

Glen Canyon Dam Technical Work Group
Meeting Minutes
June 30, 2003

Conducting: Randall Peterson, Acting Chairperson

Facilitator: Mary Orton

FINAL

Committee Members Present:

Mary Barger, WAPA
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Tribe
Wayne Cook, UCRC
Cole Crocker-Bedford, NPS/GRCA
Jonathan Damp, Pueblo of Zuni
William Davis, CREDA
Brenda Drye, So. Paiute Consortium
Norm Henderson, NPS
Amy Heuslein, BIA

Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers
Matt Kaplinski, GCRG
Robert King, UDWR
Dennis Kubly, USBR
Bill Persons, AGFD
Nikolai Ramsey, Grand Canyon Trust
D. Randolph Seaholm, CWCB
Mark Steffen, Federation of Fly Fishers
Michael Yeatts, The Hopi Tribe

Committee Members Absent:

Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
Perri Benemelis, ADWR
Christopher Harris, CRB/CA
Lloyd Greiner, UAMPS

Phillip Lehr, Colo. River Commission/NV
Don Metz, USFWS
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office
John Whipple, NM Interstate Stream Comm.

Alternates Present:

Wayne Cook
Wayne Cook
Glen Knowles

For:

John Whipple, NM Interstate Stream Comm.
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office
Don Metz, USFWS

Interested Persons:

Diane Austin, Univ. of Arizona
Gary Burton, WAPA
Nancy Coulam, USBR
Helen Fairley, USGS/GCMRC
Denny Fenn, USGS/GCMRC
Steve Gloss, USGS/GCMRC
Josh Korman (Presenter)
Lisa Leap, NPS/GLCA
Mike Liszewski, USGS/GCMRC

Jeff Lovich, USGS/GCMRC
Ted Melis, USGS/GCMRC
Steve Mietz, USGS/GCMRC
Fred Niles, private consultant
Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company
Chris Updike, NAU-CSE, USGS/GCMRC
Larry Stevens, GCWC

Recorder: Linda Whetton, USBR

Meeting Opening and Administrative Items

Convened: 9:35 a.m.

Welcome and Administrative Items: Randy Peterson acted as chairperson in Kurt Dongoske's absence. Randy welcomed the TWG members, alternates, and guests. All introduced themselves. A quorum was established and attendance sheets (***Attachment 1***) were distributed.

1. **Nomination of New TWG Chairperson.** Randy advised the TWG members that since this is the last TWG meeting of the fiscal year, a new chairperson will need to be selected. He asked the members to consider whether they would like to volunteer for the assignment or nominate someone and be ready to vote at tomorrow's meeting.

2. **New Deputy Center Director.** Denny Fenn introduced Dr. Jeff Lovich who will be the new Deputy Center Director at the Southwest Biological Science Center. His primary responsibility will be to serve as the Field Station Leader for the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center. Jeff was recently acting Director of the U.S. Geological Survey's Western Ecological Research Center in Sacramento, California.

Jeff said he is looking forward to getting to know the TWG members. He is impressed with the complexity of the program and the diversity of the representatives. He has a Ph.D. in Ecology and is excited about being part of an interdisciplinary group, particularly within the GCMRC, to address complex issues. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Georgia and spent six years at the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory in South Carolina where he did a lot of work with freshwater turtles. Freshwater ecology has always been his passion. He has also conducted research on desert tortoises and desert ecology in southern California. He feels working at the GCMRC will be a good place for him to combine his knowledge of freshwater ecology with desert ecology.

3. **New Cultural Resources Program Manager at GCMRC.** Denny also introduced Helen Fairley, who replaced Ruth Lambert. Helen said she is looking forward to working with the TWG.

Review of Action Items from May 28 & 30, 2003, meeting. All items were completed. Reminder: Any additional comments on the Tribal Consultation Plan are due to Loretta Jackson by close of business today.

Review of Minutes from May 28 & 30, 2003, meeting. Pending some minor edits and without objection, the minutes were approved.

Humpback Chub Ad Hoc Group (HBC AHG) Update – Steve Gloss said the HBC AHG has met once and held several conference calls since the last TWG meeting. The discussions have been largely devoted to prioritizing the list of 21 projects that were presented at the last TWG meeting. They have made some reasonable progress but he doesn't think the group has achieved consensus. Bill Davis added that the AMWG charge is not clear to them and they wonder if they should be spending a lot of time prioritizing or sequencing projects. Dennis Kubly also said the group's unity in seeking a comprehensive plan has been negatively impacted. They were closer together in terms of what they agreed to a month ago than where they are now because people have different perspectives of what fits into "comprehensive" and what fits into "in and out" of the AMP.

Steve said that part of AMWG's agenda in their early motion was the pursuit and development of a captive breeding/refugia population for humpback chub. There wasn't perfect agreement on what that actually meant but one of the things GCMRC did was to commission a feasibility report. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service undertook the assignment and submitted a draft feasibility study dealing with augmentation, captive breeding, and some conservation of genetics and hatchery. GCMRC received the

report around May 15 and have done an internal review. The report (**Attachment 2**) is good but a little lengthy and requires some editorial changes. It was sent to the TWG and the HBC AHG for review. GCMRC received comments from the Arizona Game and Fish Department and Grand Canyon Trust. It was sent back to the USFWS for revision and GCMRC will also be sending it out for external review. It should be finalized in November 2003 and will be included in the January 2004 AMWG pre-meeting packet.

