

Budget Ad Hoc Group Meeting

9-15-04

Bureau of Reclamation Native American Affairs Office

Phoenix, Arizona

Attendees: Jeff Lovich, Mary Barger, Glen Knowles, Chris Kincaid, JD Kite, Bill Persons, Lew Coggins, Dave and Pam Garrett, Helen Fairley, Norm Henderson, Barb Ralston, Mike Liszewski, and Dennis Kubly

Review of budget process

There will be difficulty in having 06-07 budget and workplan completed by March 05 due to extension of LTER and general planning workload. Potential solutions: develop 06-07 budget with core monitoring portion and OtherR&D components (not LTER) thereof considered “locked in”, but with the long-term experimental plan and related research and development (OtherR&D) portions that are not related to the Core Monitoring Plan “subject to hard review.” The Humpback Chub Comprehensive Plan projects could be divided into these three groups and integrated into the budget accordingly. Budget categories could be Core Monitoring, LTER, and OtherR&D.

*Action: Discuss this concept with TWG Sep 27-28.*

Discussed need for a budget component that looks at the effects of management actions conducted outside the AMP, but often funded by AMP members, on AMP research and monitoring efforts. The integration of these efforts could be initiated at the beginning of the budget process by having them identified to the AMP at the time when BOR, GCMRC, and PA begin formulation of projects. *Action: BAHG recommends to TWG that identification of projects external to the GCDAMP but that would potentially influence GCDAMP activities be initiated for the FY 06-07 budget and that TWG members will bring forth information on their agency projects for that purpose to the BAHG early in their budget and workplan development cycle. This is intended to result in a more comprehensive and collaborative process for maximizing information gain and exchange.*

How should TWG address the AMWG priorities? *Action: BAHG recommends to TWG that AMWG priorities are addressed by GCMRC assessing percentages of the budget that are being and have been allocated to the priorities identified at the AMWG’s August 2004 workshop. GCMRC will do this analysis for the FY 05 budget and for previous budgets to the extent they have time available. This analysis will be presented to AMWG at their October 2005 meeting and feedback will be requested. Additionally, a comparison will be made of the sequenced RINs and the AMWG priorities (Bill P has agreed to conduct this analysis).* Both of these tasks will be done (at least in draft) for the Sep 27-28 TWG meeting.

Suggested Process and Schedule for FY 06-07 Development:

GCMRC, BOR and PA review previous products and develop draft FY 06-07 budget and workplan—November 17-18, 2004

BAHG receives draft budget and workplan by November 30; meet to revise —December 7-8, 2004; mail to TWG by Dec 20

TWG meeting w/review of draft budget and workplan—January ?? (TBD Sep 27-28; suggest week of Jan 10) 2005

AMWG review w/fiscal and product development reporting for FY 04—February 2005

BAHG review and revision—February 2005

TWG meeting w/review, feedback and recommendation—March (TBD Sep 27-28, 2004; suggest early March) 2005

AMWG meeting w/review and recommendation;—April 2005

AMWG meeting w/update on product development—July 2005

*Action item: BAHG recommends that TWG appoint an ad hoc committee at their Sep 27-28 meeting to identify and carry out the process for developing appropriations requests and recommending them to AMWG at their Oct 25-26 meeting. Both appropriation requests for the President's budget (federal agency) and Congressional markup (non-federal members) will need to be addressed.*

*Action item: BAHG recommends that TWG appoint an ad hoc committee at their Sep 27-28 meeting to develop the 5-year strategic outlook accepted by AMWG at their August 2004 meeting and to identify formation of this group to AMWG at their Oct 25-26, 2004, meeting.*