

TWG Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) Conference Call

April 12, 2012 (9:06a – 12p, MDT)

Meeting Notes

TWG Chair: Shane Capron, Western Area Power Administration

Facilitator: Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company, LLC

Participants:

TWG Members and Alternates:

Jan Balsom, NPS/GRCA

Marianne Crawford, USBR

Kurt Dongoske, Pueblo of Zuni

Loretta Jackson-Kelly, Hualapai Tribe

Vineetha Kartha, State of Arizona

Leslie James, CREDA

Glen Knowles, USBR

Ted Kowalski, State of Colorado

Don Ostler, States of New Mexico and Wyoming

Clayton Palmer, WAPA

Bill Stewart, AGFD

Mike Yeatts, The Hopi Tribe

Others:

Peter Bungart, Hualapai Tribe

Lori Caramanian, DOI

Helen Fairley, USGS/GCMC

Dave Garrett, Science Advisors

John Halliday, DOI

Dave Uberuaga, NPS/GRCA

Marty Rozelle, The Mary Orton Company, LLC

Jack Schmidt, USGS/GCMRC

Scott Vanderkooi, USGS/GCMRC

Randy VanHaverbeke, USFWS

Agenda

Mary reviewed the agenda for the meeting. She introduced Marty Rozelle with The Mary Orton Company, who will facilitate the TWG meeting next week and assist with preparation for the AMWG May 10 webinar. Mary called the roll.

Introduction & Review of Documents

Shane welcomed everyone to the phone call. He said this call would set the stage for next week's TWG meeting, which he hopes will conclude with a draft budget recommendation to the AMWG. He said the following documents would be used for today's call:

1. USBR Memo – Glen Knowles
2. GCMRC Memo – Jack Schmidt
3. Tribal Liaison Report – John Halliday
4. CRAHG Issues – Kurt Dongoske
5. Science Advisors' Review of Preliminary Budget – Dr. Dave Garrett

DOI Comments

Lori said the budget process is just beginning. She said that even though the cultural resources program is not defined in the budget, DOI is committed to implementing a cultural resources program. She reminded the group that at the August 2011 AMWG meeting, a concern was raised about how DOI is achieving compliance with NHPA and GCPA in the GCDAMP program. GCMRC, Reclamation, and NPS are in the process of addressing that issue. As Jack noted in his memo, NPS and GCMRC are determining complementary ways to work together. Even though the program is facing budget cuts, this is a great step for the program. She said DOI is

willing to sit down separately with the tribes to address their concerns, and emphasized that no decisions have yet been made about the budget.

NPS Comments.

Dave Uberuaga commended everyone for the work done thus far on the budget. He said he is committed to working out difficult issues, and praised Jack for developing a budget that is transparent and respectful to all parties. He is supportive of the cultural program and will put his heart and soul into making sure it is outstanding. Jan added that NPS has begun conversations with GCMRC and she is hopeful of a good working relationship on projects.

USBR Budget

Glen referenced his April 9, 2012 memo and spreadsheet. He said that 2012 now has 3.9% CPI and 2013 and 2014 both are projected at 3.0%. He said the biggest change from previous years is in the Compliance Documents line item. In FY12, the amount was \$259,750, while in FY 13 and FY 14 the amount is zero. This was originally intended to fund compliance for a possible HFE and the LTEMP EIS. However, compliance for the LTEMP EIS is being funded through appropriations. The funds in this line item have been moved to the Non-Native Fish Control (NNFC) Contingency Fund, and in FY2014 \$515,000 will be moved into the NNFC line item from the Experimental Carryover Funds line item. This will be a rolling carryover fund to fund NNFC, if NNFC is implemented.

Regarding a CRAHG concern, Glen noted that there is no plan for fish removal in FY13 or FY14. Two trips in the PBR are planned in calendar year 12 with FY12 funding. The NNFC EA calls for fish removal via a two-part trigger: trout numbers have to be high and the HBC status would have to change. In response to a request, Glen said he would revise the table to show the carryover for NNFC.

In answer to a question, Glen said that plans for NNFC could include removal at PBR, LCR, and Bright Angel Creek (BAC). Scott said GCMRC is planning an experimental project with NPS: GCMRC would remove NNF at the mouth of BAC while NPS removes them in BAC.

Programmatic Agreement. Glen said Reclamation has maintained the line item for GRCA cultural resources treatment. He noted that there is some controversy about implementing the 2007 treatment plan, and there needs to be more discussion about it and NHPA compliance. This line item is a placeholder for what might be accomplished for cultural resources. The details can be added when the MOAs for the HFEP and NNFR proposed actions are completed. He added that Reclamation provided appropriated funds late in FY11 to NPS for cultural resources monitoring accomplished in conjunction with GCRMC. This work has begun.

Jan noted that Grand Canyon spent 2006-09 excavating nine of the most impacted archaeological sites. They intend to do a pilot project this year, and had asked for suggestions of locations to examine for changes over time. They are planning ground-penetrating radar work also as a possible research element.

Tribal Funding and Need for CPI Increase. In response to a question regarding tribal funding not being increased by the CPI, Glen said the tribes do not expend their allocation each fiscal year so the Department did not see a need for an increase. DOI would consider increasing those funds in future years if the tribes provide invoices in a timely manner and all monies are expended within 90 days of the end of the fiscal year. If those funds are expended and a request made, it will be considered. Loretta said that the Hualapai Tribe has spent their entire grant. Glen said he would check past invoices from the Hualapai Tribe and would report to the

TWG. Mike said Hopi has an internal billing problem and they cannot invoice 90 days before the end of the fiscal year. Glen said he would talk to Reclamation contracting staff and get back to Mike.

