



GOAL 3

21. This should go beyond razorback suckers, and be updated

GOAL 4

22. Nonnative fish management concerns are not adequately dealt with in this plan, or acknowledged, including trout natal origins issues
23. PEP recommendations could be described better both under goal 2 and 4
24. PEP recommended not spending resources in evaluating early life stages of trout, so why is GCMRC continuing to propose that?
25. There should be more under this goal to discuss downstream movement of trout/natal origins issues

GOAL 6

26. Needs a strategy for tamarisk beetle impacts, work with NPS
27. Greater emphasis on riparian vegetation, integrating PEP review, and looking at predictive models
28. Generally, the plan for this goal needs work, a number of issues identified

GOAL 9

29. Greater integration with NPS
30. More detail needed

GOAL 10

31. Update after economics workshop,

GOAL 11

32. Cultural resources is broader than the monitoring program which is focused primarily on archaeological properties and physical changes, 2000 PEP recommends less core monitoring for effects of dam operations, and more focus should be made on non-archaeological properties; questions implementation of PEP recommendations
33. Questions on statements of strong linkages between dam operations and effects on cultural resources
34. Premature to consider this for core monitoring
35. How will information management which incorporates sensitive tribal information be handled?
36. Numerous technical comments on specifics (Pueblo of Zuni)

GOAL 12

37. This is more broad than successful monitoring and research, it entails interaction with scientists, political entities, managers, and the legal constructs of society – adaptive management
38. Goal should be about improving scientific integrity not costly remote sensing technology
39. DASA should be higher priority for numerous upgrades including serving data, web update, providing updates, etc.