ACTION: Linda will e-mail the web page address of the FWS Feasibility Report to the TWG.

Upper Basin Recovery Program and GCD AMP. Steve said there has been continuing dialogue between the Upper Basin Recovery Program and the GCMRC (representing the AMP) on how they do population estimates and estimate recruitment and mortality. In the last 3-4 years they have consistently been using a stock assessment approach. They are typically using single mark recapture population estimates or three-pass mark recapture population estimates, and so forth. GCMRC has been working with Upper Basin Recovery staff for the last year in a series of meetings and discussion groups, etc., in an effort to reach resolution for using the different techniques. While they have made some progress, they haven't achieved that resolution. He mentioned one of the HBC AHG's projects is called Concurrent Little Colorado River/mainstem population estimates. It was added as a means to complement and resolve the issue of whether there is a need to measure population abundance of HBC in the mainstem Colorado River while at the same time doing principle stock assessment population estimates in the LCR proper. They feel the stock assessment approach is needed because the population probably exhibits more movement and seasonal behavior patterns than some of the other populations in the Colorado River Basin and that sampling in the Little Colorado River really represents the majority of the whole population at least during the spring.

Steve said Tom Czapl of the Upper Basin Recovery Program wrote a letter to the HBC AHG about a month ago in which he advocated super imposing some of the draft population estimate procedures on the GCD AMP. Last week the HBC AHG agreed the issue should be remanded to AMWG's Science Advisory Board. The SAB would be asked to evaluate the various approaches currently in place with those being recommended by GCMRC and the Upper Basin Recovery Program. If AMWG concurs with the recommendation, the SAB would institute the review in the fall so that results would be available to the AMWG at their January 2004 meeting. Steve said the HBC AHG would also like concurrence and a recommendation from the TWG that this is an appropriate way to start resolving similar issues between the two programs. In a conference call with Tom and other key individuals, Steve said he also agreed with the independent review approach. The feeling was that the SAB, in which there are only one or two people with fishery expertise, would probably invite an outside expert panel. He recommends it be comprised of people outside the Colorado River Basin who have expertise in these areas but have no direct experience. Dennis said Tom Czapl of Region 6 seemed agreeable with the work going forward during his attendance at HBC AHG meetings and it would be beneficial if the TWG were willing to add their concurrence to the HBC AHG's decision.

MOTION: Recommend to AMWG that the issue of coordinating draft population estimate procedures between the Upper Basin Recovery Program and the AMP be remanded to AMWG's Science Advisory Board.

Motion seconded.

Discussion.

Voting: Unanimous

Motion passed.

Pam said she generally dislikes being given a presentation in general and then being asked to vote on specific concurrence. She asked that next time language be provided from the ad hoc group.

Meeting Announcement. Steve said the presentation Lew Coggins made to the HBC AHG regarding a proposed change to the mechanical removal non-native fish control project will be given again at the Holiday Inn Hotel at 6:30 tonight.

Ad Hoc Committee for What's In and Out (AHCIO) Report. Randy Seaholm said the charge from the AMWG to the TWG was to review the AHCIO Report and make recommendations to the AMWG for action. Randy Seaholm said at the last meeting the TWG had received a report from the AHCIO (**Attachment 3a**) stating they had reached resolution on all items except 2.6.1. The issue on 2.6.1 was who has the authority to determine what a viable population is. Attached to the cover memo was a discussion of that issue between Pam Hyde and Randy Seaholm. Randy took the position that it should be the responsibility of either the State or the National Park Service while Pam said it was within the scope and authority of the Adaptive Management Program to make the determination. Randy also had a concern with the cost involved in determining a viable population. If it comes down to taking GCMRC data and describing the status and trends and as long as there is a stable population that is not declining and perhaps improving, then no further action would be needed.

Mary Orton reminded the TWG that the AMWG has approved the vision, mission, goals, and management objectives for the Strategic Plan. They are now working on the Information Needs (INs). The Research INs (RIN) have been drafted and the TWG has reviewed and modified them, and has put them in sequence order. (The Core Monitoring Information Needs [CMINs] were not sequenced per direction from AMWG because core monitoring needs to be done and it is not a question of sequencing.) The TWG has transmitted the amended RINs in sequence order to AMWG, but recommended that they not be adopted until the AHCIO finished its work. AMWG agreed.

In January the AMWG charged the AHCIO to do two things: (1) Apply criteria to determine what Information Needs are inappropriate for inclusion in the Strategic Plan. These criteria, approved by AMWG are: if it contributes nothing to achieving the vision and mission, or if it describes how an agency should develop information instead of what information is needed. (2) Place the Information Needs into one of three categories of funding and responsibility. The categories are (a) Information Needs that are appropriate for funding by power revenues and for accomplishment by the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC), (b) Information Needs that may be addressed by the GCMRC but are not appropriate for funding by power revenues, and (c) Information Needs that are funded and accomplished under the authority of an entity other than the GCMRC.

Mary reported that the AHCIO has accomplished the tasks given them by AMWG, with one exception: they haven't been able to agree on a category for IN 2.6.1.

At the last TWG meeting, Mary pointed out all the modifications to the INs including the establishment of a new principle in lieu of an RIN. Mary said that at the end of that meeting there wasn't a quorum so no action was taken. AMWG is specifically requested a recommendation from the TWG. Mary suggested the TWG tell the AHCIO what the issues and concerns are with the report and also address 2.6.1. Comments were captured on Flip Charts (**Attachment 3b**)

The Chairman said there would be a document included in the AMWG meeting packet which would summarize today's discussion on the AHCIO report. He asked Mary to prepare the document and to have the AHCIO review it before sending it to the AMWG.

