

TWG Meeting  
April 8-9, 2008

Budget Ad Hoc Report  
FY 2009 Budget Development

Submitted by: Dennis Kubly, Reclamation, Chair

BAHG Members: Bill Persons, Kerry Christensen, Mary Barger, Glen Knowles, Larry Stevens, Norm Henderson, Mike Yeatts, Jan Balsom, Don Ostler, Rick Johnson (Leslie James also has been attending since the retirement of Lloyd Greiner). GCMRC representatives: John Hamill, Ted Melis, Matthew Andersen, and Helen Fairley.

The Budget Ad Hoc Group met by conference call with GCMRC on four occasions to develop the draft FY 2009 budget and workplan: February 5, March 14, March 26, and March 31, 2008. Budget development has been impeded to some extent by necessary efforts to plan and implement the March high flow test. Also, at the time of our first call, the biological opinion and FONSI on Reclamation's proposed 2008-2012 action had not been released. The BAHG realized that there very likely would be compliance requirements in these documents that would affect the 2009 budget, so some deliberations were postponed until those documents were released.

GCMRC's general thoughts on developing the 2009 budget and workplan are contained in Appendix A. They understood that the requirements of biological opinions issued on the 2007 Shortage Criteria and the 2008 High Test Flow and Steady Flow actions would need to be considered in developing the 2009 budget. They also wanted to ensure that these new commitments were incorporated into revision of the Monitoring and Research Plan. Given their busy work schedule and large commitments for 2008, coupled with the pressing budget schedule, the BAHG agreed with GCMRC that an annual budget was most appropriate for 2009.

Input to the BAHG also came from the CRAHG (Appendix B). The CRAHG used Reclamation's proposed draft FY09 budget and GCMRC's FY 08 budget in their process. They identified projects at high, medium and low priorities for funding. The BAHG, however, decided not to prioritize line item projects at this stage of the budget development process.

The BAHG agreed with GCMRC that a line item budget should be provided to the TWG at your April 8-9, 2008, meeting, so that the TWG could review, discuss, and identify areas of priority to be recommended to the AMWG. There will need to be additional deliberations on the draft budget following the AMWG meeting. We anticipate that the next TWG meeting will have on the agenda the development of a 2009 budget and workplan recommendation for AMWG to consider at their late August or early September meeting.

## Appendix A

USGS GCMRC notes for TWG BAHG call 14 March 2008  
13 March 2008

### General Comments

1. The work prescribed in the Biological Opinions (2007 Shortage Criteria and 2008 High Flow and Steady Flow Experiments) will take some time to fully plan and implement. Complete implementation in FY 08, and FY 09, is unlikely and perhaps not prudent. Some conservation actions will benefit from more complete planning.
2. Emphasis of GCMRC activities for FY 08:
  - a. Existing work plan
  - b. HFE data collection and initial analysis with preliminary interpretation
  - c. Updating MRP to include new work prescribed by Biological Opinions – new MRP time frame: 2008-2013
3. DOI personnel will be seeking Department-level guidance for BO initiatives, especially with respect to funding (expected early this spring)
4. GCMRC proposes preparing a one year budget for FY 09

### Specific Comments

1. New projects to be incorporated into MRP for full or partial funding from AMP/power revenues
  - a. Integrated sediment, flow and temperature modeling initiative (building on recent progress toward a greater predictive capability in evaluating dam operations)
  - b. Recreation safety analysis
  - c. Near shore ecology/Fall steady flows. GCMRC recommends that there are enough elements in common between these two projects that they should both be assigned to cooperator(s) on the basis of competitive awards in FY 2008. Exterior cooperator sought through open solicitation released this spring. Draft of request for proposals nearly complete. Funding: \$110k needed to initiate in FY 08 (must be received by June 2008), \$500k per year estimated for FY 09 and FY 10. Exterior funding would be ideal, but could also turn to future installments in the experimental fund (starting with FY 10). Existing work plan projects will support this project:
    - i. Spring and fall backwater seining [tied to Project 1.D or HFE 2008]
    - ii. Humpback chub population monitoring [ongoing]
    - iii. Sediment monitoring [ongoing]
    - iv. Shoreline mapping [phase I results in 2008 and ongoing in FY 2009]
    - v. 2009 overflight [ongoing system-wide monitoring]
  - d. Humpback chub translocation.
    - i. Initiate new round of planning and negotiation in 2008. NPS, BOR, FWS, GCMRC should work with the Havasupai Nation to see if Havasu Creek could be considered as target location
    - ii. GCMRC contributions: planning, evaluation/monitoring, logistics support
  - e. Nonnative fish control.
    - i. Continue ongoing planning efforts (short- and long-term)
    - ii. Can continue to implement small scale projects FY 08-FY 10. Larger projects would need additional funding
    - iii. Single trip mechanical removal effort planned for FY 09. Native and nonnative data acquired from this trip
    - iv. Initiate building nonnative removal contingency fund in FY 09