Action Item: Glen will review past Hualapai Tribe invoices to see if there is merit for increasing their appropriated funding by the CPI rate and report back to the BAHG/TWG.

Experimental Carryover Funds. Glen said this fund has been building up over the years in order to have funding available for HFEs. Reclamation will now continue to build that fund to support the non-native fish contingency fund since HFE research and monitoring will now be funded through the GCMRC budget.

POAHG Funding. In response to a question about funding for the POAHG line item being used for other program needs, Glen said he has not talked with Sam Jansen (POAHG chair) and doesn't know what the POAHG intends to work on for the next few years.

GCMRC Budget

Jack said in the eight months he's been at GCMRC, he has worked with the stakeholders to answer the questions of what drives the AMP and the uncertainties faced by management. In early February, he challenged his staff to develop a budget that was integrated and not divided by boundaries between the agencies. He presented a pie chart showing how GCMRC's funding is divided among the different programs. Even without cultural resources in the mix, GCMRC is proposing more work than there is funding available. He has encouraged his staff to find other funding sources, and noted that there would be political imperatives for certain projects.

Last week, GCMRC was charged by DOI to present an allocation of funds similar to the spreadsheet he had sent to the TWG. Each program manager made presentations on his or her proposed work to a representative from AS-WS office and staff from GRCA, FWS, and GLCA. They also made a formal proposal on cultural resources, about which there was not universal agreement. He met with Dave Uberuaga the following day, and they committed to each other to encourage their staffs to work cooperatively in order to accomplish their individual responsibilities. The details have not yet been finalized. Kurt said he continues to be concerned about how the GCDAMP treats tribal issues.

KA Workshop Results. In answer to a question about whether GCMRC would produce a written report or synthesis of what was presented at the Knowledge Assessment workshops, Jack said it was not likely. With the increased demands from the LTEMP effort, his staff has a heavy workload. He said he would be interested in direction from the stakeholders on this matter. However, he is committed to having his scientists do science and not just write reports.

GCMRC Technical Presentations. The program managers reviewed their individual projects for FY2013-14.

Regarding cultural resources monitoring, Jack said there is a fundamental disagreement regarding the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding of the geomorphology above the river level. There is not a proposal because GCMRC and GCNP are trying to work on a joint proposal.

Jack provided additional comments on GCMRC's budget:

- SAs line item is \$60-70,000 less than the current funding. The SAs are trying to define their role in the LTEMP, which could provide funding for them.

- There are no PEP panels scheduled in FY13.
- There is \$7.8 million in compliance and monitoring activities and \$1.6 million in monitoring and research projects.
- He showed a spreadsheet that indicated high-priority projects, and noted that those would fit within the funding currently available.

Action Item. Jack will send the spreadsheet to Linda for posting to the website.

Bill Stewart noted that AGFD was listed as a collaborator on some projects of which he was unaware, and requested the detailed descriptions for those projects.

The following points were made in answer to questions and comments.

- Jack said he has challenged his staff to define how the projects are measuring the fines on the bed.
- Scott said GCMRC has integrated foodbase work into other proposed projects, instead of showing it as a separate project, because it is important to so many projects.
- Jack said the Core Monitoring Plan is on hold. (Shane added that there is a continuing conversation among Lori, Jack, and himself on the CMP.)
- Regarding tribes being included in early discussions about riparian and vegetation projects, Jack said that GCMRC has done its part and has worked with NPS in hopes of developing a good program. He will share more at the TWG meeting on Monday.

Report on Tribal Conversations

John Halliday said he met with representatives from the Hualapai and Hopi tribes and the Southern Paiute Consortium, and their concerns included:

1. Tribes respectfully request that these comments be included in the budget process as recommendations for honoring the trust responsibility of the federal government to AMWG tribes and their tribal citizens;
2. Tribes request that CPI be included as real dollars in the Tribal contracts for FY 2013-14 and subsequent future budgets so funding can be budgeted in accordance with Tribal finance policy;
3. Tribes request that the NPS Cultural Resources Monitoring \$91,000 program scope of work be the subject of Tribal Consultation prior to any final decision;
4. Tribes request that the appropriate Tribal Consultation Policy be followed in the development of the new cultural resources programming, and that meetings that include Tribal participation in the program development process be implemented providing an opportunity for meaningful consultation before any new cultural resources program is adopted;
5. Tribes request that the budget specifically identify how the High Flow Experimental and Non Native Fish Control Environmental Assessment Memoranda of Agreement stipulations will be addressed in the FY 2013-14 budget, as well as what and how specific projects will cover which MOA stipulations;
6. Tribes request that Tribal values and monitoring be incorporated into the Terrestrial Monitoring Program and that it articulate the specifics of its operational goals and functions;

7. Tribes request that DOI state how they are going to proceed with developing Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) and that TEK incorporation into DOI administrative mechanisms development be included in the FY 2013-14 budget and the Annual Work Plan;
8. Tribes request that DOI provide a schedule for how and when Tribal concerns are going to be resolved.

More details are included in John's report, which was sent to TWG members shortly before the BAHG meeting.

Details on TWG Meeting

Shane said he anticipated it will be a tough job to get budget recommendations at the TWG meeting and TWG may have to consider holding an interim conference call prior to the AMWG May 10 webinar. Marty described the proposed TWG process, which was developed in part in response to the CRAHG draft report presented at the last TWG meeting.

Call ended: 12 noon