

**TWG Comments**

**Budget & Work Plan Presentation (November 12-13, 2003)**

GCMRC FY05-06 Draft Interim Monitoring and Research Work Plan (dated Nov. 10, 2003) – [The BAHG Responses of 12/01-04/03]

Comments	From	Response	Responder
<b>GENERAL BUDGET PROCESS &amp; ORGANIZATION COMMENTS</b>			
1 As far as general budget development, we've got to stick to a more reasonable time table for review. Presently, the transition to the new organizational framework of GCMRC has made it difficult to accurately assess details of the budget requests. For example, the budget summary table presented at the TWG meeting does not match items identified in the work plan (the upgrade presented at the TWG meeting, not the review copy presented on 11/4 through the AMP web site). Hopefully this basic issue will be resolved before the Dec 1 budget ad-hoc meeting. Obviously we are behind schedule, but in the future, draft work plans should be presented 30 days before discussion in a TWG meeting. This is a large complicated project and 5 business days lead time for a informed budget discussion is not sufficient.	GCRG	Renew commitment to follow the protocols established by the 04/13/01, memo from the budget ad-hoc group (BAHG). Always provide 14-day lead prior to TWG meetings & 30-day when feasible. The GCMRC takes the lead on initiating the timeline for budget discussions & approval on basis of science programming schedule/need. The budget ad-hoc will address out-year budgeting process.	Budget Ad-hoc Group (BAHG)
2 I know the center does not have an administrative secretary [ <i>officer</i> ] at the moment, but actual costs for previous years will be essential in future years.	GCRG	This information is available and will be provided in the future in table and graphic form. The level of information will be recommended by the BAHG.	BAHG
3 In general, all of the project descriptions were too abbreviated. Each project should include a description of the methods, project schedule, trip schedule, personnel needs, and a more detailed budget. If a project includes contingencies for experimental flow activities, these should also be listed with the project and include methods, schedule detailed budget items. Outsourced science/labor should be specifically identified if known. I like to apply the Who, What, Why, When, How (WWWWH) rule. Who is doing the project, What are they doing, Why	GCRG	This information is available in the form of finalized work plans (all ongoing projects) and in the form of solicitations/RFP's when they are released and any	BAHG

Comments	From	Response	Responder
<p>are they doing it – link to strategic plan, When are they going to do it, and How are they going to do it and how much is it going to cost. In reviewing the workplan, it seems that most project descriptions are lacking in descriptions of Who is going to do the work (if known), What are they doing (methods and schedule), Why this project is important by linking it with the strategic plan – perhaps a separate table describing these linkages would be appropriate, and How much is it going to cost (more detailed budget or at least access to more detail).</p>		<p>funded work plans that result from them. The BAHG will make recommendations on the level of reporting, etc.</p>	
<p>4 I think we made a major mistake in the way the FY05 budget was presented to the TWG. I had less than a day to review the workplan and budget, and was handed a revised document at the TWG meeting. Some of this is the responsibility of the TWG, and not entirely the responsibility of GCMRC. I think had there been sufficient time to review the document and sufficient time to discuss the workplan and budget, we might have this resolved.</p>	<p>AZGF</p>	<p>Renew commitment to follow the protocols established by the 04/13/01, memo from the budget ad-hoc group (BAHG). Always provide 14-day lead prior to TWG meetings &amp; 30-day when feasible. The GCMRC takes the lead on initiating the timeline for budget discussions &amp; approval on basis of science programming schedule/need. The budget ad-hoc will address out-year budgeting process.</p>	<p>BAHG</p>
<p>5 - I think we need at least a three-day meeting to go over the budget and have a full discussion of workplan and budget.</p>	<p>AZGF</p>	<p>Renew commitment for “Quality Time” needed for budget/workplan discussions, as per BAHG memo of 04/13/01. The budget ad-hoc will address this.</p>	<p>BAHG</p>
<p>6 - The current process for TWG review of the proposed FY '05 budget and work plan is less than acceptable and does not provide a mechanism for meaningful input by the TWG to Reclamation and the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, much less the Secretary of the Interior concerning the Program. The TWG and AMWG have spent many years struggling to develop an acceptable out-year budget and work plan approval process. This</p>	<p>CREDA</p>	<p>This comment will be addressed by the BAHG in the development of the new budgeting process.</p>	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
process has not been followed for FY '05.			
7 - USBR and GCMRC have put a commendable effort into the FY05 budget plan. GRCA appreciates this effort and is looking forward to a final product that can be replicated in future budgets. This will allow for GCMRC staff to spend more time on science and less time on a budget.	NPS-GRCA	This information is available and will be provided in the future in table and graphic form. The level of information will be recommended by the BAHG.	BAHG
8 - Please identify actual costs in the budget sheets (tables).	NPS-GRCA	Will be provided, as per BAHG recommendations	BAHG
9 - Identify actual type of award. For example the money may be outsourced but is it sole sourced verses internal USGS competition verses open to the public competition, etc?	NPS-GRCA	Will be provided, as per BAHG recommendations	BAHG
10 - Why would delays of the FY05 budget approval process result in decreasing the research that goes out for public competition? There are several public entities that are not on a university schedule. University personnel should not be the focus for completed research.	NPS-GRCA	The earlier the budget is approved the more timely becomes the process for getting the competition and award process becomes and the work initiated.	BAHG
11 - Draft work plan numbers and titles do not correspond with the FY05-06 line item budget. Please adjust accordingly for a more effortless review.	NPS-GRCA	GCMRC will correct in the future.	BAHG
12 - The budgeting process should involve the Budget Ad Hoc Committee plus GCMRC first, then TWG, then AMWG.	NPS-GRCA	Follow existing BAHG process in 04/13/01 memo.	BAHG
13 - The budget should be based on an integrated model of the ecosystem structure and an agreed upon program administration. We recommend the Science Advisory Panel review that model.	GC Wildlands	The BAHG agrees that review of program direction & science products should be done by the Science Advisors	BAHG
14 - The budget should be formatted to incorporate the Experimental Management Actions and the HBC Actions into the appropriate resource areas in the GCMRC Science Activities. These are science activities also, and need to be evaluated in the context of the other monitoring and research activities within the resource areas. They should remain distinct projects (and in some cases where they have been combined into other resource projects in the workplan they need to be split out into distinct projects), but they should be grouped with like projects in the terrestrial, aquatic, integrated or sociocultural/other program areas.	GC Wildlands	The BAHG concurs with this comment. GCMRC is currently making the proposed revisions for budget & work plan.	