ACTION: Mary Orton will prepare a paper for the AMWG summarizing the TWG's discussion on the AHCIO Report.

Budget AHG Update - Dennis Kubly directed the members to look at the revised budget (**Attachment 4a**, dated 6/28/03) with what was sent out in the TWG meeting packet (**Attachment 4b**) and noted the

positive difference of about \$245,000 between available funds and proposed spending. In the Budget AHG's deliberations, they considered the options for using the surplus funds:

1. Treat the \$245K as a contingency fund. They didn't know if the appropriations would come through for the experimental flows. (Denny Fenn joined the call midway and said that the commitment made by USGS was going to be adhered to and the funding would be available.)
2. Reallocate dollars from proposed cuts back to the projects and that the discussion at the TWG meeting would center on how much goes back to each of those projects, or
3. Recognize the priority concerns for humpback chub – move those dollars toward HBC projects proposed by the HBC AHG.

The Budget AHG agreed that the most expedient and highest priority portion of the budget was the HBC work. However, Dennis said he wanted to speak briefly to one item that is in the Programmatic Agreement segment on page 2. The proposal is to reduce the monitoring being done by Glen Canyon and Grand Canyon by 15% and to place \$100K in the development of a treatment plan for Glen Canyon and Navajo Nation lands. The thought being treatments should begin closest to the dam and closest to the water, because that is where the dam most likely has effects on cultural resources. The Budget AHC heard from some PA members that they didn't have adequate time to discuss the budget changes and requested they be able to take the bottom line and decide among themselves what the most appropriate way to divide those funds. In the new version, the following comment was added: "Division of funds among activities 1-5 will be decided by PA signatories by July 7, 2003." That date was given to GCMRC so they would have sufficient time to incorporate the changes and include with the AMWG mailing on July 11.

He reviewed some of the changes made to the HBC section of budget:

- ID 1 – This was previously listed as \$120K. In the last HBC AHG meeting, the FWS identified that amount was well in excess of what was needed. It was decided that \$16,800 would be enough to do the work. Steve Gloss called Rob Simmonds and the FWS has agreed to fund that effort.
- ID 9 – The HBC AHG agreed that the first part of that which concentrates on the impact of the scientific investigations occurring in Grand Canyon should go forward and so \$10,600 has been allocated.
- ID 13 – This is important in that baseline information is needed prior to the TCD beginning in 2005.
- ID 15 – The HBC AHG agreed to move \$50K into the development of a comprehensive plan for how to monitor parasites and diseases and investigation for control.
- ID 17 – The largest change advocated by the HBC AHG was for \$250K:
 - \$50K for the expert panel workshop that would be convened in autumn to discuss population estimation techniques used in the Upper and Lower Basins, with feedback to be provided by the end of the year.
 - \$200K would be held as a placeholder for mainstem HBC monitoring until the workshop and science advisors' review had occurred.
- ID 19 – This hasn't been developed in the Upper Basin but a recovery implementation program would look at the genetics of humpback chub in the Grand Canyon and its geographic range, stocking procedures, procedures for fish removal, and FWS policies on holding fish. There are a number of elements under the genetics management plan. While all aren't specific to genetics, all are important to any decisions that would be made on augmentation and propagation.

Bill Persons would like to see some type of formal paired comparison process whereby each project could be ranked against all the other projects.

FY 2004 Budget (cont.) – Randy asked if there were any comments on the basic structure of the table. Cole said he had a problem with how the items at the bottom of page 5 were broken out. He asked why items 6 and 10 needed to be broken out at the bottom. Randy said projects 6 and 10 were moved down below the subtotal and identified as separate funding by either USBR or NPS appropriations. Randy said it probably makes sense to keep them identified in the main body and note the funding is through perhaps some separate appropriations.

Randy said he would propose that this is how the budget would be prepared for the future. In working with Denny, they feel this format is a lot clearer. While it will be tricky to identify who is bringing dollars to the table and under what authorities, everyone can get a sense of how the program is going to accomplish the objectives of the GCPA, ESA, NEPA, etc. Comments were recorded on Flip Charts (***Attachment 4c***).

USBR Activities

Program Administration. Randy reviewed the USBR portion of the budget and said the FY 2004 costs were reduced by 15%. In doing so, Reclamation will need to look for other sources of funding in order to continue doing AMP work. Randy said the travel reimbursement portion of the budget needed to be adjusted. Randy introduced the 2004 budget by noting the increased need for funding due to both HBC and experimental flows activities. As a result, spending in most program areas was needed to be reduced in 2004. Generally, Reclamation's costs are quite a bit less than the whole reimbursement for AMWG and TWG but the sum total of reimbursement is about right. Randy reminded the members to be careful with their travel expenses and said Reclamation staff have stopped getting rental cars and thereby saving approximately \$60 a day.

Tribal Consultation. In reducing the tribal consultation costs for FY04, Reclamation transferred the involvement of the tribes on the river trips into some of the monitoring activities of GCMRC. Tribal involvement will need to be more tightly coordinated with the GCMRC river trips.

