

DRAFT

Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) Report on Changes to the FY 2012 Workplan and Budget.
June 16, 2011

Chair: Shane Capron

Members: Norm Henderson, Mike Yeatts, Kerry Christensen, Rick Johnson, Glen Knowles, Don Ostler, Larry Stevens, Clayton Palmer, Leslie James, Clifford Barrett, Jan Balsom, Bill Stewart, Jerry Cox, Kurt Dongoske

The BAHG has reviewed the revised FY 2012 budget recommendations provided by Ted Melis (Acting Chief GCMRC) and Glen Knowles (Chief BOR) dated May 3, 2011. During review of the budget and workplan, the TWG, and BAHG, implemented a new budget process as requested by Anne Castle (Secretary's Designee: March 31, 2011; May 4, 2011). The goal of this new process is to identify and resolve technical issues of detail at the TWG/DOI level and pass only policy-level issues up to AMWG. This new process poses some challenges and TWG will respond to AMWG with comments and ideas on how to improve the effectiveness of the process once the FY 2012 budget consideration is completed.

The BAHG requests consideration and feedback from DOI via Lori Caramanian on the unresolved technical issues described below before the June TWG meeting so that TWG may consider them further if necessary. We are also transmitting the draft policy statements so that DOI can have a heads-up to the policy level issues that TWG may consider and have an opportunity for comment on those as well before the TWG meeting.

It is possible that further technical issues may surface at the June TWG meeting. If so, the TWG Chair will forward those to DOI (Caramanian) for consideration by DOI in the development of the draft budget that AMWG will consider in August.

POLICY ISSUES: recommended for TWG consideration at the June meeting.

1. Sediment monitoring (projects 2, 3 & 4): The TWG recommends that AMWG recommend that the Secretary of Interior consider restructuring the AMP sediment program in future budget and workplans so that it focuses on addressing the monitoring of the sediment-related resources identified by the AMWG DFCs, and that the sediment-related budget items be reduced in favor of further understanding, research, and monitoring of the biological resources.

Considerations: The GCMRC sediment program tracks new and existing deposits of sediment and the transportation of sediment within the Grand Canyon. Historically, the GCMRC sediment program has been the largest component of its budget.

The budget should reduce sediment monitoring and put greater emphasis on biological monitoring and research, given:

- the ESA,
- program participants' interest in continuing the improvement in the Grand Canyon HBC population,
- the interest in controlling downstream trout drift while maintaining a sport fishery at Lee Ferry, and
- the way that recent biological research has contributed to significant new understandings on the functioning of the Grand Canyon ecology.

During the press conference held at the time of the release of the SCORE Report in 2005, GCMRC indicated that the program would move toward an increased focus on biological

resources. Moreover, the AMWG recently developed and recommended to the Secretary a list of desired future conditions (DFCs). The Colorado River Ecosystem (CRE) DFCs includes a group of sediment-related resources. The sediment program aspects of the budget should be revised to focus on research and monitoring related to the newly adopted DFCs, which emphasize the products of sediment (e.g. recreational beaches), rather than research and monitoring of sediment per se.

2. Terrestrial monitoring (project 23): The TWG recommends that AMWG recommend that the Secretary of the Interior requests GCMRC to develop a policy that explicitly values and integrates tribal knowledge into the science program.

Considerations: Integration of tribal traditional knowledge and tribal monitoring into the larger AMP program has been deemed unsuccessful by some GCDAMP participants. Preliminary attempts were made to integrate a subset of the tribes into the terrestrial monitoring program in earlier phases of its development. Since that effort, the overall terrestrial monitoring program has been reduced to a bare minimum and the preliminary positive attempts to develop integration with tribes has not happened. Those tribes that were involved with the original integration efforts are still maintaining monitoring efforts within their own monitoring programs but this information is not being valued or integrated by the remainder of the AMP. The lack of integration of traditional tribal knowledge and values is obvious in the current terrestrial monitoring program and is especially unsatisfactory due to the integral role plants play in traditional tribal culture. Further, the lack of integration of tribal values in the science program is present in most of the monitoring and science programs under the AMP.