15 - To assist in evaluating the research components of the proposed budget line items, it	GC Wildlands	The GCMRC agrees, and	BAHG

Comments	From	Response	Responder
would be helpful to have the IN that the research project addresses <i>and</i> its sequence order number attached to the line item.		this will be done in preparation of future workplans.	
16 - The budget breakdowns need to be more detailed. If we are being asked to make recommendations on a budget, we need the ability to look at augmenting or cutting the budget within any particular project in order to put together a budget recommendation that does the science that we think needs to be done for the money that we have available. The "Outsourced Science/Labor" category should be split into two. The logistics category should indicate estimated number of trips and cost per trip. The operations category should include a breakdown of what is included in that category with line item budget numbers attached. And the salary category should include a breakdown of the positions included and the number of pay periods estimated, again with line item budget numbers attached.	GC Wildlands	BAHG will address this comment in its recommendations for future budgets & work plans (06 and beyond)	
17 - GCMRC appears to be too big; more money should be sent out to competitive science (non USGS scientists.)	GC Wildlands	Appropriate for AMWG discussion at Mar. meeting	
	WAPA		
18 - L. 24-38 (Tribal Consultation): Have other tribes been invited to be involved?	GC Wildlands	Yes, (Havasupai, choose to remain uninvolved, yet interested)	
19 - Tribal role within the science program (continued): What the Hopi Tribe would like to see is a mechanism whereby tribal programs can develop culturally relevant monitoring and science that can be funded at levels appropriate to accomplish the work and that these projects go through the same type of peer review that other projects receive. Obviously, the review needs to address whether the methodology is appropriate for addressing the questions within a given cultural system, not whether the cultural system itself is valid. Currently, the limited funding opportunities for tribes are a fixed amount, not tied to a specific task or scope and level of work. This fixed (equal) funding approach essentially obviates the Center's peer review process and sends the message that work by tribes is not really rigorous and of a lesser value within the broader science program.	GC Wildlands	<p>The BAHG suggests this as an AMWG discussion topic at future meeting(s).</p> <p>-Tribes should also develop proposals for AMWG describing the proposed future activities and how they should be funded.</p> <p>-It is not clear to the BAHG why the existing tribal funding cannot be applied to the proposed new activities? Use of the existing tribal funding should be carefully defined.</p>	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
<p>20 - Scope and direction that the science program is headed: concern about the direction of the program as a whole, while not a budget item in and of itself, is fundamental to funding priorities within the program and has not been explicitly addressed or resolved on the broad scale. Perhaps the biggest dichotomy is the relative weights of research vs. monitoring. (In this discussion, research is used to mean relatively short-term "experiments" to address a specific process related question whereas monitoring is used to mean collection of data to identify temporal trends (recognizing that neither of these categories are not mutually exclusive)). Obviously, an understanding of the _workings_of the system is need at some level in order to effect management actions. It is also necessary at some level in order to effectively and efficiently monitor the system since not everything can be directly measured. It seems like the program, however, is stuck in the _understand the system_phase and is not moving into a monitoring phase. It is the rare meeting that you don't hearing about the next [fill in your favorite resource group] flow experiment_or a modification to an ongoing one. And each of these requires additional study that eats into an already under-funded program. Discussion needs to occur on what is the proper balance for the program. The system is dynamic and virtually every year will bring slightly differing conditions and dam operations. If we continue to go down the path that we seem to be following, our effort will be focused on treating each _event_as an experiment unto itself and forsaking the long-term monitoring continuity. A parallel issues is the role that the Center (and AMP program as a whole) is going to take in active management outside of direct dam operations. In part, this is an in-and-out issue, but at a broader level than just for the Ins, MOs, etc. The clearest example is surrounding the humpback chub. The program seems to be moving ever closer to becoming a humpback chub recovery program. Whether this is good or bad isn't necessarily the issue. There just hasn't been adequate resolution of whether this is the direction that the program should go; it just seems to be proceeding on its own inertia. The ramifications on a capped budget of moving beyond fundamentally being a resources monitoring program into remediation (a management agency function) are substantial to say the least.</p>	GC Wildlands	BAHG will consider these comments in development of a process for future years planning and budget documents	
<p>21 - Tribal role within the science program: The need and desire to incorporate tribes and tribal values into the science program has been clearly and repeatedly stated within science and management forums of the AMP. Unfortunately it is not reflected in the budget. In fact, the potential for realizing real tribal participation is decreasing. Within the FY05 budget, the only place within the science program for tribal participation is in the terrestrial monitoring and this is limited; the cultural program doesn't even have any! For the past three years, the Hopi Tribe has been working towards developing an integrated monitoring approach with the GCMRC's terrestrial monitoring program. It seeks to utilize the expertise of the Center's program to collect specific resource data while complementing this with tribal knowledge that can only be</p>	Hopi	<p>The BAHG suggests this as an AMWG discussion topic at future meeting(s).</p> <p>-Tribes should also develop proposals for AMWG describing the proposed future activities and how they should be funded.</p>	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
collected with direct participation of tribal participants. The base funding for this program has dropped from 25K to 10K for FY05 and appears that it will remain at this level, irregardless of the level and needs for the Tribe. There are additional funds for developing an outreach plan in FY05 which is appreciated by the Hopi Tribe (as this is an integral part of the Hopi long-term monitoring plan), but which may or may not be appropriate for other tribes. Each tribe needs to develop its own culturally appropriate participation needs. Outside of the terrestrial monitoring program, there are no funding mechanisms available for the tribes to directly participate within the science program. In order to fundamentally participate, a tribe needs to be able to develop monitoring and research approaches that address the needs of the program (and the tribe) from within its own cultural system. It can't be accomplished from the outside. Simply adding a tribe to an already developed program is more along the lines of consultation, not participation at a fundamental level. In the past, more culturally appropriate participation this has been facilitated through the use of unsolicited proposals from the tribes, but this mechanism is not available for FY05.		-It is not clear to the BAHG why the existing tribal funding cannot be applied to the proposed new activities? Use of the existing tribal funding should be carefully defined.	
