

Glen Canyon Dam Technical Work Group WebEx Meeting

April 3, 2013

Conducting: John Jordan, Chairperson
Facilitator: Chris Page with Triangle Associates, Inc.

Convened: 10 a.m. (MDT)

Committee Members/Alternates Present:

Cliff Barrett, UAMPS
Shane Capron, WAPA
Todd Chaudhry, NPS
Kerry Christensen, Hualapai Tribe
Jerry Lee Cox, Grand Canyon River Guides
Paul Harms, State of New Mexico
Vineetha Kartha, State of Arizona
Robert King, State of Utah
Glen Knowles, Bureau of Reclamation
Tony Joe, Jr. Navajo Nation

Nikolai Lash, Grand Canyon Trust
Chip Lewis, BIA
Gerald Myers, Federation of Fly Fishers
John Shields, State of Wyoming
Larry Stevens, GCWC
Bill Stewart, AGFD
Jason Thiriout, State of Nevada
Kirk Young, USFWS

Committee Members Absent:

Jan Balsom, NPS/GRCA
Charley Bullets, Southern Paiute Consortium
Bill Davis, CREDA
Kurt Dongoske, Pueblo of Zuni

Chris Hughes, NPS/GLCA
Ted Kowalski, Colo. River Conservation Board
Don Ostler, Upper Colorado River Commission
Mike Yeatts, Hopi Tribe

Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center:

Phil Davis
Dave Lytle, SBSC Director
Jack Schmidt, GCMRC Chief

Chris Schill, Budget Analyst
Scott Vanderkooi, Acting Deputy Chief

Interested Persons:

Marianne Crawford, Bureau of Reclamation
Kevin Dahl, GCT
Todd Dillard, Robert Lynch & Associates
Craig Ellsworth, WAPA
Evelyn Erlandsen, State of Arizona
Lesley Fitzpatrick, USFWS
Alan Foster, Triangle Associates
Dave Garrett, M³Research/Science Advisors

John Hamill, Federation of Fly Fishers
Leslie James, CREDA
Sarah Rinkevich, FWS/Federal Tribal Liaison
Seth Shanahan, SNWA
Rosemary Sucec, GLCA
Warren Turkett, Colo. River Conservation Board
Bob Wheeler, Triangle Associates

Meeting Recorder: Linda Whetton

Welcome and Administrative. Welcome by John Jordan.

1. Approval of January 24, 2013, Meeting Minutes. Pending minor edits, the minutes were approved by consensus.
2. Review of Action Items. (**Attachment 1**).
3. Updates.
 - Sequestration - Glen reported that as a result of Sequestration there should be a 5% cut to the program however, DOI is evaluating whether that would include power revenues. Sequestration has affected Reclamation's ability to award contracts in a timely manner and has really slowed down the acquisition process. John Shields requested the distinction between funding AMWG and other basin programs that also rely on power revenues . Glen will keep the group informed of any budget decisions affecting the program.
 - Ad Hoc Group Updates - These will be updated as identified in the agenda.
4. New Business.

- The next TWG meeting will be held on June 26-27, 2013 at the Department of Arizona Water Resources. Linda will send an e-mail soliciting agenda items.

LTEMP EIS Update. Glen reviewed LTEMP's purpose and scope (**Attachment 2**). Alternatives from other sources have been received and the LTEMP team will be working closely with Mike Runge on evaluating them through structured decision analysis.

The LTEMP is not considering infrastructure additions or modifications as part of the proposed action." The current schedule is:

- Preliminary Assessment –Phase I (Apr-Jun)
- Stakeholders Workshop Tradeoff analysis (Jul)
- Alternative refinement and experimental design (Jun-Aug)
- Additional assessment –Phase II (Aug-Sep)
- Public meeting to present science and alternatives (Expected between Jul 2013-Jan 2014)
- Public Draft EIS (Expected between Dec, 2013-Apr 2014)

Dr. Schmidt requested a date be set for the tradeoff analysis workshop as soon as possible as July is a busy time for field work.

TWG Operating Procedures. Shane referenced the Agenda Information Form (**Attachment 3a**) and the latest revision of the operating procedures:

Concerns noted:

- Clarify TWG tasks in relation to what GCMRC does
- Voting status of DOI members
- Role of Reclamation Vice-chair in contacting speakers for meetings
- Facilitation costs for TWG meetings → Reclamation will assess and report at June meeting.
- The OPAHG suggests that Dr. Schmidt sit at the table during TWG meetings

The changes to TWG operating procedures were incorporated into the revised document (**Attachment 3b**). Shane is hopeful the AMWG will provide input to the OPAHG so a new document will be available for discussion at the June meeting He requested the TWG Operating Procedures be on the May 8th AMWG agenda.

MOTION. Proposed by Cliff Barrett, seconded by Randy Seaholm, and approved by consensus: **TWG initially approves the revised operating procedures, as modified by the TWG on April 3, 2013, and requests AMWG review and comment on them before the June TWG meeting where final consideration will be made and the procedures adopted by TWG.**

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program Budget.

