

Glen Canyon Dam Technical Work Group Meeting

June 20-21, 2012

FY2013-14 Biennial Budget & Workplan

MOTIONS

The TWG recommends that AMWG recommend the FY2013-14 Biennial Budget & Workplan from the Bureau of Reclamation and Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, as reviewed by TWG on June 20-21, 2012, to the Secretary of the Interior for approval.

Passed by consensus.

The TWG requests by consensus that the Department of the Interior consider the following issues in the development of the FY2013-14 Biennial Budget & Workplan from the Bureau of Reclamation and Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center:

1. Maintain the annual Lees Ferry creel surveys (\$25,000 FY13, \$25,000 FY14)
2. Include a cultural resources Science Advisor for \$10,000 annually.

Passed by consensus.

DISCUSSION ITEMS WITH RESULTS INCLUDING AGREED UPON ACTIONS

General:

- 1. What recommendations from the Socioeconomic Ad Hoc Group will be addressed in the budget?**

The DOI Interagency LTEMP team has been requested to give an update on their progress determining the socioeconomics issues that will be addressed under LTEMP.

Answer: DOI is still working on it; no clear answer yet. There will probably be a response in the next couple of weeks. The SEAHG may meet with GCMRC by webinar to determine whether budget changes are warranted after that information is shared.

- 2. Has the federal salary freeze been reflected in the Reclamation salaries in this BWP?**

Glen Knowles will report whether the Reclamation FY13-14 budget includes the freeze.

Answer: Reclamation salaries are indexed by CPI for FY13-14. \$13,000 in FY13, same in FY14. Would go back into the Basin Fund if it is not spent.

- 3. P. 12: Recommend that until the POAHG has a specific work plan recommendation with deliverables, this activity be reduced, with the funding potentially provided to have a synthesis of the Knowledge Assessment workshops completed this year.**

It is unlikely that POAHG will have a budget completed before the TWG meeting.

However, the chair expects to have it completed before the AMWG meeting in August.

Same report from Glen.

Project C

- 4. P. 96: Clarifying question: please clarify the statement "Equalization resulted in the evacuation of cold water from deep portions of the reservoir. These unusual conditions**

resulted in the warmest release temperatures since 2005, reaching 15.2°C on November 12, 2011, in spite of higher reservoir elevations.”

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

Jack: this was odd but happened as described. Jack will consider adding more information.

Project F

5. P. 138: F.7.1 – This sentence doesn’t seem to fit together: “Monitoring will focus on midday collections because drift rates tend to be more variable, but higher, during nighttime hours. Seven samples will be collected every six weeks from each location.” Is it important to sample midday because of variability, or better at night?

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

Answer: Scott – drift rates are steadier, more consistent during the day, so we prefer to sample then. Will make sure this sentence is more clear.

6. P. 135: F.4.3 – We had been promised by FWS and GCMRC a Chute Falls translocation plan before the next budget cycle. It appears that document has not been prepared and no mention of it is in the description. Please clarify when we can expect to see a Chute Falls translocation plan? We believe it is important to understand the goals of the project, methods, research plan, important results to date, rationale for continuing it, etc. The second to last sentence on the next page talks about a peer review; that would be helpful, but we think a draft translocation plan would be a good starting point.

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

Answer: GCMRC will add to workplan: GCMRC, NPS, and USFWS will work on finalizing this plan.

Project J

7. P. 198: On the bottom of the page this research question is highlighted, “Therefore, a key research question that needs to be resolved is not whether cultural sites are eroding or otherwise changing but whether they are eroding or changing faster or in a significantly different manner than they would if the dam were not present [*emphasis added*] or was operated differently than it has been up until now.” – Question, is this the right question? I understand that we want to understand changes if the dam were operated differently. Is it appropriate to have the larger question, if the dam were not present?

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

Answer: GCMRC does not believe that all changes are due to the dam. This question, however, is important to consider in order to help clarify and understand the changes due to the dam’s existence as well as its operations. Project J-3 is funded at \$160,000 by Reclamation. Jack acknowledged the sensitivities and said he would change the language. His motivation was that he didn’t want the dam blamed for all erosion in the Grand Canyon.