22- The workplan contained no project descriptions of a) tribal consultation, b) cooperation with tribes, c) tribal river trips, d) programmatic agreement. GCRG would like to request these items be added. Every element of the program should have the same level of project description.	GCRG	Reclamation will check to see about the status of this information and will add if missing.	
<b>CORE MONITORING: GENERAL</b>			
23 - I feel uncomfortable in cutting core monitoring for any program area. I would prefer that some of those funds be reinstated. Examples include terrestrial, coarse sediments and fine sediments. I understand that GCMRC is considering going to an every-other-year core monitoring schedule. That may be appropriate in some cases. However, without some sort of scientific evaluation, switching over to biennial at this time would be inappropriate.	WAPA	The BAHG recognizes that "core monitoring" has not been fully defined yet. These projects will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.	
24 - In the last GCMRC presentation at the TWG it was apparent that "core monitoring" was suffering from a lack of funds. Why is "core monitoring" being cut before other research? Why doesn't the budget reflect (emphasize) the importance of "core monitoring" and de-emphasize extra curricular experiments? GCMRC will be submitting reports on the importance of "core monitoring" in April, yet, those programs are the ones being cut. This is a contradiction in practice.	NPS-GRCA	The BAHG recognizes that "core monitoring" has not been fully defined yet. These projects will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.	
25 - Lines 102-107. It has been told to TWG members that higher technology and models will allow for a decrease in field work and a decrease in overall core monitoring activities. When will the budget reflect this? Currently, the budget reflects when the models will be completed, yet the budget shows no consequential decrease in expenditures. Please explain this. This is	NPS-GRCA	The BAHG believes that the answers to these questions will be evident in the 2006 and beyond	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
also exhibited in lines 138 and 140.		budgets & workplans.	
26 - Need to fully funding the core monitoring program: This comment is pretty much self-explanatory. Things that are identified as core monitoring should be the first things to be funded. TWG/AMWG recognized the importance of core monitoring when it conducted the prioritization exercise: core monitoring was not included in the exercise precisely because it needed to be done every year (or as appropriate as dictated by resource response time) in order to maintain a scientifically valid monitoring program. The FY05 budget has substantial reductions in a number of the projects identified as core monitoring, in particular the terrestrial monitoring and some of the sediment projects. If these are not truly considered to be core monitoring, than that should be identified. Otherwise thought needs to be given to restoring funding to them.	HOPI	The BAHG recognizes that "core monitoring" has not been fully defined yet. These projects will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.	
<b>EXPERIMENTAL FLOWS: GENERAL</b>			
27 - Zeroing out the experimental flow component for the mass balance program seems inappropriate since we want to do an experimental flow if we get the sediment trigger. Without this monitoring program, it may be impossible to assess if it worked.	WAPA	BAHG will develop a work plan & budget that includes carry-overs that apply to the "with" and "without sediment" experimental components.	
28 - Pg. 43. These three contingency events perhaps should be included as a regular budget item owing to their importance. If hydrologic conditions prevent their being deployed, then funds could be allocated to less critical needs or carried over.	CREDA	BAHG will develop a work plan & budget that includes carry-overs that apply to the "with" and "without sediment" experimental components.	
29 - If the experiment doesn't occur, where will the funds be moved? How much of the program continues regardless of the experiment? If the experiment does not occur wouldn't it be wise to reinstate "core monitoring" programs that were cut?	NPS-GRCA	BAHG will develop a work plan & budget that includes carry-overs that apply to the "with" and "without sediment" experimental components.	