Brenda commented that this is the last year for monitoring. They tried seven years ago to join with different trips. She asked how the people on the trips were going to respect their ways and have patience with their tribal elders, allowing them to stop at places to say their prayers, and conduct sacred ceremonies at various sites. Denny said it wasn't their intention to depreciate the purposes for those trips or to impose on their privacy but try to accommodate the budget pressures they are facing.

Programmatic Agreement. Randy said that a 15% cut was also applied to these activities. It was his understanding there was a tradeoff between some of the treatment plan efforts of ID 5 vs. some of the monitoring costs identified in 3 and 4. Randy asked if the TWG wanted to discuss or let the PA signatories address this issue.

Cole said that Grand Canyon doesn't feel it can handle another reduction. Over the years inflation has contributed to the loss of monies and Cole doesn't feel they can go down to \$170K and still do the required work. He had proposed during the Budget AHG conference call keeping the GRCA and GLCA amounts as they are and taking money from the Glen Canyon and Navajo Nation treatment plan. Cole said from Grand Canyon's perspective the treatment plan to be developed should be a river-long plan. Lisa Leap tried to arrange a meeting with the PA signatories prior to today's meeting but was unable to do so. Mary Barger said that during the Budget AHG conference call, she asked the PA Group for information on proposed PA activities. Nancy Coulam said the proposal in the FY 2001 original budget reflected that a treatment and mitigation plan would be ready in 2004 after the PEP was completed. It would be both a plan and implementation of as much of that plan as could be accomplished in that fiscal year. They are a little bit behind that schedule but Reclamation's goal, as the agency that is responsible to bring the signatories to resolution of adverse effect, is to have a treatment plan and start implementing

it in FY 2004. Initially they had budgeted \$200K so they have actually taken a 50% cut on what Reclamation needs to do to be in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act. Jonathan Damp said that every archaeological site is going to be different and \$100K could buy a lot or a little. He suggested using the figure of \$25K for a week of field work, times 4-6 weeks, followed up by write-up and analysis work.

USGS Activities

Experimental Flows. Denny said the total funding they are recommending for next year is \$2,538,000. This is based on having sediment inputs and doing the experimental flow. They did not get the sediment trigger this year and the experimental flow wasn't done. He referred to page 6, line item #2, and stated the carry over is \$780,000. About 75% of the carry over is coming from the experimental flow portion of this year's funding that wasn't expended. The current budget expects the experimental high flow will be done next year.

GCMRC Annual Operating Budget. Denny said he received a number of comments after the last TWG meeting and has incorporated all the changes into the current document. He reviewed some of the changes:

ID #	CHANGE
A3	Recommended it be zeroed out in FY04 so \$69K was eliminated.
A4	Recommended it be zeroed out in FY so \$113K was eliminated.
A6	Had planned on investing \$25K in that project. This was integrated into the IT database so it is now pretty close to being on-line through a contract with NAU and won't require additional funding.
A7	This was a mistake in the last budget. It was funded by USGS appropriations and funds moved to B2.
B5	Non-native and native species effort has been eliminated. This was recorded twice in the budget in two different places. It is also under Experimental Flows where it was supposed to be. We did not need that \$77K. They eliminated that one.
B6	Found a way to fund that in FY03 with some re-programmed funds and so that has been accomplished.
D1	Have zeroed out the Unsolicited Proposals.
D2	May find another way to cover any requests that come in.
D3	Propose to eliminate for this year per comments received at the last meeting.
D5	Will be accomplished with existing agency budgets rather than GCRMC paying for that this year.
D6	Eliminated the \$11K and moved that funding up to C1. It turns out that a number of the cultural resource things are being done in that category already.
D7	Have zeroed out as well. It will be covered by the \$459K under C1.
E1	Have reduced by moving direct charges to indirect payments.
F6	\$150K is a real reduction in efforts. May be able to do every other year. FYI: During the Memorial Day overflights there was a glitch with the contractor's camera so no data was collected.

Available Funds. Denny referred to page 6 and said that the \$945,000 breaks down as follows: \$95K is USGS' portion for tribal participation plus \$850K which is the remainder from \$1 million in appropriations after the cost center overhead is subtracted.

Denny said he was in Washington last week and asked USGS Director Chip Groat whether the AMP would receive the \$1 million in Appropriations. Director Groat said the money would be coming. Denny said the money could come from two possible sources: (1) the \$1 million for DOI science support that is in the western region portion of the USGS budget before the Congress. The House Appropriations Committee marked up the budget last week and left that money in. The Senate is supposed to do their mark up during the week of July 7. Theoretically if it survives in the House and Senate, it's close to guaranteed. (2) This is one of three items Chip made a commitment on so Denny feels Chip will live up to that commitment so even if Congress doesn't appropriate the \$1 million, he will take the money off the top of the USGS' \$900+ million budget before he appropriates the money out to the field offices.

Denny said one of the comments from the previous meeting was to provide the salary information. He distributed copies of the GCMRC Salary Worksheet and the FY 2004 Salary Projections (**Attachment 4d**). He also distributed copies of a redline/strikeout version of changes made to the GCMRC FY04 work plan (**Attachment 4e**).

Randy advised the TWG to review the budget and cautioned that tomorrow would be their last opportunity to comment on it. If the AMWG doesn't make a recommendation to the Secretary, then the Federal agencies will be forced to determine how the money will be spent.

