dollars to terrestrial monitoring go to tribal participation.
5	B2, p 3 replace? Status and trends of DS fish C5, p 3 replace? control network redirect to processing data	C6, p3 \$90,000 (non-pers. Costs)	Channel mapping – gyro compass → was to support model research – to enhance predictive capability → bottleneck of getting data to modelers could go to status & trends of downstream fish could go to control network
6	PA 3, p2 \$40,000	HBC 19 Genetics Mgmt Plan \$40,000	remedial action AND monitoring in GRCA Sites are being monitored on 41 sites/year (cont) with additional funding, \$50-60K of NPS funds will follow. → object to cutting genetics – can't contemplate translocation without it. → Genetics is critical but not tied to dam operations. → USGS - \$1M could pay for this → 2001 Appropriations bill makes ESA issues payable with power revenues
7	HBC 18, p 5 \$15-20,000		15-20K into development of public outreach plan – one-time cost
8	Recreational PEP \$15,000		Recreational PEP – has never been done PEP on how to do economic analysis 1-3 Need discussion/decision on whether AMP is right place for HBC comprehensive plan (vs. RIP)
9	Economic Analysis PEP \$15,000		
10	HBC 13 \ \$50,000 HBC 18 /	HBC 8 \$50,000	GCMRC responsible to do Diamond Creek monitoring – move \$ from public outreach - HBC felt the work below Diamond Creek could be delayed – needs to be coordinated with MSCP and that work is not possible - MSCP will work primarily below Hoover Dam
11	C2, p3 GCD Gauge \$15,000		Need to keep gauge in Glen Canyon – upper 15 miles → can get hydrograph from dam releases → won't be finely tuned → impact on foodbase, YOY → data should be available via telephone → SCADA data is not available → important to measure at dam → Steve – keep sediment augmentation feasibility on table → include - reduce downstream native fish monitoring downstream of DC reach