30 - Pg. 45. We fail to understand why baseline monitoring work needed to test the value of a 1994 Biological Opinion-mandated set of flows has not been done and why it is now considered "additional work." By 2005, it will be over 10 years since the BO mandated such work. We seriously question the need for a SASF release regimen; but we also have scant information on baseline conditions that would help make the necessary comparisons, to possibly result in	CREDA	The BAHG acknowledges the challenges in comparing these data sets. GCMRC will commit to presenting these data to the	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
<p>recommendations to the Secretary. A GCMRC plan (Program of Experimental Flows) agreed to by USBR and USFWS to meet the BO RPA was intended to study the SASF concept. This plan requires a year of ROD flows in an 8.23 maf year and this occurred in 2003. However, it is our understanding that monitoring and research of the kind and intensity thought necessary during the 90-day period of the 2000 LSSF to test its effects was not repeated in 2003. The workplan is silent on addressing this significant baseline issue. We suggest there should be a presentation to the TWG of the comparative findings (2000 v. 2003).</p>		<p>TWG in the near future and the results will be incorporated into the core monitoring programming decisions.</p>	
<b>COMMENTS RE: PA PROJECTS</b>			
<p>31 - The BOR line item for treatment for NN and GLCA concerns me since it is treating sites above the 97,000 cfs line. I prefer to renegotiate the sites for treatment to a lower stage flow.</p>	WAPA	<p>The BAHG believes that this is a misinterpretation of the commitment for treatment of sites.</p>	
<p>32 - Since the proposed "APE" for treatment of archaeological sites has been negotiated to 97,000 cfs, I would like to see some of those funds retained to begin the whole canyon treatment plan, preferably a monitoring and treatment plan.</p>	WAPA	<p>If the NN – GLCA treatment plan requires less funding than is committed, then it can be reprogrammed to the Grand Canyon River Corridor (GCRC) treatment plan.</p>	
<p>33 - The recommendation of the BOR to reduce the TCP GIS funding to \$30,000 is appropriate since Zuni is interested in pursuing this project.</p>	WAPA	<p>The BAHG supports this proposal as a pilot project, under the condition that results are presented to the AMP and that they are subjected to external peer review. (This change would free up \$120,000 for the FY05 budget)</p>	
<p>34 - Line 48. TCP GIS – This presentation left TWG representatives confused. The question is will TCP information be integrated into a GIS data base for use in assessing affects of AMP actions on National Register eligible and non National Register eligible Traditional Cultural Properties as a result of this project? If so, why isn't there a push for all tribes to participate as this would be very important for partial completion of GCMRC's integrated data base?</p>	NPS-GRCA	<p>The BAHG supports this proposal as a pilot project, under the condition that results are presented to the AMP and that they are subjected to external peer review. (This change would</p>	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
		free up \$120,000 for the FY05 budget)	
35 - The recommendation for \$10,000 for the Zuni to participate in the check dam work sounds premature. Based on the meeting, Zuni is not ready to work on the check dams until additional studies are done on their efficacy.	WAPA	The BAHG suggests that the TWG and the Zuni should consult on this issue with regard to effectiveness of check dams relative to arroyo gradient.	BAHG
36 - Line 47. Zuni Conservation Program: The installation, monitoring and maintenance of check dams are an essential part of the preservation program. It could be combined with NPS funds if the additional funds were added to NPS budget. TWG representatives were very confused after Reclamation's presentation for this project. The presentation of this program came across as being completed by unprofessional Zuni personnel and as a task not really needed. This presentation was not only insulting to the Zuni Tribe, but also an embarrassment to people who actually reviewed the draft final by Joel Pederson and others (University of Utah). The Pederson report indicated that "Based on these results, we recommend that the placement, monitoring, and maintenance of erosion-control structures continue in Grand Canyon, and that further research be done to confirm our initial findings, including that brush check dams are superior to rock linings". NPS strongly supports continued funding to the Zuni Tribe for these efforts until determined otherwise.	NPS-GRCA	The BAHG suggests that the TWG and the Zuni should consult on this issue with regard to effectiveness of check dams relative to arroyo gradient.	
37 - The monitoring line item for GLCA may need to be zeroed out since the sites will receive treatment.	WAPA	Funding for this will depend upon two factors: whether sites have been subjected to treatment, and whether the type of treatment requires future monitoring. The FY05 budget will be adjusted depending upon progress in the treatment process.	
38 - I would like the table for each project to reflect the amounts of dollars associated with the experimental flow. I would also like to see the dollars for what is called core monitoring.	WAPA	GCMRC will make revisions to the FY05 workplan to reflect the various funding categories. (move to the core monitoring section)	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
<p>39 - There seems to be much disagreement between BR, NPS, and PA signatories over the scope of the cultural program. Perhaps AMWG needs to recommend to the Secretary that BR and NPS work with the PA to define the APE and clarify responsibilities for compliance. It appears that the PA and GCMRC haven't made much progress. Would resolution of the APE issue help the AMP with decisions about which projects (Holocene deposits) might be covered within the AMP and which should be funded by other programs?</p>	AZGF	<p>A presentation or review by the PA signatories on the history of determinations is suggested as a means of clarification on this issue.</p> <p>BOR and NPS are jointly working toward creation of an agreement to meet their joint responsibilities related to future work plans and budgets</p>	
<p>40 - Programmatic Agreement: Dennis Kubly indicated at the last TWG meeting that Reclamation and the National Park Service were close to agreement on the shared compliance responsibilities for cultural resources. This agreement may have an impact on the FY '05 activities identified for the Programmatic Agreement, but to what extent is unclear to CREDA. During the November TWG meeting it was clear that there was close to \$400,000 that could be trimmed (which Reclamation appeared to support) from the proposed programmatic activities. It was unclear in the TWG meeting whether Reclamation supported the revisions to the proposed FY '05 Programmatic Agreement activities. Given this uncertainty, CREDA would like to understand how the agreement between Reclamation and the National Park Service will affect the overall Programmatic Agreement responsibilities, how it will revise the activities identified for FY '05, and what will happen with the funds that are trimmed from the Programmatic Agreement. Will these funds be reprogrammed and what is the process for the TWG to comment on that reprogramming, or will they be subtracted from the total FY '05 budget? Given these uncertainties, CREDA continues to support our original comments to delay funding for the Whole Canyon Treatment Plan, to limit the National Park Service's Glen Canyon monitoring program request unless the National Park Service presents the TWG with a detailed work plan and justification for this monitoring, to re-evaluate and perhaps delay the need for check-dam construction during FY '05, and reduce the TCP GIS documentation project scope of work to a pilot project for the Pueblo of Zuni with sufficient funding to develop protocols that the other four tribes may choose to follow. Above all, Reclamation should provide the TWG with sufficient time to meaningfully comment on the FY '05 activities proposed under the Programmatic Agreement and to understand how the TWG's comments were considered by Reclamation.</p>	CREDA	TBD	
<p>41 - L. 42, 48 (Database and TCP GIS): Who is doing the work?</p>	GC Wildlands	Zuni will do the TCP GIS.	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
		The BAHG is requesting from the PA a determination of how the Cultural Program Database will be managed, including any disclosure agreements required.	