Long-range Planning – Steve said this was a follow-up to a workshop held before the last TWG meeting. It's a process to get the TWG and AMWG involved in a long-range experimental program and some planning for it. He said the reason they are doing this came from an AMWG motion made approximately 14 months ago that led to the current suite of experimental flows. GCMRC was directed, in consultation with the TWG and the science advisors, to develop an experimental plan for long-term implementation. They feel the multi-attribute trade-off analysis (MATA) process is the appropriate way to do that. Steve gave a PowerPoint presentation. (**Attachment 5**).

Trade-off Analysis - Josh Korman distributed copies of the "Summary of Results from GCD AMP TWG Multi-Attribute Evaluation Workshop" Report (**Attachment 6a**). This was a process which attempted to quantify the AMP objectives. There are series of stakeholder objectives and information needs but they could use better definition and they need to account for some of the trade-offs that will inherently occur under some of the experimental options. He said the idea was to get an understanding of the stakeholder values and priorities and to identify areas where they can agree on certain outcomes.

Comments:

- The management options are going to have direct, measurable impacts on the aquatic foodbase and that should be taken into consideration. (Steffen)
- Need a bridge such as an ad hoc group. Charge for the group: Define the end points and flow options as well. (Kubly)
- Need to add some end points for riparian. (Cook)
- To use only peregrine falcon as the only attribute on the riparian wildlife is over generalizing and suggest there is some way to find a vegetative attribute that could complement the peregrine falcon in concert with these aspects. (Hyde)
- Consider the physical (availability for electricity) and financial (the cost for doing so) elements of the power issue. (Davis)
- Legal concerns: Law of the River, CRSP, GCPA, etc.
- Add OHWZ, NHWZ, Marsh/spring (Kaplinski)
- Include cultural aspects for the end points. (Yeatts)

Josh said he could work with a few ad hoc groups to define end points and flow options. Josh said it would probably take two days to do the end points and flow options. Josh and his new group could then work on the consequence table prior to another workshop.

Dennis said in terms of a timeline, the AMWG needs to hear a presentation in August and make a decision on whether they would support this. He questioned how far along the TWG needs to be to make a presentation to the AMWG. There was general feeling among the TWG members that they were ready to go forward with a presentation to the AMWG. Josh will follow up with the ad hoc groups.

Adjourned: 5 p.m.

Glen Canyon Dam Technical Work Group
Meeting Minutes
July 1, 2003

Conducting: Randall Peterson, Acting Chairperson
Facilitator: Mary Orton

FINAL

Committee Members Present:

Mary Barger, WAPA
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Tribe
Wayne Cook, UCRC
Cole Crocker-Bedford, NPS/GRCA
Jonathan Damp, Pueblo of Zuni
William Davis, CREDA
Brenda Drye, So. Paiute Consortium
Norm Henderson, NPS
Amy Heuslein, BIA

Pamela Hyde, Southwest Rivers
Matt Kaplinski, GCRG
Robert King, UDWR
Dennis Kubly, USBR
Bill Persons, AGFD
D. Randolph Seaholm, CWCB
Mark Steffen, Federation of Flyfishers
Michael Yeatts, The Hopi Tribe

Committee Members Absent:

Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
Perri Benemelis, ADWR
Christopher Harris, CRB/CA
Lloyd Greiner, UAMPS
Phillip Lehr, Colo. River Commission/NV

Don Metz, USFWS
Nikolai Ramsey, Grand Canyon Trust
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office
John Whipple, NM Interstate Stream Comm.

Alternates Present:

Wayne Cook
Wayne Cook
Glen Knowles

For:

John Whipple, NM Interstate Stream Comm.
John Shields, WY State Engineer's Office
Don Metz, USFWS

Interested Persons:

Gary Burton, WAPA
Nancy Coulam, USBR
Helen Fairley, USGS/GCMRC
Denny Fenn, USGS/GCMRC
Steve Gloss, USGS/GCMRC
Lisa Leap, NPS/GLCA
Mike Liszewski, USGS/GCMRC

Jeff Lovich, USGS/GCMRC
Ted Melis, USGS/GCMRC
Steve Mietz, USGS/GCMRC
Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company
Chris Updike, NAU-CSE, USGS/GCMRC
Larry Stevens, GCWC

Recorder: Linda Whetton, USBR

Meeting Opening and Administrative Items

Convened: 8:03 a.m.

Welcome and Administrative Items: Randy welcomed the TWG members, alternates, and guests.

Election TWG Chairperson – Randy asked if there were any nominations for the TWG Chairperson or if there were any TWG members or alternates who wanted to volunteer for the job. There were no volunteers. Randy said someone could be hired to do the job, use staff from a TWG member organization and alter the operating procedures, or use Mary Orton as the TWG Chair. Mary said whether she should serve as TWG chair depended on the TWG's preference on the roles of the chairperson and facilitator.

Norm Henderson said he may be able to do the job but wouldn't know until the end of July. He also suggested he could possibly serve as a co-chair with Dennis Kubly.

ACTION: Norm Henderson will get back to the TWG by the end of July on whether he can assume the role of the new TWG Chair.

