

Flipchart notes from the Small Group discussion of Goals 7, 8, and 9. Participants in the 11/21/00 Flagstaff meeting and phone conference: Nancy Brian, John Bridges, Bill Davis, Norm Henderson, Chris Karas, Dennis Kubly, Rick Johnson, Vickie Meretsky, Randy Peterson, Art Phillips, Mark Sogge, Larry Stevens, Bob Winfree. Several participants also presented written comments (attached), as did Bryan Brown and Mike Kearsley, who could not join the meeting. The draft MO's produced by this group represent a general consensus, but not necessarily the individual opinions of all participants. Brainstorming notes (below) are included to capture comments by individuals, but do not necessarily represent the group's final consensus

Marsh vegetation

Suggested target – 1999 vegetation + 30%
Restore or mimic pre-dam levels
New HWZ invading Old HWZ, both invading beaches
Need critical habitat for WIFL
What is feasible is the operative word
Best flow regime for marshes was 1991-1995, 60K every 10 years may be OK, now 45K
Marshes are in small range from 8,000 cfs stage to two meters above that
Don't maximize, what is the minimum threshold?
We haven't tested MFLF's yet, don't really know what they will do.
"Maintain" over a long time frame, 100 years. Don't limit flexibility.
Pre-dam conditions are not achievable
Driving succession through dam operations
Don't want to use spillway
Info need – what is the ecological value of small marsh patches for non-endangered avifauna, inverts, herps, plant species, etc.
Marsh target –10% to +40% of current area
Maintain all species over 10-20 year spans
Historical distribution of marshes, 10 in 1965, 0 before then, 1800 in 1/96, ~1000 now
Use running average, or a proxy established by remote sensing
10 sq. meters or larger, defined by wetland species, soil
Marsh target +/- 50% of 2000 area imaged
Max 10% cover by non-native plants

New High Water Zone

Patches not the issue
1300 acres in EIS (above Diamond?)
Use Y2000 numbers
Use percentage of measured levels
Non-natives should not exceed Y2000 areas on a running average
NHWZ veg is a disturbance maintained community. No flooding is worse than flooding
Must distinguish between the low zone tamarisk and NHWZ
Shouldn't try to preserve all NHWZ species, flooding may eliminate some
Don't wait 10 years to measure presence or absence of species

Willow Flycatcher

Currently 1000 territories range-wide, very dynamic, $\pm 40\%$
40 of 180 known sites have been extirpated within last 10 years
RM 246-273, 12 territories, few upstream to dam
Habitat restoration helps when there are breeding sites nearby to populate the habitat
Nest in the upper river NHWZ vegetation are around 60,000 cfs, dense tamarisk
monoculture, 10-20 meters wide, 4+ meters high.
Lower river habitat is in tamarisk and young Gooding willows over about 4 meters high.
Distinguish goals above and below Separation
Cowbird control varies in success. Small numbers of cowbirds can severely impact small
WIFL populations.
Don't set targets for bird numbers, just for the habitat they need.
Critical habitat may be redefined in the future.
Delete the WIFL goal, moving the MO to the Riparian goal.

Kanab Ambersnail

There is no evidence that dam operations will influence survival of KAS at Vaseys
Accept the Expert Panels statement that 125,000 cfs, with occasional 200,000-300,000
cfs flows would not pose a long-term threat to the snail.
Anything short of a disaster won't put water above 125,000 cfs.
This group assumes that snails will persist in suitable habitat.