42 - Line 43. NPS GRCA – This program is for both Monitoring <b>and Treatment</b> please reflect this in the title. Additionally, the actual request for funds for FY05 is \$276,000. At the PA meeting, \$206,000 was discussed, but it was not based upon the NPS funding request. As with other out year budgets recommended by GCRMC, it would be appropriate to include the actual request rather than the funds that have currently been identified. Throughout the program definitions, TWG has encouraged GCMRC to submit budgets to reflect the work to be done, even if these funding requests are above current levels. The PA program budget should be equally represented.	NPS-GRCA	The BAHG acknowledges this comment as informational and understands that the FY05 request remains at \$206,000.	
43 - Line 46. Whole Canyon Treatment Plan and Implementation: Please note that at the last PA meeting the majority of representatives expressed that these dollars to be spent on a formalized treatment plan. The dollars left over from the plan would be used to begin treatment to fulfill Reclamation's NHPA Section 106 responsibilities as stated in the 1994 Programmatic Agreement. By no means will treatment be completed in FY05.	NPS-GRCA	The BAHG agrees.	
44 - "Whole Canyon Treatment Plan": The title of this project seems to concern some TWG members; (please edit to reflect that the treatment plan is for part of the Colorado River corridor below Lees Ferry, not the whole Grand Canyon.)	NPS-GRCA	The BAHG agrees.  Note: Need to change the title of this project to more accurately reflect the geographical boundaries.	
45 - L. 43-44(GLCA & GRCA Monitoring): Review cost effectiveness.	GC Wildlands	The BAHG concurs that all AMP-funded activities should be subject to AMP peer review protocols.	
<b>GCMRC INTEGRATED SCIENCE PROGRAMS COMMENTS</b>			
46 - Pg. 52. We wonder if the sensitivity level of sediment modeling information is too high, i.e. does it need to be higher than the level needed to help the AMWG recommend modifications to dam operations? First, do we presently have sufficient information to say which of the dam operations reviewed in the EIS will conserve the most sediment, e.g., HFF, MLFF, SASF, etc.).	CREDA	These comments should be provided to the TWG and the AMWG for programmatic review and	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
Second, will further refinement of the data set allow us to recommend a modification to operations at a different level of sensitivity from that found between alternatives described in the EIS? These comments also apply to Project A-3.		discussion. They are beyond the scope of the BAHG in consideration of the FY05 budget process.	
47 - Project A.1.a IQWP . What is the 15% USGS assessment? Descriptions should be provided for the research projects, including methods, schedule, budget, etc. (– I'll abbreviate this comment as WWWWH, as it applies to essentially all of the projects)	GCRG	<p>The 15% assessment is the indirect rate charged by the USGS for funds transferred from outside USGS for the program.</p> <p>The WWWWH will be addressed by the BAHG in its future recommendations, as appropriate.</p>	
48 - L. 99 (A.1.a, IQWP-Lake Powell): Since these are BOR O&M funds, it should be noted that these funds are restricted to this project, and can't be used for other aspects of the science program.	GC Wildlands	The BAHG agrees.	
49 - Pg. 49. Monitoring component 3 (of project A.1.b in the tailwater only) seems inadequate to track changes in chemical and biological conditions in the CRE. Multiple tributary inflows plus in-situ changes modify chemical and biological conditions below Lees Ferry yet no stations are located downstream. We think additional effort needs to be made to quicken the transition from funding reservoir water quality monitoring in favor of downstream monitoring as suggested by the PEP. Also, under Status/Schedule, comments regarding the initiation of water quality monitoring associated with the TCD are troubling. It will be too late to begin monitoring after the TCD is operable if the intent is to understand changes in water quality resulting from the TCD. A baseline of data should be collected before the TCD is operable and now, with the probability summer 2004 water temperatures will be similar to those from a TCD, this workplan should include such work.	CREDA	<p>The BAHG recommends that an assessment be done (by Lake Powell scientists and members of the TWG) on the need for QW data to provide ongoing verification and support of model simulations. This approach should also be applied downstream.</p> <p>Section 8 funds (\$200,000) are available for measurement of affects of warmer water in the CRE in FY04 and FY05.</p>	
50 - L. 95 (A.1.b., IQWP-Downstream): Why does the program need to spend \$200k on this?	GC Wildlands	The BAHG recommends	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
<p>Don't we have enough data to model temperature throughout the river corridor downstream from the dam? If we are monitoring water quality in the reservoir, how much effort do we have to fund to monitor it downstream of the dam? Does what is released change that much as it travels downstream? Can we model that as well? We see huge potential overlap with the aquatic foodbase monitoring as well – is that so? We need to assess whether this project is doing more work than it needs to. Have we done a power analysis? We also need to assess whether water quality is a significant enough priority for the program to be spending \$200k on it.</p>		<p>that existing QW data from the CRE below GCD be analyzed for their utility in addressing these questions.</p>	
<p>51 - Project A.1.b. more detail is needed as to what this program entails.(WWWWH)</p>	GCRG	<p>The WWWWH will be addressed by the BAHG in its future recommendations, as appropriate.</p>	
<p>52 - Project A.1.c. restore funding level. The consequences of current proposal are unacceptable. This program is essential to the program. More detail is needed about this project (WWWWH).</p>	GCRG	<p>BAHG will develop a work plan &amp; budget that includes carry-overs that apply to the “with” and “without sediment” experimental components. (See #27-29).</p> <p>Barring implementation of the EHF, there is no additional need for R&amp;M of non-ROD fluctuating flows in FY05, as they don't occur (see GCRMC Exp. Flow plan).</p>	
<p>53 - L. 54 (Project A.1.c, experimental component): We're not clear from the workplan about what would be done if there were more funds available, so we can't evaluate the cut. Would the program be getting necessary additional information regarding transport rates from this work if we could fund it?</p>	GC Wildlands	<p>See #52</p>	
<p>54 - L. 103 (A.1.c, Stream-flow and sand transport-core monitoring): The cuts in this program were explained at the last TWG meeting, but we're still confused...can we get a written explanation of what is being cut in this project and what the implications for the long-term data stream are? Is this reduced core monitoring? The general comments from line 102 apply here as well.</p>	GC Wildlands	<p>See #52</p>	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
55 - Project A.1.d. not included in plan. Add to revision using the WWWWWH rule.	GCRG	Details for this future monitoring element will be described in project A.8 (food base). The budget for this element is \$0 in FY05.	