Mechanical Removal – Steve Gloss said he wanted to talk about a proposed modification to the non-native fish mechanical removal portion of the current experimental flows project that is underway. He said that when the original proposal was made, GCMRC wanted to conduct six electrofishing trips in each of the next two years starting in January 2003. Three of those would be in mid-winter, early spring (Jan-Feb-Mar), and three would occur in Jul-Aug-Sep. They have a control section upstream of the LCR reach but the primary target area is a 10-mile stretch that encompasses the confluence of the LCR and the mainstem about 5 miles above and 5 miles below that confluence. They do electrofishing for ten nights in that reach, make five complete passes through that reach, and remove all the non-native fish they catch. The project had three primary purposes:

1. to better understand the potential efficacy of the electrofishing removal technique,
2. to conduct a complete diet analysis of the non-native fishes, primarily rainbow trout and brown trout, and
3. to do a comprehensive analysis of the incidence of predation of those non-native species on native fish.

GCMRC completed three trips which resulted in the removal of about 88% of what they determined was the original abundance of non-native fish in the 10-mile study reach. They estimate that after the next trip, which launches around July 15, they will have achieved greater than a 90% reduction of non-native fishes for that reach of the river. He continued with a PowerPoint presentation (***Attachment 7a***).

They are now proposing an extension of the downstream removal area by a distance of about 7 miles. When small humpback chub come out of the Little Colorado River, they almost always completely move downstream. Lew Coggins and Mike Yard made a reasonable proposal (***Attachment 7b***) but it is still very demanding, takes a lot of people, and is fairly expensive. They are spending approximately \$600,000 this year and next year on this project. They continually deplete the fish in the reach which they estimated in their original abundance was about 7,000 rainbow and brown trout and that's perhaps as little as 10% of what some earlier estimates from the program and from Arizona Game and Fish Department had been so the densities were perhaps lower than what they were thought to be. They now have an opportunity to enlarge the downstream control area to effectively create more than a doubling of potentially available improved habitat conditions. This may increase the likelihood that they will see more recruitment from humpback chub. They should be able to detect through monitoring the change in recruitment. If there is about a 50% increase in recruitment in humpback chub. They think this is the most effective way to increase the strength of this treatment in reducing the non-native predators in the

system. They propose to implement this by conducting their normal proposed electrofishing operation in the control reach and the 10-mile range around the LCR during July 2003. If their expectations are met, that will result in over a 90% reduction from the original numbers of fish that they encountered in January. They would then propose in August-Sep and continuing throughout the year to reduce the next 7 miles down to the same level of non-native abundance (a 90% or greater reduction in non-native fishes throughout that entire reach). On subsequent trips they would systematically electrofish and check abundance in randomly selected areas throughout the entire reach and then selectively fish in areas where fish (RBT and BT) appear to be in greater abundance. The goal would be to attain and sustain a 90% reduction in non-native fishes throughout that reach.

There are a number of things that need to be done to allow the change in the program to happen. They have had conversations with representatives of all the tribes and the tribes are not opposed to this action. They have also begun reinitiation of consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act with the FWS so they can get a new Biological Opinion that would accommodate the change. They will probably encounter few humpback chub in part of this reach and there will be less incidental take of chub. They have also initiated a modification of the permit process with NPS. They are working with Reclamation to prepare an amendment to the Environmental Assessment to comply with NEPA and they have applied for a modified collecting permit from AGFD for the rest of 2003 to cover the Aug-Sep trips.

Lew Coggins and Mike Yard made a presentation on the proposed change to the HBC AHG about two weeks ago. The HBC AHG has endorsed the project and would like the TWG to make a recommendation to the AMWG supporting the change.

MOTION: TWG recommends approval to the AMWG of the proposed modification for the mechanical removal project.

Motion seconded.

Comments:

- Future press releases need to accurately reflect the numbers of trout in the Grand Canyon. (Steffen)
- Since this effort relates to the existing budget, would like AMWG to consider the expansion. (Seaholm)
- When the presentation is made to the AMWG, would advocate that it be done in a way that ties the HBC comprehensive plan projects including NPS control of non-natives in tributaries to this as part of the comprehensive strategy so that the AMWG doesn't see it as just a project. It's a project that is part of a strategy. (Kubly)

Steve said that when Lew and Mike made the presentation to the HBC AHG, Bruce Taubert (AGFD) became aware of the proposal and wrote a letter to Michael Gabaldon, the Secretary's Designee for the AMWG, reminding him that the AMP is required to report to the AMWG every 6 months on the outcomes of the experimental flows, etc., and asked that this mechanical removal modification not go forward without AMWG's approval. Steve said that presents a logistical and timing dilemma for GCRM. The next trip launches on July 16 and the following trip launches on August 13, which is the first day of the next AMWG meeting. They think it would be a little presumptuous on their part to put that trip on the water and then call in by satellite phone to report at the AMWG meeting. They would like to find a mechanism to either engage AMWG before that date or they will have to move that trip back several days and that has a confounding effect of beginning to compromise their tentative agreement with the NPS to respect the non-motorized season which begins on Sept. 15.

Bill Persons explained that Bruce Taubert wanted this brought to the AMWG because GCRM had achieved its objective of removing the fish and he thought there might be the potential to save \$200K

and re-program the money for other work. Bruce wanted the AMWG to be aware of that before moving forward.

Steve said GCMRC needs to do the trips regardless of the way they are done. They think it will be much more cost effective to expand the treatment area downstream and show a positive impact on HBC and probably not a cost effective expenditure to do electrofishing in this study area and so may realize some cost savings. It might be \$50K.

Wayne reiterated how critical it was to have the issue brought before the AMWG prior to the meeting on August 13. In order to do this, he suggested the AMWG hold a conference call. He suggested Reclamation prepare a Federal Register Notice. He advised the TWG members to brief their AMWG members on the issue so they are prepared to vote during the conference call.