Reclamation FY13-14 budget (**Attachment 4a**).

- Reclamation will review the costs for the Triangle Associates facilitation contract.
- Sequestration slowed the process of getting contracts done. NPS permitting contract is delayed.
- AMP tribal members need to be involved in the LTEMP EIS, funding for items in the cultural program could be adjusted.
- A final proposal of changes will be presented at the next meeting.

GCMRC FY13-14 budget. The burden rate at GCMRC was forecasted last fall at 14% but was actually 11%. There were minor reductions in some GCMRC projects (**Attachment 4b**). Burden for the new economist position and planning for the new cultural representative on the Science Advisors were not considered in the budget. The following big issues will need to be wrestled with in the FY15-16 budget:

1. To what degree did the FY13/14 BWT address the priority science questions that were defined in August 2004?

2. To what degree have the priority science questions that were defined in August 2004 now been addressed by the HFE Protocol and the NNFC EA? To the degree to which the priority science questions are now being addressed by these EAs, does that situation redefine the role of GCMRC in addressing these questions? Does this redefine the expectations of TWG in when/how monitoring and research is addressed?
3. To what degree have the priority science questions that were defined in August 2004 been assumed in the LTEMP EIS process? To the degree to which the priority science questions are now being addressed by the LTEMP program, does that situation redefine the roles of GCMRC in addressing these questions? Does this redefine the expectations of TWG in when/how monitoring and research are addressed?

On behalf of the TWG members, Shane advocated that GCMRC provide a more explicit link between where we started with the 2004 priority questions and where we are today with the workplan. Jack will prove a historical evolution of how some of these questions have been addressed and how they've evolved over time.

BAHG Update. Shane identified the following items specific to the 2014 budget review:

1. Increased aggregation sampling of HBC to reduce sampling errors in enumeration.
2. Additional or new capture points for tagging trout in the natal origins rainbow trout study to eliminate possible sample errors for ascertaining the degree of downstream movement.
3. Improve detection levels for HBC in the mainstem to confirm estimates
4. What elements of the administrative history project require funding? Conduct a pilot effort on those elements in FY2014 and use the results to develop a more thorough undertaking in the next budget cycle, if warranted.
5. Phragmites is an ecologically and culturally important species that is highly responsive to dam operations. Compile background data and information, including Tribal significance, in 2014 in a pilot analysis and if feasible, conduct the analysis in the next budget cycle in the context of integration of TEK within the AMP (AR meeting).

Shane encouraged TWG to read through the budget AIF as it contains a list of other general considerations for the FY15-16 workplan and budget. Consider the priorities of the program and decide if the 2004 priorities should be adjusted due to the LTEMP EIS process.

There will be a BAHG meeting in late May or early June if other members want to participate, let Shane or Linda know.

Update on Species of Management Concern. Larry Stevens reported that in the last year they've seen RBS in the lower canyon, consequently their range now extends into Grand Canyon from Lake Mead. Managers and river runners are providing feedback on species information, increasing communication about some on rare species and providing additional distributional data. Visual sightings of raccoons in the lower canyon have been made for the first time. There is a second or third record of hognose skunk in the lower canyon. Kerry Christensen added that the translocated zebra-tailed lizards over wintered at Diamond Creek and reproduced, juveniles have been seen in their surveys.

Science Advisors' Annual Report. Dr. Garrett reviewed the goals of the SA program that provides independent review of science and management plans and management actions for the program (**Attachment 5**). The SA contract is behind the normal fiscal year time frame and begins in February, not October. SA conducted three reviews last year which included reviewing the draft FY13-14 biennial budget for TWG, the same for GCMRC, and a review of the socio-economic/hydropower section of the

Knowledge Assessment Report. The SAs planned activities for 2014 includes a review of the biennial work plan, participation in TWG/BAHG/SEAHG/AMWG meetings, and other activities as needed. Shane suggested integrating the SAs into the FY15-16 budget process and developing a closer relationship with the SAs. Jack expressed concern that in June 2014, GCRMC will be in the middle of field work. It's good to start the conversations but his staff has a tremendous amount of work to pull off in the FY13-14 workplan.

Over-Flights in May. The following documents were provided in preparation for today's discussion:

Attachment 6a: FUGRO EARTHDATA, Inc., GCMRC 2013 Ortho Imagery and DSM Proposal

Attachment 6b: Status of the Upcoming 2013 Airborne Data Collection for Colorado River Corridor

Attachment 6c: Uses for Remote Sensing Data by GCMRC Projects.

Attachment 6d: Progress and Plans for Processing Airborne Data PPT.

The over flights will occur over Memorial Day weekend, May 25 through Saturday, June 1. The flows will be steady at 8,000 cfs. If the entire weekend isn't needed for the over flights, Reclamation will return to May operations of 8,-13,000 cfs daily fluctuations. Dr. Phil Davis, USGS, said there is no other way to gather information on the Colorado River corridor. The fundamental goal is to obtain consistent, calibrated, and undistorted multispectral image and digital elevation models for the entire corridor. Since 2009 GCMRC has collected the best possible data that exists for the canyon. It takes approximately five days to photograph the entire corridor. At the end of day three, they're at about river mile 210. If the weather is clear the following two days, they can complete the information.

