

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Bureau of Reclamation FY 2012 Budget and Work Plan

Bureau of Reclamation
Glen Canyon Dam
Adaptive Management Program
Adaptive Management Work Group
August 24, 2011



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

Bureau of Reclamation

Proposed Changes to FY 2012 BWP

The BAHG recommended that funding be moved out of line items in the 2012 budget identified to fund non-native fish removal. To address this, and to ensure that proposed experimental actions in the High Flow Experimental Protocol and Non-native Fish Control Environmental Assessments can be implemented in FY2012 if they are approved, Reclamation and GCMRC propose the following changes:

Move funds from:

Line 18: GCMRC Nonnative Fish Control Contingency Fund - \$191,126 and

Line 19: Reclamation Nonnative Fish Suppression Contingency Fund \$271,460

To: Line 20: Reclamation Experimental Funds Carryover, now \$462,586.

RECLAMATION

Bureau of Reclamation

Proposed FY12 Changes cont.

Shane Capron, TWG Chair, explained at the June 28, 2011 TWG meeting that Secretary's Designee Anne Castle has requested a more prominent role for the TWG in the GCDAMP, and asked that Reclamation provide facilitation for all TWG and BAHG meetings. The following FY 2012 Work Plan and Budget line items have been modified to meet facilitation needs for the GCDAMP in FY 2012:

- **Increase line 54, AMWG Facilitation Contract, by \$11,301 to \$39,010.**
- **Increase line 60, TWG Chair Reimbursement, by \$3,703 to \$29,013 (All funds will be used for contracted facilitation assistance).**
- **Decrease line 51, AMWG Personnel Costs, line 52, AMWG Travel Reimbursement, line 58, TWG Member Travel Reimbursement, and line 59, TWG Reclamation Travel, by \$3,751 each.**

DOI Responses to TWG Policy Issues

The TWG had six policy issues, three of which are related to Reclamation's National Historic Preservation Act 106 compliance for operations of Glen Canyon Dam and one to AMP treatment of Tribal concerns.

TWG Policy Issue 1:

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 to clarify how DOI (and the GCDAMP) is achieving compliance with both NHPA section 106 and the GCPA and what is specifically necessary to do so. (Passed by consensus).

DOI Responses to TWG Policy Issues

DOI Response to TWG Policy Issue 1:

Reclamation is planning a 3-day meeting, September 6-8, 2011 , with the five AMP member Tribes, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, NPS and other interested parties, in Phoenix, Arizona. Reclamation intends to work with these parties at this meeting, utilizing a professional facilitator and an NHPA consultant, to: (1) determine adequate resolution of adverse effect for NHPA purposes for two undertakings, Implementation of the High Flow Experimental Protocol and Non-native Fish Control Downstream of Olen Canyon Dam; and, (2) if time allows, to initiate an in-depth collective analysis of (the 1994) PA implementation, with the goal of determining why the PA has not been fully effective and how to make it so.

RECLAMATION

DOI Responses to TWG Policy Issues

TWG Policy Issue 3:

The TWG recommends that AMWG make a recommendation to the Secretary on the following questions:

How should the program fairly treat conflicts of cultural values, specifically those involving Native American perspectives?

How will tribal values be monitored and tracked in this program? (Passed by consensus).

DOI Responses to TWG Policy Issues

DOI Response to TWG Policy Issue 3:

CRAHG is appropriate venue to develop recommendations on this complex issue.

John Halliday is working with tribes on ways to integrate TEK of tribes into federal agencies administrative procedures. CRAHG can also address this.

The Integrated Tribal Resources Monitoring budget line item (line item 26) funds monitoring by tribes to identify traditional cultural properties and the condition of historic properties in Glen and Grand canyons to evaluate the effects of dam operations and other actions under the authority of the Secretary to directly inform the program on the status of GCDAMP natural and cultural resources from a tribal perspective.

A special section will be developed for tribes to report on Integrated Tribal Resources Monitoring Program reports at the AMP Annual Reporting Meeting.

RECLAMATION

DOI Responses to TWG Policy Issues

TWG Policy Issue 4:

TWG recommends that AMWG recommend to the Secretary that Reclamation implement the process that has been identified in Reclamation's 2007 Treatment Plan to comply with the requirements of NHPA Section 106 on the operation of Glen Canyon Dam. (Passed by consensus).

DOI Response to TWG Policy Issue 4:

Section 106 and its regulations require consultation and the implementation of agreements about how to resolve adverse effects. The 2007 Treatment Plan currently does not represent such an agreement, and implementing it therefore would not contribute to Reclamation's compliance with Section 106; indeed, it might complicate such compliance because of tribal objections to its archaeological provisions. This issue will be addressed at the Sept. 6-8 2011 work shop.

DOI Responses to TWG Policy Issues

TWG Policy Issue 5:

TWG recommends that AMWG recommend to the Secretary that Reclamation identify what it will do in FY12 to mitigate adverse effects at the 53+ archaeological sites identified in Reclamation's 2007 Treatment Plan. (Passed by consensus).

DOI Response to TWG Policy Issue 5:

Some tribes have objected to excavation and data recovery at archeological sites in Grand Canyon. In FY 2012, Reclamation will support continued monitoring of the condition of sites identified in the Treatment Plan and undertake remedial actions as necessary to mitigate actual impacts; at the same time it will seek agreement among the Section 106 consulting parties on the terms of an effective programmatic agreement to address such impacts in the long term using Line item 27, Canyon Treatment Plan (\$521,013) for implementation in FY 2012.

RECLAMATION