Project L

8. P. 233: Table, in the line starting “Participation in phone calls...,” “50%” should be changed to “5%.”

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

Answer: GCMRC will look into it.

General

9. Many river trips are identified in this work plan. A table of proposed projects and the time of year when these trips would take place would be helpful to determine whether we have the logistical support to conduct all this work, especially if non-native control takes place.

Answer: A table is under development and will be included in the BWP.

BOR Budget and Workplan

10. P. 6: Consider changing “Experimental Carryover Funds” to “Experimental Funds” and changing “Native Fish Conservation Contingency Fund” to “Native Fish Conservation Contingency Fund Carryover.” Rationale: the experimental fund is an annual fund, when it carries over it goes to the native fish line.

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

Glen: make sense, will make those changes.

11. SAs’ involvement in the LTEMP

Leslie James and Don Ostler will present a proposal for the SAs’ involvement in the LTEMP for a possible recommendation to AMWG.

From Leslie and Don: TWG recommends that the SAs review the LTEMP alternatives and provide a report to the TWG and AMWG. The cost of this review is estimated to be approximately \$25,000 and should be funded by appropriations (as is LTEMP funding). In the event appropriated funds are not available for this purpose, TWG recommends that the FY12/14 budget include \$25,00 for this review.

Lori: This issue will resolve itself over the next few weeks. Beverly and Rob are finalizing the peer review plan, and will know if the SAs’ will be involved in the peer review. If SAs’ are not involved, changes could be made to the budget.

Agreed: AMWG will decide whether to recommend a change to the proposed budget based on the additional information provided by DOI.

USGS Budget and Workplan:

Project A

12. P. 57: Project A.4 may be of immediate concern to GCDAMP, especially with the HFE implementation looming in the horizon. Recommend that this project should be funded. (\$243,300 FY13, \$249,800 FY14)

If funding for this project has not been identified, it may need to be discussed at the TWG meeting.

Jack: Will be funded through GCMRC carryover funds.

Project F

13. P. 132: F.1, Question – It looks like only one annual trip is being planned. Please clarify whether it is one trip or two. If it is one, please explain why only one trip is needed now when we used to conduct two, and AGFD has provided a rationale for two in past discussions.

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

Scott: The intent was for only one trip. Fish PEP recommended considering whether two trips are necessary. There are trade-offs, but as we are looking for long-term trends, we think we can drop it to one trip. Caveat: high turbidity will be problematic. We are re-evaluating this due to a new logistical issue. We may divide this trip into two shorter trips to better accommodate crews.

14. Proposal: Maintain the annual creel surveys (\$25,000 FY13, \$25,000 FY14)

- A memo from Bill Stewart on this issue was sent to all TWG members. Historically, AGFD has funded a creel survey at Lees Ferry. Due to recent budget cuts, they can no longer fund it annually, and there will be no surveys in FY13-14. The 2009 PEP panel recommended maintaining the survey. These surveys are important to obtain data not gathered with electrofishing. They see the larger fish caught by anglers that are not as vulnerable to electrofishing. They also see what is being harvested, and can assess how management recommendations are affecting the fishery.

Consensus: Maintain the annual creel surveys (\$25,000 FY13, \$25,000 FY14). (to be sent to DOI)

15. Consider the budgetary implications of adding cultural resource Science Advisors.

This would cost \$10-25,000. Dave: we could retain a Cultural Resources specialist instead of an environmental specialist.

Proposal: Include an additional cultural resources Science Advisor for \$10,000 annually. (consensus)

16. Rewrite the Monitoring and Research Plan.

Defer discussion until the LTEMP is complete.

17. Administrative history project – following up to AMWG motion. How do we accomplish it?

Shane will send to the AMWG planning team the motion passed by TWG October 2011 regarding the administrative history project.

18. Ecosystem response to warming water temperatures.

Scott: We will be as nimble as possible in responding to experiments.

19. Project I – riparian ecology – discuss the logic and justifications. Need to understand the physiology of the plants. Methods do not seem to be adequate.

Answer: This is a collaborative project that proposes new and untested methods. Jack will follow up with Larry, Barb, and NPS staff and anyone else who is interested. Interested people should let Jack know.