

TECHNICAL WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS

NEW ASSIGNMENTS (Sept. 27-28, 2004):

Date	Assignment	Status / Updates
9/27	Any comments on the Draft TWG Minutes from the June 30-July 1, 2004, meeting, need to be provided to Linda by October 8, 2004.	No comments received.
9/27	Based on the outcome of the PA Meeting to be held on 9/29/04, Mike Berry will report back to the TWG on any resolution for getting GIS data layer information shared between USGS (GCMRC), USBR, and NPS. Ken McMullen may be able to resolve the NPS concerns. If the issue cannot be resolved, then the TWG will send a recommendation to the AMWG on how they it could be resolved. Norm will send an e-mail message to the TWG on any further action required.	Mike continues to work with the individuals involved in resolving this issue.
9/27	Minutes from the Cultural Resource/Research Design Ad Hoc group (CRDAHG) meeting will be sent to Linda Whetton so she can capture any additional action items.	No comments received.
9/27	GCMRC will develop a process, a schedule, and a recommended budget for suppression and control of non-native fish (warm water species) to be presented to AMWG at their October meeting.	
9/27	The TWG will review the MLFF White Paper and provide comments to Ted Melis by October 15, 2004.	
9/27	The TWG will provide comments on the Draft Core Monitoring Plan to Jeff Lovich by October 15, 2004.	
9/27	Dennis will send out an e-mail message tomorrow (9/28) and get the next LTEP AHG meeting scheduled.	Done. An LTEP meeting was held on 12/7.
9/27	Jeff Lovich will make a presentation to the AMWG in October on the projects TWG approved for deferral from FY04 to FY05.	

CONTINUING ASSIGNMENTS:

Date	Assignment	Status
6/30/04	Jeff Lovich will visit with persons drafting the protocol for dissemination of reports to see if he can influence the direction of the protocol.	
6/30/04	TWG members should give Norm feedback on this issue. He will make it part of the report to the AMWG	
6/30/04	Jeff Lovich will read through the documents and send out a timeline for next meeting of CMAHG.	
6/30/04	USBR, NPS, and GCMRC to work out GIS data layer issues and report back to TWG at the next meeting (9/27/04).	Mike reported there is no data sharing between individuals. They have their own 97K line with data they know to be inaccurate at precise locations. Grand Canyon has been doing additional work but they don't know what they've been doing. Helen said that as far as cultural data, they don't have any at this time. Mike said that the lower level of squabbling, it needs to be kicked upstairs on data sharing. Helen said she has requested on a couple of occasions from Lisa Leap said she would provide site data information and yet haven't received anything to date. Mike has recommended as a long-term solution to this problem is that they need a common server shared by GCMRC, BOR, and NPS so that when people update a record, everyone gets that information. Mike said it is a relatively easy IT problem but the problem