Public Comment: None

Wrap-Up and Next Steps. John thanked everyone for being in attendance and said the next in-person TWG meeting is scheduled for:

Next TWG Meeting

Date: Wed., June 26 - WebEx/Conference Call

Adjourned: 2 p.m. (MDT)

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Whetton
Upper Colorado Regional Office
Bureau of Reclamation

Key to Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program Acronyms

ADWR – Arizona Dept. of Water Resources
AF – Acre Feet
AGFD – Arizona Game and Fish Department
AIF – Agenda Information Form
AMP – Adaptive Management Program
AMWG – Adaptive Management Work Group
AOP – Annual Operating Plan
ASMR – Age-Structure Mark Recapture
BA – Biological Assessment
BAHG – Budget Ad Hoc Group
BCOM – Biological Conservation Measure
BE – Biological Evaluation
BHBF – Beach/Habitat-Building Flow
BHMF – Beach/Habitat Maintenance Flow
BHTF – Beach/Habitat Test Flow
BIA – Bureau of Indian Affairs
BO – Biological Opinion
BOR – Bureau of Reclamation
BWP – Budget and Work Plan
CAHG – Charter Ad Hoc Group
CAP – Central Arizona Project
GCT – Grand Canyon Trust
CESU – Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Unit
cfs – cubic feet per second
CMINS – Core Monitoring Information Needs
CMP – Core Monitoring Plan
CPI – Consumer Price Index
CRBC – Colorado River Board of California
CRAHG – Cultural Resources Ad Hoc Group
CRCN – Colorado River Commission of Nevada
CRE – Colorado River Ecosystem
CREDA – Colorado River Energy Distributors Assn.
CRSP – Colorado River Storage Project
CWCB – Colorado Water Conservation Board
DAHG – Desired Future Conditions Ad Hoc Group
DASA – Data Acquisition, Storage, and Analysis
DBMS – Data Base Management System
DOE – Department of Energy
DOI – Department of the Interior
DOIFF – Department of the Interior Federal Family
EA – Environmental Assessment
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement
ESA – Endangered Species Act
FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
FEIS – Final Environmental Impact Statement
FRN – Federal Register Notice
FWS – United States Fish & Wildlife Service
FY – Fiscal Year (October 1 – September 30)
GCD – Glen Canyon Dam
GCES – Glen Canyon Environmental Studies
GCT – Grand Canyon Trust
GCMRC – Grand Canyon Monitoring & Research Center
GCNP – Grand Canyon National Park
GCNRA – Glen Canyon Nat'l Recreation Area
GCPA – Grand Canyon Protection Act
GLCA – Glen Canyon Nat'l Recreation Area
GRCA – Grand Canyon National Park
GCRG – Grand Canyon River Guides
GCWC – Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
HBC – Humpback Chub (endangered native fish)
HFE – High Flow Experiment
HMF – Habitat Maintenance Flow
HPP – Historic Preservation Plan
INs – Information Needs
KA – Knowledge Assessment (workshop)
KAS – Kanab Ambersnail (endangered native snail)
LCR – Little Colorado River
LCRMCP – Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program
LTEMP – Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan
LTEP – Long Term Experimental Plan
MAF – Million Acre Feet
MA – Management Action
MATA – Multi-Attribute Trade-Off Analysis
MLFF – Modified Low Fluctuating Flow
MO – Management Objective
MRP – Monitoring and Research Plan
NAU – Northern Arizona University (Flagstaff, AZ)
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act
NNFC – Non-native Fish Control
NOI – Notice of Intent
NPS – National Park Service
NRC – National Research Council
O&M – Operations & Maintenance (USBR Funding)
PA – Programmatic Agreement
PBR – Paria to Badger Creek Reach
PEP – Protocol Evaluation Panel
POAHG – Public Outreach Ad Hoc Group
Powerplant Capacity = 31,000 cfs
R&D – Research and Development
RBT – Rainbow Trout
RFP – Request for Proposal
RINs – Research Information Needs
ROD Flows – Record of Decision Flows
RPA – Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
SA – Science Advisors
Secretary – Secretary of the Interior
SCORE – State of the Colorado River Ecosystem
SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office
SNARRC - Southwest Native Aquatic Resources and Recovery Center
SOW – Statement of Work
SPAHG – Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Group
SPG – Science Planning Group
SSQs – Strategic Science Questions
SWCA – Steven W. Carothers Associates
TCD – Temperature Control Device
TCP – Traditional Cultural Property
TEK – Traditional Ecological Knowledge
TES – Threatened and Endangered Species
TMC – Taxa of Management Concern
TWG – Technical Work Group
UCRC – Upper Colorado River Commission
UDWR – Utah Division of Water Resources
USBR – United States Bureau of Reclamation
USFWS – United States Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS – United States Geological Survey
WAPA – Western Area Power Administration
WY – Water Year