

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group
Agenda Item Information
December 5-6, 2006

Agenda Item

FY08 Budget Development

Action Requested

- √ Feedback requested from AMWG members.
The specific feedback requested is detailed in the “Background Information” section, below.

Presenters

Dennis Kubly, Chair, Technical Work Group (TWG) Budget Ad Hoc Group; Chief, Adaptive Management Group, Upper Colorado Region, Bureau of Reclamation
Kurt Dongoske, TWG Chair

Previous Action Taken

- √ By AMWG:
AMWG passed the following motion on August 10, 2004 by consensus:
To adopt TWG-recommended budget process, adding an annual priority-setting session by AMWG, and adding an interim step of review and feedback on the budget and workplan by AMWG before approval of the budget.

Relevant Science

- √ N/A

Background Information

√ Background information for this agenda item is as follows:
The budget process adopted by AMWG in August 2004 called for a two-year budget and workplan, and presumed that the Core Monitoring Plan and Long-Term Experimental Plan would serve as foundation documents for development of the biennial budget and workplan. FY 2007 and a large part of FY 2008 will be spent in completing environmental compliance for the Long-Term Experimental Plan considered for adoption in a Record of Decision. The FY 2007 budget and workplan were recommended by AMWG for adoption with the understanding that this year would be a transitional year for the GCDAMP.

Given that implementation of the Long-Term Experimental Plan likely will not ensue in FY 2008, the question arises as to whether an annual budget and workplan should again be developed for that year, which would mean that FY 2009-2010 would be the first years for the biennial budget and workplan. Does the AMWG agree that should be the case?

Secondly, the AMWG identified five priorities for the program in August 2004. The questions pertaining to those priorities (listed below in order of priority) have been used in development of budgets and workplans since that time. Does the AMWG agree that these same priorities should be used by TWG and GCMRC to develop the FY 2008 budget and workplan?

AMWG Priorities, adopted at the Priority-Setting Workshop in August 2004:

1. Why are the humpback chub not thriving, and what can we do about it? How many humpback chub are there and how are they doing?
2. Which cultural resources, including TCPs, are within the APE, which should we treat, and how do we best protect them? What are the status and trends of cultural resources and what are the agents of deterioration?
3. What is the best flow regime?
4. What is the impact of sediment loss and what should we do about it?
5. What will happen when we test or implement the TCD? How should it be operated? Are safeguards needed for management?

Thirdly, the AMWG requested in 2004 that there be a meeting to discuss a draft budget and workplan, in advance of the meeting at which the budget is adopted. Does the AMWG still believe that this meeting is necessary and do they desire to have a draft budget and workplan available for discussion at their next meeting?