		<p>doesn't exist at the IT level but rather on the cooperation level and that has to get resolved or the program is going nowhere. Helen said she put in requests to get the monitoring data. Lisa said she would share site information on the polygons but she couldn't provide it right away and far as monitoring, she wasn't willing to share that information. She was asking for the raw data. Based on the outcome of the PA Meeting to be held on 9/29/04, Mike Berry will report on any resolution for getting GIS data layer information shared between USGS (GCMRC), USBR, and NPS. Ken McMullen may be able to resolve the NPS concerns. If not, the issue will be forwarded to the AMWG for resolution at a higher level. Dennis said that the TWG needs to make recommendations to the AMWG on how we solve problems and not lay problems at their feet. He advocated that if anything is going to be forwarded to the AMWG that they be in the form of alternatives to resolution of the problem. Mike will report back to Norm and Dennis following the meeting. Norm will send an e-mail to the TWG on what action is to be taken.</p>
	<p>(Continuing) Bill Persons and GCMRC will provide an update on the metrics and management objectives for the Lee's Ferry trout fishery at the June/July 2004 meeting and lead the TWG to looking at the bigger issue (updating management objectives).</p>	<p>Done. Presentation made on 9/27/04.</p>
	<p>(Continuing) Mary Barger will provide updates on the HBC Genetics Management Plan at upcoming TWG meetings</p>	<p>Update: Bob Muth says it's a work in progress. It's on their schedule but no time frame at this time – probably six months out. 9/27/04: Norm said he spoke with Bob Muth and they are planning to get the report completed by the end of the calendar year.</p>
	<p>(Continuing) Glen Knowles will track the status of the Willow Beach Genetics Assessment and provide copies of that report upon completion.</p>	<p>Update: Work continues. Will have something for the January 2005 meeting. 9/27/04: Glen said this has been derailed slightly. He received an e-mail this morning and apparently the project is on hold until there is some funding or until a new lab person is in place. He needs to get with Manuel who is the hatchery manager and figure out a way to get some funding to them. Dennis asked Glen to refresh people's mind on the importance of the plan. Glen said it will tell us what the fish in Willow Beach hatchery are. There are some 100-150 humpback chub on station and this analysis will tell us what those fish represent in terms of what we know about the genetics of the species and it should dove-tail very nicely in the work that Douglasses are doing at Colorado State. The Douglasses research is a genetics picture of the entire species in the upper and lower basin and this work is specifically to look at the genetic makeup of the fish that were on station at Willow Beach. It could potentially tell us in light of what the Douglas' findings are is whether or not we already have a refugium population. It's kind of small number. Generally 500 is a number people talk about in terms of creating a refugia but if they're relatively homogenous as a species, perhaps we already have a refugia in place.</p>
	<p>(Continuing) GCMRC (Ted Melis) will endeavor to provide copies of the HBC Genetics report being done by Mike and Marlis Douglas. GMCRC will provide copies of the draft report by July 31, 2004, or sooner, in order to present to the AMWG at their August 9-10, 2004, meeting.</p>	<p>Update: Ted is hopeful they will have a draft by July. They will send it out for review and then share it with the TWG. 9/27/04: Barbara Ralston reported that the Douglas' project is scheduled to be completed in December</p>

		<p>with a final report by January 2005. They are hesitant to provide some preliminary details because they're dealing with an endangered species so they would just as soon wait until they have their final analysis finished before they provide any preliminary results. Ted said that typically their protocol for reporting before the final is that there is a preliminary presentation made to the TWG so he suggested that the Douglas' should make a presentation at the next TWG meeting prior to finalization of the report in January.</p>
	<p>GCMRC (Ted Melis) will endeavor to provide copies of the Feasibility Assessment on Augmentation and Refugia and provide copies of the report to the TWG upon completion, and to the AMWG for their August 9-10, 2004, meeting.</p> <p><u>Update: 5/3/04:</u> Bruce Taubert indicated on the Science Advisors' river trip that he would be willing to provide money to conduct a feasibility assessment for growout ponds in terraces above the Little Colorado River. Bill Persons will get an official statement from Bruce on what he committed to do and report back at the next TWG meeting.</p>	<p>Done. Sam Spiller gave PPT presentation on 9/28/04. Update:</p> <p>Bill Persons provided a copy of an e-mail message from Bruce Taubert. In it, Bruce stated that he "agreed to conduct an evaluation of the hatcheries to determine which ones, if any, met the dictates that the Service set out in their document."</p>
	<p>GCMRC and USBR will develop a visual matrix or flow chart that explains how the Long Term Experimental Plan, the Core Monitoring Plan, the AMP Strategic Plan, etc. fit together and present at the next TWG Meeting.</p>	<p>9/27/04: Dennis said the science advisors are going to be holding a meeting on integration of the plans but we would have it done prior to that meeting. He thinks the meeting will be held later this fall.</p>
	<p>Reclamation (Dennis Kubly) will confer with the Secretary's Designee (Michael Gabaldon) on the projects TWG approved for deferral from FY04 to FY05 per GCMRC's recommendations to see how they should be handled.</p>	<p>Done. Dennis spoke with Mike Gabaldon. The vote on deferrals was unclear. Reading minutes, it was unclear there was not consensus on them. Mike wanted to know what the vote was. Mike asked that the TWG discuss. When the AMWG passes a budget, it is passed down to the implementers, so if there are deviations, they should come back from the implementers to the AMWG.</p> <p>NEW ACTION: Jeff will present at the next AMWG meeting (October 2004).</p> <p>9/27/04: Dennis said this issue wasn't put on the next AMWG meeting agenda. Norm advised it should be prepared for the March 2005 AMWG meeting.</p>