

## **TWG BUDGET AD HOC GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS ON FY05 BUDGET**

### **Part I. Process/content recommendations to GCMRC, BOR, TWG, & AMWG, and requests for presentations.**

#### **A. BAHG recommendations to GCMRC**

- 1) In general, there needs to be “more meat on the bones” of FY05 work plan project statements. GCMRC will need to have them fleshed out by summer 04 (preferably sooner) before we get into discussion of FY06 budget.
- 2) Experimental Flow Actions, (Lines 54-55 and others): BAHG assumes at least 50% (if not all of the sediment-related project funds in FY04) would not be spent without a sediment trigger and could therefore carry over into FY05. Is this correct? BAHG requests presentation from Ted Melis at January TWG meeting on what amounts of FY04 exp. management actions funding (e.g., lines 54, 55, 58, 59, 69, 71, 74) will be carried over if trigger does not occur in FY04. BAHG would like to see future budgets show figures “with” and “without” experimental components included, so amount of potential carry over money would be clear.
- 3) Mechanical Removal: BAHG would like to see more detailed breakdown of the mechanical removal budget (how many people, schedules/numbers of trips, etc.) and what we are paying for out of that money; however, BAHG recommends continuing this effort in FY05.
- 4) Food Base Initiative: BAHG recommends that GCMRC develop comprehensive, robust monitoring program for primary productivity/food base (esp. in relation to currently changing temps and future TCD) in FY04 for implementation in FY05. BAHG would like to have a presentation on this topic at next TWG if possible, describing where the food base initiative is headed and how all the different food base projects fit together in FY05 budget and beyond.
- 5) RBT Diet and Predation (Lines 67-68): BAHG is uncomfortable with this as currently budget. Several members feel this work needs to be continued in FY05. Results of FY03-04 efforts need to be analyzed and presented to TWG before the end of FY04 so we can be confident that this is good use of funding.
- 6) Status and Trends of LF Trout fishery: BAHG requests that Bill Persons and GCMRC make a presentation to the TWG on the status and future of this effort. (If not snorkeling, then what methods and metrics will be used in the future?)
- 7) Geomorphology Process Model (Line 118): BAHG would like to see the proposal peer-reviewed in FY04 prior to funding it to make sure it will produce the kind of information that will be helpful to the program. Funding this project in FY05 is contingent on results of the peer review.

8) Core Monitoring of Cultural Resources (Line 119): BAHG recommends that a PEP review of the current monitoring program and proposed core monitoring program take place in FY04, by using some of the 135K that was left over from FY04 budget process. This would free up 40K in FY05.

9) GCMRC Admin Costs (Lines 128-130): BAHG requests GCMRC provide more detailed cost breakdowns in work plan for TWG review.

10) DASA Projects (Lines 134-140): BAHG requests presentation to TWG at next meeting on the whole DASA program.

**B. BAHG recommendations to BOR (requests for presentations to the TWG are highlighted in red):**

1) Tribal Consultation (Lines 25-30): BAHG recommends that Bureau of Reclamation defines goals of the tribal consultation explicitly in their co-op agreements with Tribes, with clear objectives, expected outcomes, etc.

2) Tribal River Trips (Lines 31-36): Same general comment as above. BAHG recommends that Bureau of Reclamation defines goals of these river trips explicitly in their co-op agreements with Tribes, with clear objectives and expected outcomes.

BAHG would like a presentation from BOR to the TWG about the tribal participation dollars, what they are used for, what the expected products/outcomes are, etc.

3) All PA projects (Lines 40-50): BAHG requests further clarification and more detailed write up of all the PA projects so we can understand what these projects involve and what the products will be, especially the treatment plans.

BAHG requests BOR make presentation to the TWG on results of January PA group meeting discussion, outlining what has been agreed between NPS, BOR and other PA signatories about future treatment of archaeological resources.

4) Temperature Control Device (Line 161): BAHG requests BOR come to next TWG with a better (more detailed) proposal for how to use these \$\$\$.

