

Whetton, Linda A

From: Shane Capron [Capron@wapa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 12:01 PM
To: Larry Stevens; Bill Persons; Bill Werner; Perri Benemelis; Heuslein, Amy; Cantley, Garry; Kurt Dongoske; Christopher S. Harris; James Thiriot; McClain Peterson; William E. Davis; Loretta Jackson-Kelly; Glen Knowles; Nikola Lash; Emily Omama; Jeff English; Andre Potochnik; Charley Bullets; Mark Steffen; Matt Kaplinski; Michael Yeatts; John O'Brien; Rick Johnson; Henderson, Norm; Mietz, Steven; Clifford Barrett; Leslie James; Andy Makinster; John W. Shields; Dwight Randolph Seaholm; Ted Kowalski; Jay C. Groseclose; Kubly, Dennis M; Ostler, Don; Whetton, Linda A; Crawford, Marianne; Ryan, Thomas P; Robert King; Mary Barger; Clayton Palmer; Kerry Christensen
Cc: Alpine, Andrea E; McKenzie, Barbara A; Bennett, Glenn E; Fairley, Helen; Hamill, John F; Laura Gagney; Andersen, Matthew E; Grams, Paul E; Mankiller, Serena; Melis, Ted
Subject: pre-TWG preparation and background on agenda items

TWG - I wanted provide a little more background information on some of the agenda items for the TWG meeting next week and provide some ideas on how to prepare for the TWG meeting.

GCMRC updates: these are in written form so please take time to read these and come prepared with any questions you might have, this will be a short Q&A session.

Develop annual reporting requirements for January 2010 meeting: John Hamill will have a draft of the reporting outline for us to review before the meeting, this is not posted yet but I'm hoping soon. This is the outline that guides the researchers on what we would like them to put into their annual reports. Think about what you would like in those reports, format, length, etc. and be prepared to provide those ideas to GCMRC.

Study plans (Fall steady flow and non-native management): The bulk of this meeting is being devoted to reviewing these two plans which have already undergone TWG review and comment. Thanks to GCMRC and the many cooperators who put a lot of work into these plans. Our role now is to review the documents and consider recommendations to AMWG. In doing so, we will discuss the Science Advisor comments, GCMRC responses to the SAs, and review TWG comments and GCMRC responses (comment tables). Although some work has been done on revisions post-TWG comment, revised versions of the plans are not yet available. GCMRC intends to solicit further input at this TWG meeting and then provide a revised draft to TWG sometime this Fall. Ideally, TWG would recommend approval of these documents in time for AMWG review at their February meeting. Because our January TWG meeting is very close to the AMWG meeting, I suspect we'll need to consider a web conference sometime later this year to consider a recommendation. Again, GCMRC is not seeking a recommendation at this current meeting, they recognize that we have substantial concerns left to be resolved. So, it would be helpful for folks to review the comment tables and the GCMRC responses to see if you are satisfied with their responses. If not, please be prepared to discuss those at the TWG meeting with the recommended changes you would like to see made. It is a long list of comments so I suspect we'll just ask TWG members which comments they would like to discuss and we'll focus on those, or if there are any new comments members would like to make.

Biennial budget process development: I drafted the beginning of a document that we can use to start some discussion on a description for the budget process (which is based on past documents). Its only a rough start but wanted to get something on paper to get us going. Some major issues to think about are how to consider changes to the year-two budget, modifications to the current process such as timelines and the BAHG, among many other issues I think we need to think through a bit more and capture on paper. I'm not sure how the TWG would like to move forward on this, use the BAHG to help develop this paper or a smaller group of interesting TWG members. The AIF is posted for your review, please bring your good ideas to the meeting on how you would like to proceed and issues you think we need to address in the document.

TCD and sediment augmentation projects: We will hear an update from Dennis Kubly on these efforts and consider how to respond to AMWG's motion. This seems like a fairly broad motion, so please be thinking on how best the TWG can respond to AMWG, we need to decide on how to move forward (e.g., an ad hoc, recommendation to AMWG, further study, etc.)

AMWG MOTION: The AMWG recommends to the Secretary of the Interior that Reclamation report on the status of the TCD and Sediment Augmentation projects to the TWG. The TWG will make a recommendation to the AMWG for consideration at the spring 2010 AMWG meeting. Motion was passed by consensus.

Life cycle analysis: this has been on our action tracking list for quite a while. It has been completed and the document is posted for your review. There will be a presentation on day 2, time-certain at 2:15 pm to allow for an outside expert to make the presentation. Please allow time in your schedules to remain for this presentation - it is the last item on the agenda. This is informational only, but may relate to lots of other issues including the economics workshop.

Thanks, and I look forward to productive discussions with you at the TWG next week.

Shane

Shane Capron, Fish Biologist
Western Area Power Administration
P.O. Box 281213
Lakewood, Co 80228-8213
720-962-7259