56 - Project A.2. restore funding for this core monitoring program	GCRG	Proposed in the future as a biennial monitoring effort, beginning in FY05. Also, to be discussed in the core-monitoring plan	
57 - (Project A.2 coarse sed modeling): We agree with zeroing this out for 2005. With limited funds, the program needs to lean toward direct effects monitoring associated with the experimental purposes. However, in the long run we need to get a better sense of how important understanding the coarse sediment component of the sediment dynamic is, compared to some of the fine sediment work, and whether our budgeting is in line with those priorities.	GC Wildlands	The BAHG agrees. We will examine it further in the core-monitoring plan.	
58 - L. 104 (A.2 coarse grained inputs-core monitoring): Does monitoring of coarse sediment need to occur with the same frequency as monitoring of fine sediment? It seems like this could occur less frequently given less rapid transport rates.	GC Wildlands	See #56	
59 - A.2 coarse sediment monitoring: I like the biennial approach, and hope we see this kind of approach with other projects.	AZGF	See #56	
60 - Project A.3. restore funding for this core monitoring program. Break out experimental flow and core monitoring activities. (WWWWWH)	GCRG	There is no real reduction in this project in FY05. The ratio between monitoring and experimental work is 25% (mon) to 75% (exp).	
61 - A3. sand storage core monitoring: I'm concerned about cuts to core monitoring and I'm confused by which parts of this budget are for core monitoring, which are experimental portion. Can those components be broken out, or is that not possible?	AZGF	The ratio between monitoring and experimental work is 25% (mon) to 75% (exp).	
62 - L. 102 (A.3, FIST): What exactly gets cut here – field collections? Will there be fewer trips going out? How is the long-term data stream affected? A lot of the sediment work is taking a hit in 2005, and it would be helpful to get a big-picture, non-technical view of what that means in terms of our ability to continue to develop our understanding of the sediment situation in the canyon. Also, we should take a look at how dependent we may have become on high-tech but	GC Wildlands	These issues will be clarified by the development of both the GCMRC's remote-sensing and core-monitoring plans	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
relatively expensive ways of monitoring the sediment resource that makes that monitoring vulnerable to interruptions in the long-term data stream when the budgets are tight, money has to be spent in other categories, and sediment projects get cut.			
63 - L. 55( Project A.3-FIST): Why does this component get funding and the mass balance does not? Again, we're not clear from the workplan as to what actual effects monitoring would occur under this line item. Would all the studies in the "Experimental Component" paragraph on page 61 of the 11/10/03 version of the workplan be included? If not, which ones would? There seem to be a bunch of separate projects all lumped together under this line item – we suggest they be broken out and budget figures attached to each project.	GC Wildlands	Under FY05 funding limitations, the topographic sand bar responses are given priority in assessing the conservation response of the EHF implementation. Additional descriptions will be added for sub-project elements in future revisions of the FY 05 workplan.	
64 - Each of these projects that has been subsumed into larger projects like FIST should actually be broken out in the workplan with their own project descriptions and budget line items so that we can evaluate them separately. We don't want to have to zero out FIST in order to zero out a project that isn't actually core monitoring, but rather is experimental flow effects monitoring.	GC Wildlands	The GCMRC shall identify and describe each of these sub-projects more clearly in future FY05 workplan revisions.	
65 - The eolian transport study completed by Draut/Rubin should be a line item in this section rather than in the experimental section. It is one of the few integrated studies by the AMP and should be clearly acknowledged by TWG representatives.	NPS-GRCA	The GCMRC shall identify and describe this project more clearly in future FY05 workplan revisions.	
66 - L. 69 (sed. deposition in arroyos): There is a zero line item for this, but the note says it is included in A.3. This is confusing. Is it going to be done, but it has just been combined into another project (if so, we'd like to see it split out with its own budget line item)? Or has it been combined into another project and there are no dollars for it in that project either, so it will <u>not</u> be done?	GC Wildlands	The budget for this EHF effort is now included in project A.3. It will be shown as a separate budget line item in future revisions.	
67 - L. 80 (A.4.a, Terrestrial Ecosystem core monitoring): The >50% cut in this project is foolish. To eliminate bird surveys and other basic terrestrial wildlife monitoring efforts for a year is not acceptable. The legal implications of eliminating SWFL monitoring alone are serious. We need to find a way to restore the project to workable levels in 2005, the way we anticipate doing it in 2006.	GC Wildlands	The BAHG suggests that this be a placeholder for additional consideration of funding restoration for annual surveys of SWFL	
68 - A1.4 Terrestrial monitoring: What legal obligation does this group (AMP) have to monitoring SWFL? If Fall vegetation monitoring is the "minimum" that must be accomplished to monitor relationships between Dam operations and vegetation, it should be identified as core	AZGF	The BAHG suggests that this be a placeholder for additional consideration of	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
monitoring and continued. \$80,000 to interpret fall vegetation monitoring seems excessive		funding restoration for annual surveys of SWFL  The BAHG suggests this as an AMWG discussion topic at future meeting(s).	