**C. BAHG Recommendations to the TWG:**

1) BAHG recommends that TWG reconvene the HBC Ad Hoc committee to determine the leads for the HBC projects and assign responsibilities for completing these projects.

2) BAHG recommends that a discussion of the future budget process be included on next TWG meeting agenda. (see BAHG responses to TWG comments for specific suggestions about the budget process). Larry Stevens has volunteered to lead discussion

#### **D. BAHG Recommendations to AMWG and AMWG Chairman:**

- 1) Tribal Consultation (Lines 23-30): BAHG requests chairman of AMWG to follow up with Secretary of DOI to get 2001 memo reauthorized for funding tribal participation with appropriated \$\$\$ and have her give direction directly to heads of BOR, USGS, FWS, BIA and NPS to fund (\$97,200 each agency) through their appropriations.
- 2) Funding Tribal Proposals: BAHG recommends having a discussion at future about the possibility of developing mechanisms for considering funding proposals from the tribes that are not scientific proposals (public outreach, youth education, etc.)
- 3) Kanab Amber Snail Taxonomy (Lines 87-88): No funding should be coming from AMP for this. If resolution of the taxonomy issue is necessary, this determination should be made by FWS. USGS received a one time appropriation in FY04 of \$88K, which is 20% of what was needed. BAHG recommends that this project be pulled out of the AMP completely in FY05 and the money should be applied by USGS to FWS effort to resolve this issue. AMWG should recommend to Secretary that additional money should be appropriated to resolve the taxonomic status of this species so that exp. high flows (above 42K) can go forward. (\$405K is estimated total cost of resolving this issue, based on proposal received by USGS, so approximately \$320 in additional funds is needed).
- 4) Public Outreach (Line 132): BAHG requests clarification from AMWG about the public outreach program for AMP and process for using or applying for these funds.
- 5) Core Monitoring of Cultural Resources (Line 119): BAHG recommends that a PEP review of the current monitoring program and proposed core monitoring program take place in FY04, by using some of the 135K that was left over from FY04 budget process.

#### **E. Commitment from Budget Ad Hoc Group to itself:**

BAHG will provide clean, clear process direction to GCMRC for developing FY06 budget before that time.

#### **II. Specific funding recommendations and miscellaneous comments from BAHG:**

BOR Admin Costs (lines 2-21). *OK.*

PA projects (see comments under Part 1.B above): BAHG would like to see more detailed descriptions of these projects.

Zuni conservation program (Line 47): BAHG recommends not funding \$10K for check dam work until further clarification is provided by Zuni about the need for this work.

TCP GIS Documentation (Line 48): BAHG recommends cutting TCP GIS documentation project from 150K down to 30K. The 30K should be used by Zuni to pilot this approach.

*PA Project funds not approved: 120K + 10K = \$130K available for other projects.*

### **Experimental Actions**

**Lines 54-55:** (repeats comment in Part I.A above) BAHG assumes at least 50% (if not all of the sediment-related project funds) will not be spent without a sed. trigger and could therefore carry over into FY05. Is this correct? Need Ted Melis to make a presentation at next TWG concerning all the potential carry over funds that will be available if sediment trigger is not reached in FY04.

Line 56: This appears to show up under Line 92 (A.8) as core monitoring in FY05. FY06 money is related to experimental high flow experiment.

Line 57: BAHG does not agree with carrying over FY04 money into 05. If there is anyway to get started on this in FY04, we should do it (high priority to do it now, as a pilot project, to take advantage of current warm water coming from dam to begin establishing monitoring protocols for TCD). We especially need to know if money in lines 56-57 and 92 is sufficient to cover development of pilot project and monitoring for both planned exp and pseudo-temperature control exp. in FY04-05.

Line 58: do we need money in FY05 if high-flow test occurs?

Line 59: BAHG assumes this money would carry forward in FY05 if trigger does not occur. Ask Ted to verify this.

Lines 60: carries forward in FY05? Again, need Ted to verify this.