Dennis suggested that perhaps the three Federal action agencies could call Bruce and talk with him about the difference between 2003 and 2004 funding, and that the AMWG could meet in August to consider modifications to this proposal for 2004. If Bruce would agree to the 2003 activities, which would be Jul-Aug-Sep trips, they could proceed under the existing budget that has been agreed to. If he didn't agree, then Reclamation would proceed with scheduling the conference call.

Voting results: Yes = 14 No = 0 Abstaining = 3

Motion passed.

Comments:

Randy Seaholm (abstaining): I would just like to observe that for the 2003 budget, I think it's appropriate for AMWG to consider the expansion of what gets accomplished. From a long-term perspective, I think we would prefer to see the mechanical as part of the comprehensive plan for humpback chub and handled in a different manner but I think that since this relates to the existing budget, I would just like to see AMWG address the expansion.

Mark Steffen (abstaining): I didn't vote no because I have a lot of respect for Lew Coggins particularly. I think Lew is doing a terrific job under very difficult circumstances. I also have a lot of respect for this group and I think I understand the motivations and the intentions behind this. However, I do think this group runs the risk of appearing, with the expansion of this project, to be vindictive and even sadistic.

Bill Persons (abstaining): No comment.

ACTION: The three Federal action agencies (USBR, USGS, NPS) will call Bruce Taubert to discuss his concerns for the proposed mechanical removal modification work.

ACTION: Reclamation will start the Federal Register process announcing the conference call and inform the AMWG accordingly. Reclamation will also send an e-mail to the AMWG to get a sense of their comfort level.

FY 2004 Budget – Randy suggested the TWG document their requests for future budget presentations. He asked for suggestions on how to make the review process more effective and efficient. The Budget Ad Hoc Group could be tasked to design a timeline and a list of products to be in place prior to any TWG budget discussions in an effort to expedite the review/recommendation process.

Products Needed:

- Work Plan – updated with budget table
- Show actual expenditures from previous years (most recent available)
- Show current year budget
- Show year of multi-year projects (in work plan currently?) – on table
- Response to comments table

- Ad hoc groups should have first input to applicable sections of the budget
- Recognition of others agencies' work in Grand Canyon (needs guidelines)
- Other agencies' work
 - incorporate results
 - perhaps as a footnote with approximate amounts
 - up to agencies to transmit data
 - dollar amount may be less important than project descriptions
- Tag the core monitoring vs. research line-by-line
- More information on impacts of increases/cuts – impacts on future science and management
- Make spreadsheets available in digital form (on website)
- Add IN number and sequence order to each line -> put in Work Plan
- Add breakdown of personnel costs to each line – could be separate document or in work plan
- Need a way to adjust the budget mid-year → task for the Budget AHG
- GCMRC to begin 2005 budget immediately
- PA Group to send budget to USBR and USGS/GCMRC

Randy requested that if anyone was going to suggest an increase in one area, they would need to identify a decrease in another area. Changes were captured in a separate budget table (**Attachment 8**).

Moving to a discussion of the 2004 budget, Randy said in looking at the proposed cuts, they fall into categories related to the humpback chub comprehensive effort or channel mapping and aerial photography. He asked if anyone felt the humpback chub activities should be reduced. The supermajority of the group felt it was important to support the humpback chub activities. This resulted in \$290,000 to allocate among program activities. Randy asked Denny and the GCRMC program managers to take a first shot at what they would recommend as being the most important projects that should be funded with this money.

The GCMRC proposed the following:

- Restore the \$36,000 cuts to the downstream monitoring plus add \$49,000 to extend the monitoring down in the 50-mile stretch (\$85,000 total).
- Add \$40,000 back to the C2 for fine sediment stream flow to restore the Glen Canyon and Diamond Creek gauges.
- Fund the two PEPs (recreation and economics).
- Restore the \$15,000 for logistical support for each of the tribal outreach efforts on the river.
- Take the balance of the \$40,000 and put that into a public outreach effort for the HBC effort, which is half of what the HBC AHG recommended (\$85K).

Proposed Changes:

ID #	Description	+ (added)	ID#	Description	- (subtracted)
B2	Native fish downstream monitoring	\$85,000	C6	Channel Mapping	\$90,000
C2	Fine Sediment	\$40,000	E6	Aerial Photography (1 flight)	\$200,000
	New 2 PEPs (recreation & economics)	\$50,000			
B1 Pg 1	Tribal Outreach River trip logistics	\$75,000			
HBC 18	Public Outreach For AMP in general	\$40,000			
	Total	\$290,000		Total	\$290,000

Additional Comments/Proposed Changes:

- Cutting remote sensing trips eliminates evaluation of technology (canyon wide digital)
 - Keep original GCMRC proposal
- Erosion prediction model (Joel Pederson presentation) – consider funding this = \$80K
- Reduce B1-5 by \$30K, replace in GRCA monitoring and remediation
- Obtain BioWest data before doing anymore sampling of Diamond Creek
- Public Outreach – hire a Public Information Officer, use existing PIOs, or hire a company to develop a plan. Need to identify all aspects of public outreach (include tribal efforts).

MOTION: Accept the changes GCMRC has recommended in the budget.

Motion seconded.