69 - Project A.4.a. Terrestrial Biological Resources – Core Monitoring. CREDA is concerned that this important “core monitoring” program is being dramatically cut (by the Center’s own admission by more than 50%) and reduced in scope by the Center in FY05 in order to fund other, perhaps less necessary, research projects. CREDA believes that core monitoring of terrestrial biological resources is vital to the effectiveness of the Adaptive Management Program and the collection of monitoring data on these resources is part of the foundation of the AMP. CREDA recommends funding the terrestrial biological monitoring program and all core monitoring programs at the necessary levels in favor of other less germane research projects.	CREDA	The BAHG suggests that this be a placeholder for additional consideration of funding restoration for annual surveys of SWFL	
70 - Line 70. A.4.a, 1. Terrestrial Ecosystem -- please list the programs included. Does this include tribal dollars?	NPS-GRCA	Mainly vegetation. Yes, the tribal participation dollars are included in A.4.a.	
71 - Project A.4.a restore funding for this core monitoring program. The consequences of current proposal are unacceptable. (WWWWH)	GCRG	The BAHG suggests that this be a placeholder for additional consideration of funding restoration for annual surveys of SWFL	
72 - Project A.4.b. more info is needed for this project. Is this funding for each tribe? Who is going to do what? Is this integrated with A.4.a? (WWWWH)	GCRG	The BAHG will consider funding Hopi proposal either as part of the terrestrial monitoring or as part of tribal outreach.  Yes, this is intended to be integrated with A.4.a.	
73 - Project A.4.b Core Monitoring – Terrestrial Ecosystem: Tribal Involvement Component – Based on the very limited information provided in the work plan narrative, it appears to CREDA to be very naive of the Center to believe that they can develop booklets, CDs and other tools that will translate scientific terminology and data into culturally relevant and meaningful	CREDA		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
categories and terms for five (5) culturally unique and distinct tribes with \$25,000. CREDA questions whether this is an effective use of the funding amount tied to this program and suggests it may be more prudent to delay this effort to a time when the project is more thoroughly developed and identified as an exclusive project.			
74 - L. 81 (A.4.b, TEM-tribal component): This project is important. However, we'd like to know how critical it is that we spend the \$25,000 for the tools that translate scientific terminology and date into culturally relevant categories and terms in 2005. Can any part of that element of the project be deferred for a year or longer?	GC Wildlands		
75 - L. 82 (A.5, Kanab Ambersnail core monitoring): This is important. It looks like we have been successful in cutting the costs of doing this work. The increase for 2006 is questionable, but that can be addressed when we discuss the 2006 budget.	GC Wildlands		
76 - L. 83 (New Research in Terrestrial Ecosystems): What's up with this? We add it but we abandon it? Can we get a sense at some point of what was anticipated here? Was it supposed to address INs? Respond to PEP recommendations?	GC Wildlands		
77 - L. 84 (mapping holocene deposits): If the project has been eliminated, drop the line item.	GC Wildlands		
78 - Project A.6. How does this project integrate with DASA? Is this project being conducted in cooperation with A.4.a personnel? Is this a project to develop new protocols for veg monitoring? Says imagery will be collected in 2006. What about the 2004 imagery? (WWWWH)	GCRG		
79 - L. 85 (A.6, Habitat Map and Inventory): Any real implications of not moving this project along in 2005? If the program is not doing this in 2005, why can't we come up with enough \$ to at least monitor terrestrial resources?	GC Wildlands		
80 - Project A.7. Suggests carrying forward 04 funds to 05. Isn't this an ongoing project? If so, why would it have a 04 carryover? (WWWWH)	GCRG		
81 - L. 87 & 88 (A.7 Kanab Ambersnail Taxonomy): How important is it to complete this in 2005? The workplan does not reflect this \$25,000 in AMP funds, nor does it describe why AMP funds are necessary. The AMWG has determined that the taxonomy questions associated with KAS are not appropriate for power revenues and should not be done through GCMRC. That puts this whole project in question. Since the taxonomy needs to be resolved, discussions should begin with FWS regarding how to have them take that on.		BAHG understanding is that AMP funding was not going to be used for KAS. Please clarify this.	
82 - Project A.8. experimental flow component needs to be fully developed – what does it add to the budget? (WWWWH)	GCRG		
83 - L. 92 (A.8 Aquatic Foodbase): Is this whole project being competitively bid? Are there experimental components to this project that are part of the \$315,000 total (this is very confusing)? If so, those should be eliminated (see comments to lines 61 and 65).		See requested discussion below	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
84 - A 8 Aquatic foodbase new initiative: I think this initiative needs more discussion with the TWG. What was core monitoring in 97-2000, 01, 02, 03? What did it reveal, what is wrong with it? An RFP with somewhat prescriptive methods for assessing the foodbase was issued recently for foodbase studies. Can we have an update on what happened, what work was done, why it wasn't sufficient to meet information needs? I would like to have a more complete discussion of this resource. The initiative, if it is a 3-5 year initiative (likely I suspect) seems very expensive. How is this different from Project A11?	AZGF	BAHG recommends having a thorough discussion of the food base initiative, including the changes that are being made in the foodbase program to help TWG understand how different projects fit together; in the meantime, need to have a definite identification the rate of predation on HBC is being determined. GCMRC should be prepared to have a detailed presentation and discussion on these topics at the next TWG meeting.	
85 - L. 93 (A.9 Status and Trends of Downstream Fish): For \$820,000, we need a MUCH more detailed description of what is included in this project. We also need to know what is different or what is being cut from 2004 to 2005 that reduces the budget line item by \$50,000, and what the potential impact of that cut will be. Just to say that \$820,000 is needed to monitor status and trends of downstream fish, including recruitment, abundance and distribution of natives and non-natives, is not enough.		BAHG would like to have the answer to this question from GCMRC.	
86 - A9 Core monitoring Downstream fish community: There is a \$50,000 cut in outsourced science labor. What work is being cut, or is this to take advantage of "efficiencies"?	AZGF	See comment above.	
87 - Project A. 10. experimental flow component needs to be fully developed – what does it add to the budget? (WWWWH)	GCRG	Needs to be identified in FY05 budget as exp. \$ that may carry over; this is part of the larger issue of tracking and carrying over exp. flow money that isn't spent in FY04.	