Lines 61: ditto above (line 60)

Line 62: *OK. This project is completed.*

Lines 63-65: do these go to biennial monitoring? Until exp. flow regime for FY05 is determined, can not be certain this project will need to go forward in FY05. TWG is expected to make recommendation on FY05 flows in conjunction with the FY05 budget.

Line 66: (Repeat of comment in Part I.A above) BAHG would like to see more detailed breakdown of the mechanical removal budget (how many people, schedules/numbers of trips, etc.) and what we are paying for out of that money; however, we recommend continuing this effort in FY05. (See comment from Randy S about future funding of this project in comments table.)

Lines 67-68: Not OK as budgeted. This work needs to be continued in FY05. (Results of FY03-04 efforts need to be analyzed and presented to TWG in FY04 so we can be confident that this is good use of funding).

Line 69: this money will carry forward without trigger.

Line 70: *OK as is.*

Line 71: this money will carry forward without trigger.

*Line 72-73: OK, no conflicts as programmed.*

Line 74: this should be carry forward money, not yearly allocation.

Summary of Exp. Flow money discussion

*Potential Savings: L54=210??? L55=250. L60=10. L74=32. Total potential carry over=\$502K.*

*Potential Needs L54=???? L57=50+. L63=50. L64=125. L65=60. L67=25. L68=25. Total Potential needs related to experimental flows = \$275K+*

Clayton specifically requests that any carry over money from lines 54, 55, 57 gets added to total available for exp. management (line 76) and reallocated by TWG after experimental actions for FY05 has been determined.

### **GCMRC Science Activities**

**\*Line 80:** Need to add a minimum of \$25K for SWWFC monitoring. If we find additional money after budget is completely reviewed, we will revisit this one. Denny will check on status of funding for synthesis of this project.

**Line 81:** No agreement. Leave it? Delete it? Call it public outreach and fund through Public outreach funds? Need more discussion.

**Line 82:** Program should stay but logistical support costs seem high since it is possible to hike to both Vaseys and the upper Elves release site. Could the river trips be eliminated? (This would result in a potential \$57K savings in logistical costs.)

**Line 83:** *OK.*

**Line 84:** *OK.*

**Line 85:** *OK.*

**Line 86:** *OK.*

**Line 87:** (Repeat of comment in Part I.A above): No funding should be coming from AMP. If resolution of the taxonomy issue is necessary, this determination should be made by FWS. AMWG should recommend to Secretary that money should be appropriated to resolve the taxonomic status of this species so that exp. high flows (above 42K) can go forward (\$405K is needed).

**Line 88:** (Repeat of comment in Part I.A above): and see comment for Line 87 above. USGS received a one time appropriation in FY04 of \$88K, which is 20% of what was needed. Request in FY05 was for new AMP money. BAHG recommends that this project be pulled out of the AMP completely in FY05 and applied by USGS to FWS effort to resolve this issue.

**Lines 87-88:** If this project is zeroed out, this will free up \$88 + \$25=\$113K for other AMP projects.

**Line 89:** *OK, project done.* (This was the original Joel Pederson study; it will be completed in Dec. 2003.)

**Lines 92-99:** integrate and address comments from comments table.

**Line 92-99:** Need much more detail in a fleshed out food base proposal.

**Line 93:** *OK (but still need to integrate comments from comment table.)* Bill Davis wants to see monitoring below Diamond Creek be integrated into this project in FY05 (tie lines 93 and 168 together in FY05 budget).

**\*Line 94:** (Repeat of comment in Part I.A above) and see comments in comment table: BAHG requests that Bill Persons and GCMRC make a presentation to the TWG on the status and future of this effort (if not snorkeling, then what methods and metrics will be used in the future?) AZGF thinks that proposed funding may/will be adequate (barely), although with warming water, extra effort and funding would be prudent.

**Line 95:** Bill Davis would like to see nutrient analysis be part of downstream water quality. Wants to see clearer demonstration that PEP recommendations to transition to more downstream monitoring is being implemented.