- f. Sediment transport effects on humpback chub habitat. Addressed within 2008 HFE projects 1.C. and 1.D.
- 2. New projects best addressed outside AMP
  - a. Humpback chub refuge/broodstock management plan – BOR and FWS (GCMRC can contribute to planning, if desired)
  - b. Genetics biocontrol symposium – BOR and FWS
- 3. GCMRC advises the following are low priorities for funding:
  - a. Fish parasite research. Highly variable infestation rates and inconclusive impacts on humpback chub population. Asian tapeworm susceptible to water temperatures.
  - b. Rainbow trout movement. Suggest that existing data are compelling that the bulk of rainbow trout in Grand Canyon are spawned in Lees Ferry reach, with some additional spawning in Bright Angel Creek. A great deal of effort could be applied to determine exact natal origins of individual rainbow trout, but costs would be high. GCMRC can prepare a presentation to TWG on this subject, if desired.
- 4. HFE in 2009 (contingency for possible 4<sup>th</sup> test if sand enriched conditions occur)
  - a. Any additional HFEs should be subject to meeting sediment trigger: approx. 1 million metric tons of sand from Paria and incorporation of modified weighting of sand inputs from downstream tributaries, such as the Little Colorado River
  - b. GCMRC could stage a reduced science study effort as early as 2009. Estimated cost: less than \$1M. Proposed projects:
    - i. May 2009 overflight imagery (partial funding already secured through AMP in FYs 2007-08 budgets)
    - ii. Sediment monitoring (some additional funding needed for heightened mass flux sampling for suspended-sand transport)
    - iii. Sonic tag and track humpback chub (additional funding needed)

## **Appendix B**

CRAHG Recommendation for FY09 Budget  
March 20, 2008

The CRAHG held a conference call on March 20, 2008, to discuss the 09 budget based on a request by the BAHG. A summary of the BOR's 09 budget was received by the CRAHG. An e-mail from Helen Fairley stated she could not participate and was unable to send anything on short notice. In order to evaluate GCMRC's budget, the group looked at the GCMRC 08 budget and work plan.

Mike Berry and CRAHG members Mike Yeatts, Kurt Dongoske, Jonathan Damp and Mary Barger were on the call. NPS had briefed Mike Berry on their concerns and could not participate.

Understanding that the BAHG is going to look at GCMRC's and BOR's 08 budgets and make a recommendation of high, medium and low in order to fund new requirements related to the Environmental Assessment and the Biological Opinion, the CRAHG members focused the discussion on evaluating projects at high, medium and low based on their relative contribution to compliance responsibilities. Also, understanding that the focus of the BAHG and TWG will be to reprogram funds to cover the new requirements of the EA and BO, the CRAHG also agreed that any projects related to the National Historic Preservation Act compliance will be high priority.

### **Bureau of Reclamation**

Archaeological Site Treatment; \$500k; HIGH

NPS cost share; \$142k; HIGH

Tribal Protocol Monitoring; \$137K + CPI; HIGH

### **GCMRC**

Without a submission, the group discussed the following possible projects based on the 08 budget and work plan:

Implement pilot monitoring; thalweg measurements; and total station and LiDAR mapping.

Due to lack of information, lack of updates this FY, and no contribution to compliance for NHPA, the group recommended all projects as low to low medium for a ranking.

Members of the CRAHG who are TWG members would like to reserve the right to change this ranking based on new information provided to the TWG, not only on these projects but also on other GCMRC projects that will be ranked.

Concern was also expressed that the CRAHG had requested, at a November 2007 meeting, routine updates for ongoing projects. This request included a schedule of reports for FY08, reports and updates on FY08 components before FY09 is reviewed/approved, have contractors give presentations on projects for a CRAHG meeting in order to use this as background for the FY09 budget, and more information on what researchers are doing which identify bridging mechanisms between geologist, archaeologists and Native Americans. Nothing has been received by CRAHG members. At that November 2007 meeting, it was also agreed that the CRAHG could recommend that some projects go on a hiatus if researchers were not making sufficient progress or the CRAHG doesn't have sufficient information.