The TWG continued to discuss and suggested the following **changes**:

ID #	Description	+	ID#	Description	-
B2	Native fish downstream monitoring including downstream of Diamond Creek	\$85,000 \$100,000	C6	Channel Mapping	\$90,000
C2	Fine Sediment (2 gauges – Diamond Creek and GLCA)	\$40,000 \$25,000	E6	Aerial Photography (1 flight)	\$200,000
	New 2 PEPs (recreation & economics)	\$50,000			
B1 Pg 1	Tribal Outreach River trip logistics	\$75,000 \$45,000			
HBC 18	Public Outreach For AMP in general	\$40,000 \$70,000			
	Total	\$290,000		Total	\$290,000

Voting results: Yes = 11 No = 6 Abstaining = 1
 Motion passed.

Noting that the TWG Operating Procedures call for the members to seek consensus, Randy asked if there were any simple fixes to gain more support for the above changes. Dennis said he would vote for the motion if the GLCA gauge was removed. Wayne Cook and Mary Barger said they would change their votes as well. Randy asked if the TWG wanted to entertain another motion. Pam suggested that the voting results be provided to the AMWG with a note stating that the TWG could not agree on whether to fund the GLCA gauge or apply the \$15K to native fish downstream monitoring

MOTION: Move to reduce the fine sediment funding to \$25,000 and increase the native fish downstream monitoring to \$100,000.

Motion seconded.

Voting results: Yes = 14 No = 2 Abstaining = 1
 Motion passed.

Norm asked what they just voted on. He thought it was for a change in the proposal, not as the overall budget. Norm said he would not vote with the elimination of aerial photography and feels it is a critical component of the program. Cole said he thought they were voting on the entire budget. As such, the voting results were changed to:

Yes = 12 No = 4 Abstaining = 1

The TWG continued to discuss the tribal river trips – how many, how much do they cost, their priority in the AMP budget, etc. Jonathan Damp recommended the issue be remanded back to the PA Group and ask them to have some discussion on where the dollars are going and what is being accomplished and then look at other alternatives.

Randy said because there was some confusion on what the members were voting on, he suggested throwing out the previous motions and voting on the budget with some amendments. Steve suggested there be a vote on the amendments and then a vote on the overall budget. Wayne felt it was a cleaner process and concurred.

Jonathan reiterated that the TWG needs to look at the justification for how the cultural resources are going to be treated and he doesn't think it is going to happen by July 7. He thinks it is a long-term process and would be better addressed in next year's budget. He feels the TWG should approve what's in the budget now and then look at it over a long-term period, integrating GCMRC, NPS, and others' participation and come up with a clear consensus on what they (cultural people) want. They need a better justification on priorities.

Public Comment: Lisa Leap said the NPS recommended that \$91,000 go to Aeolian transport, not knowing that NPS monitoring was getting cut about \$30,000 so if they had known that, they would not have recommended \$91,000 going into the Aeolian transports. She would ask GCMRC to give \$30K of the \$91K back. Steve said GCMRC did adhere to their requests and moved money out of two projects up into the projects that support Aeolian work. The cuts to NPS monitoring were recommended in the PA area and did not come from GCMRC.

Mike Liszewski said he didn't think that cultural resources should be taking a hit every time. For example, the GIS database has had money taken away from it. He feels that plans need to be developed on how the data is going to be presented before funding discussions are started.

Randy suggested the way to resolve the confusion was to throw out the previous motions and vote on the budget as a whole package, the handout from yesterday modified with today's changes.

MOTION: Recommend that AMWG recommend the 2004 budget, including the 6/28/03 budget table, "proposed 2004 budget column," with the following adjustments:

ID #	Description	+ (added)	ID#	Description	- (subtracted)
B2	Native fish downstream monitoring including downstream of Diamond Creek	\$85,000 \$100,000	C6	Channel Mapping	\$90,000
C2	Fine Sediment (USGS gauges)	\$40,000 \$25,000	E6	Aerial Photography (1 flight)	\$200,000
	New 2 PEPs (recreation & economics)	\$50,000			
B1 Pg 1	Tribal Outreach River trip logistics	\$75,000 \$45,000			
HBC 18	Public Outreach - For AMP in general - develop a plan & begin implementation	\$40,000 \$70,000			
	Total	\$290,000		Total	\$290,000

Motion seconded.

Discussion: None

Voting Results: Yes = 15 No = 2 Abstaining = 1

Comments: Randy Seaholm – The reason I voted no because the budget contains some items for the HBC which I believe are not appropriate for the Adaptive Management Program to undertake (HBC items 5, 8, 19).

Future agenda items:

- update on Tribal Consultation Plan
- Reinitiation of SCORE Report
- TCD – planning / compliance
- Report from remote sensing initiative
- BioWest data integration
- Presentation by Steve Wiele on 2-dimensional flow modeling
- MATA workshop
- Status report on Coggins' work – mechanical removal – July and August
- Updates from all ad hoc groups
- Definition of core monitoring
- Vegetation mapping
- Report on NPS non-native fish control

MATA Workshop. There was a brief discussion on when to hold a *standalone* MATA Workshop. It was decided to hold it during the week of September 8-11, 2003. GCRMC will work out the location for the workshop.

Next TWG Meeting:

Wednesday, October 1, 2003 (9:30 a.m. – 5 p.m.)

Thursday, October 2, 2003 (8 a.m. – noon)

Location:

Bureau of Indian Affairs
2 Arizona Center
400 N. 5th Street, 12th Floor
Conference Rooms A&B
Phoenix, Arizona

Meeting adjourned: 12:23 p.m.