Line 96: *OK*

Line 97: *OK*

Line 98: *OK*

Line 99: *OK*

Line 102: *NO agreement (MK, LS)*

Line 103: *NO agreement (MK, LS)*

Line 104: *OK for FY05.* But there are questions about what the work plan says (why is money being zeroed out in the fifth and final year; what will become of the synthesis effort if money is eliminated in final year of the co-op agreement?) Bill Davis questions whether frequency should be reduced even further (from every other year to every 5 years)

Line 105: *OK.* Project completed in FY04.

Line 106: “Increase” in FY05 is actually restoring it to pre-FY04 levels. *OK. But this is a possible candidate for deferral in FY05.*

Line107: *OK in FY05 (zero).*

Lines 108-109: *OK, these projects have been completed.*

Line 112: No agreement reached on need to fund unsolicited proposals. More discussion is required.

Line 113: *OK for FY05 (no funding). Should be revisited in FY06.*

Line 114: *Tribal outreach (workshop): Ok. This workshop will be conducted in FY04. No continuation planned.*

Line 115: *OK (zero \$). Cultural Synthesis and Data Report: This project is being deferred indefinitely.*

Line 116: *OK (zero \$). Cultural affiliation study is responsibility of NPS. Project eliminated.*

Line 117: *OK (zero \$). Funding was provided in FY04 for single year workshop/study.*

Line 118: (Repeat of comment in Part I.A above): BAHG would like to see proposal peer-reviewed in FY04 prior to funding it to make sure it will produce the kind of information that will be helpful to the program. FY05 funding should be contingent on results of the peer review.

Line 119: (Repeat of comment in Part I.A above): BAHG recommends that PEP review of monitoring program take place in FY04, by using some of the 135K that was left over from FY04 budget process. This would free up 40K in FY05.

Line 120-121: *OK.*

Lines 128-130: *OK. GCMRC will provide more detailed cost breakdowns for TWG.*

Line 131: *OK.* (Bill Davis wonders if this budget figure will change depending on decisions made about Science Advisors' protocols at the next AMWG meeting.)

Line 132: (Repeat of comment in Part I.D above): BAHG requests clarification from AMWG about the public outreach program for AMP and process for. Larry requests a SCORE report.

134-140: (Repeat of comment in Part I.A above): BAHG requests presentation to TWG at next meeting on the whole DASA program.

Line 140 (A.30.a): the 200K proposed in FY05 (for aerial overflight in FY06) could be deferred. This would free up 200K in FY05.

Line 141: No agreement. (This is a project that could potentially be partially cut to make funding available for other projects.)

#### HBC Actions

Line 156: *OK. (No cost in FY05.) This can be eliminated from future budgets.*

Line 157: *The 40K in FY04 is moved to FY05. This will free up 100K in FY05. Is this a GCMRC responsibility? BAHG recommends that TWG needs to reconvene the HBC Ad Hoc committee to determine the leads for the HBC projects and assign responsibilities for completing these projects.*

Line 160: *OK*

Lines 161: No clear agreement. 50K could potentially be available for other purposes related to the TCD. BOR will come to next TWG with a better proposal for how to use these \$\$\$.

Line 162: more clarification required for FY05 expenditures.

Line 163: *OK. (FY04 money is for feasibility study)*

Line 164: *OK (more money needed?) LS = Make sure the RFP includes review of past handling/impact studies.*

Line 165: *OK. NPS money.*

Line 166-167: *OK. NPS will be funding with CCI money that Park Service received in FY03.*

Line 168-170: *OK. GCMRC will write RFPs in FY04. (Line 170 - see previous comments provided in comment table by Bill Person about showing actual expenditures in FY05, rather than carrying over money from previous year)*

Line 171: *Dependent on peer review outcome and AMWG determination for both FY04 and FY05. Randy S: Didn't AWMG agree to fund this already?*

Line 172: No agreement. Needs more discussion at next TWG meeting.