3. Concern about nonnative fish control (project 19). Multiple issues identified in the comment related to tribes and consultation. How are tribal issues addressed with AMP related decision-making? (Kurt Dongoske). *This policy issue has not been fully developed because the key participants were not available at the June 13 BAHG meeting to help draft further text. This may or may not be considered further at the June TWG meeting.
4. Archaeological site monitoring and NHPA compliance (projects 25 & 27): The TWG recommends that the AMWG recommend that the Secretary of Interior consider a review of the GCDAMP programs related to archaeological site monitoring and compliance with NHPA section 106 and the GCPA. It is unclear to many GCDAMP participants how DOI (and the GCDAMP) is achieving compliance with both NHPA section 106 and the GCPA and what is specifically necessary to do so.

Considerations: The purposes of archaeological site monitoring in Project 25 is not well defined. There are potentially two needs: (1) monitoring that may be necessary under the NHPA section 106 related to the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and Programmatic Agreement (PA), and (2) monitoring to more broadly assess the health of archaeological resources authorized under the Grand Canyon Protection Act (GCPA). Project 25 in the 2012 budget may not currently meet the need of either of these needs. It is not clear to the AMP participants what the fundamental purposes are of archaeological site monitoring within the AMP program. Funding for project 27 was intended to provide for complete compliance with the NHPA section 106 for the operation of GCD. This included the implementation of the PA. A process has been developed and formally agreed to by the PA signatories which will lead to compliance with Section 106 by BOR. Yet, it appears the process has stalled and it is unclear how to attain compliance with NHPA section 106 or the GCPA. It is also important to identify the cultural monitoring and research needs under the GCPA. The AMP is unclear how to advise the Secretary on tribal-related projects without further understanding how DOI

intends to satisfy NHPA and GCPA responsibilities related to the operation of Glen Canyon Dam.

TECHNICAL ISSUES: for consideration by DOI (Caramanian) prior to the June TWG meeting. Each item was voted using hand votes with majority rule for which issues would continue to be considered and forwarded to DOI for consideration.

1. Economics (project 32): Cancel economist in project 32, set aside \$25k for SEAHG support, savings of about \$73k. BAHG vote: 5 for/2 against/3 abstaining.
2. Science Advisor budget (project 44): Add \$67k back in plus another \$30k for LTEMP participation (no objections).

In general, the primary considerations were to hold off on hiring a full-time economist until the economics implementation plan is approved by AMWG and to use some funds (e.g., project 30) to provide funding for contract help in developing economic-related science needs. The Science Advisor budget was supported due to the value placed on those independent science reviews and the potential that Dr. David Garrett could provide leadership for the Socio-economics ad hoc group. The ad hoc also felt it was important to ensure money was available for LTEMP participation, especially if draft alternatives or other reviews were necessary in the upcoming year. More detailed notes on the BAHG meeting will be made available.

RESOLVED ISSUES: issues that the BAHG and GCMRC/BOR were able to come to agreement on prior to the TWG meeting.

1. Concern about nonnative fish control funds (project 19). BOR and GCMRC agreed to move funding from projects 18 and 19 to the Experimental Fund to avoid the appearance that decisions have been made about mechanical removal projects.
2. Concern about trip numbers and timing and adequate funding for project 16 (PBR study). Further description of the project will be provided to TWG at our next meeting, as well as project 14.
3. Return funding to the Adopt A Beach (AAB) program (28): estimated cost of \$7,191. GCMRC agreed to find funding to return this project to the budget and workplan. The BAHG, GCMRC, and BOR agreed that the reporting process should follow GCRMC's normal reporting procedures.
4. Various concerns with the fish monitoring projects (projects 9, 14, 16). These issues were parked until the TWG meeting, GCMRC will provide more detailed workplan descriptions.
 - a. Concern about needing 2 mainstem fish surveys (1 scheduled in 2012),
 - b. Concern about having adequate humpback chub aggregation sampling (occurred in 03, 04, 05, 06, 10, 11, and proposed in 2012)
 - c. Concern about having too frequent aggregation sampling, propose biennial sampling and full review of PEP panel recommendations.
5. Economics (project 30): Cancel project 30 (recreation survey, \$106,090). Vote 3 for /5 against/2 abstaining – FAILED
6. How will Reclamation spend the funds for project 27. BOR agreed to set a PA meeting within the next week.