

TWG Minority Report concerning the Monitoring and Research Plan to Support GCDAMP FY2007-11 concerning recommendation to AMWG for adoption of the MRP (Vote of 11/9/2006)

Eight TGW members either voted against (6) or abstained from voting (2) to approve the 09/13/2006 draft GCMRC MRP. This minority believes that the current MRP draft has several significant deficiencies as specified below:

- Unclear relationship between the AMP Strategic Plan (and prioritized RINs) and the proposed strategic science questions posed in the MRP. A great deal of time was spent on development of the Strategic Plan and the MRP effort should add more detail and not redirect priorities or their focus.
- Unclear relationship between the strategic science questions and the proposed GCMRC science programs (for the next five years).
- The core monitoring development process did not follow the process developed and recommended by the core monitoring team.
- The Humpback chub science questions and information needs only partially address the HBC questions and needs and those identified are not the top priorities. The top priorities identified were protection of the HBC in refugia and the monitoring of HBC population size and composition in order to determine if recovery is being achieved. It is noted that the top priorities should be part of a separate recovery program and we agree. We would also note that all activities associated with the HBC should be part of a separate recovery program, the foundation for which is being developed as part of the Humpback chub management plan. The MRP should address the top HBC priorities or defer all HBC related activities to a separate recovery program. If tasks are going to be divided out, a much clearer description of how they will interface and work together is required.
- The sediment questions fail to provide a monitoring plan that will lead to the identification of the sediment lost or redistributed outside the primary study reach as a result of a BHBF.
- The five year food base program does not address how fluctuating flows affect production and delivery of the food base. As a result, a subgroup of stakeholders: Arizona Game and Fish, Western Area Power Administration, SWCA and Argonne National Labs, Federation of Fly Fishers and Arizona Wildlands Council provided a proposed science plan to GCMRC to expand or amend their program. This, science plan, directed at a clear scientific uncertainty that would inform the policy debate has been ignored by GCMRC and is not included in the MRP.

Without addressing the above deficiencies, it is unclear whether specific high priority stakeholder science questions are being or will be answered over the next five years.

We recommend that the draft document be approved as a working document to help guide preparation of the '08/'09 workplan and budget but that GCMRC be charged with addressing the above concerns in a final FY2007-11 document and that document brought back to the AMWG for further consideration next summer.