88 - L. 94 (A.10, status and Trends of LF Trout): Will this monitoring effort have any ability to assist in assessing the efficacy of the fluctuating flows experiment? Do we lose that ability if	GC Wildlands	Core monitoring will help to address it but w/out much	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
we drop the snorkel surveys?		power (not a strong signal with one year of data). BAHG requests Bill Persons and GCMRC make a presentation at next TWG on history of how we started using snorkel survey and their results to date.	
89 - A10 Core monitoring Lees Ferry fishery: Experimental Component section in the document needs to be cleaned up.	AZGF	Grammar, cut and paste problems need to be fixed. Doesn't make sense as currently written	
90 - A11 New research primary productivity: How is this related to A8? This project needs more discussion, I'm unclear on what is involved and how this differs from A 8.	AZGF	BAHG requests that this project be more fully developed and vetted through discussion at the next TWG.	
91 - L. 56 (Project A.11- primary Productivity): We're OK with zeroing this out for 2005. It seems like the program needs to put its energies into developing the core monitoring program for aquatic foodbase, and given limited funds, we need to lean towards direct effects monitoring associated with the experimental purposes.	GC Wildlands		
92 - L. 96 (Native and Non-native species): Same comment as line 86.(i.e, What is this? Is there a description in the workplan anywhere? If you want a placeholder in the budget, then at least describe what the placeholder is.	GC Wildlands		
93 - A12 Experimental Treatment: nearshore warming: Is this BOR Temperature control device funding, or is it from AMP funding? Either way I think it needs to be discussed.	AZGF	These are TCD funds	
94 - Project A. 12. Not identified in budget spreadsheet. Can this be integrated with the IQWP and done cheaper? (WWWWH)	GCRG	Reclamation and GCMRC needs to resolve who will conduct these studies ASAP.	
95 - L. 57 (Project A.12-Temps and Habitat Use): Clarification...are these Section 8 dollars being carried over from FY04? Are they restricted for this purpose? Also, this seems to have two components, monitoring water temperature in near shore environments and monitoring fish utilization of these habitats. Please separate this into two projects, show the relative costs, and	GC Wildlands	Yes, these are TCD funds. Reclamation and GCMRC needs to resolve who will conduct these studies	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
then show where the cost savings occur from combining field efforts. Finally, the price tag for this seems a bit high. Why is outsourced science/labor \$85,000 and salary \$30,000? Can this work be done for less? Can there be additional cost savings by doing some logistical combining with other experimental flow effects monitoring trips?		ASAP.	
96 - Pg. 44 and Projects A-12 and A-29. The workplans should show a line item for studies associated with the likely warm water release in summer 2004. Funds are available from CRSP Section 8 for research and monitoring TCD effects. This is an opportunity to test the effects without incurring TCD compliance, design and construction cost. USBR and GCMRC should immediately coordinate this effort and prepare workplans for all those facets to be monitored as if a TCD were operable, e.g., food base, native and nonnative fish, recreation, trout fishery, etc.	CREDA	BAHG agrees with this comment.	
97 - L. 58 (sandbar modeling): How critical is it to verify the sandbar model soon? If we have a high flow in 2005 and can't do the verification, then don't have another high flow for several years, do we really hurt our sediment work?	GC Wildlands	Isn't This modeling project completed in FY04? If so, why is there money in FY06?	
98 - L. 60(A.13 Kanab Ambersnail pop): Essential for legal compliance. Keep it in.	GC Wildlands	OK. Has the compliance money been carried forward from FY04? Please provide more detailed cost breakdowns for A.5 and A.13.	
99 - Project A.13. Wasn't this habitat mapping converted into a remotely sensed deal? Why isn't this just an element of A.5.? (WWWWH)	GCRG	Because habitat area can not be effectively photographed from air.	
100 - Project A.14. restore funding for this project. Understanding changes to the food base as a result of high flows is a critical aspect of the experiment. (WWWWH)	GCRG	This should be covered in GCMRC's presentation to the TWG (see comments on foodbase issues above)	
101 - L. 61(A.14, Foodbase impacts of EHF flows): We're OK with zeroing this out for 2005. It seems like the program needs to put its energies into developing the core monitoring program for aquatic foodbase, and given limited funds, we need to lean towards direct effects monitoring associated with the experimental purposes.	GC Wildlands	This should be covered in GCMRC's presentation to the TWG (see comments on foodbase issues above)	
102 - L. 62 (Monitoring of Adult RBT): If this project is complete, let's just cut the line item out.	GC Wildlands	OK.	
103 - Project A.15. restore funding for this project. This is the only project I can identify that investigates the intent of the experimental high flows. Why cut it? (WWWWH)	GCRG	This is an off year for exp. high flows.	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
104 - L. 63 (A.15, distrib. of spawning Redds): Does monitoring these matter? They were mapped in the LF reach in 2003. We're extending that down into the rest of the CRE in 2004. We may need to just go with those data in terms of mapping. If there is a compelling reason why we need to map these redds over multiple years during the experimental flows, please let us know what it is. So we're OK with zeroing out the mapping component of project A.15 in 2005, and suggest that we may want to zero it out in 2006 as well.	GC Wildlands	BAHG recommends that GCMRC respond to these questions at next TWG and be prepared to discuss rational for chosen methods.	
105 - L. 64 (A.15, Determination of the Suppression Mechanism): This portion of project A.15 is a whole different story. It is critical to determine the mechanism for mortality of trout under these experimental flows. If the program hasn't figured that out by spending \$125,000 on it in 2004, then we need to have funds available in 2005 to do it. We can't push this one off to 2006.	GC Wildlands	BAHG recommends that GCMRC respond to these questions and comments at next TWG in light of fact that experimental regime may be revised in FY05.	
106 - In the workplan, these two elements of project A.15 should be split into two separate projects. We don't see any good reason why they were combined.	GC Wildlands	See comment above.	
107 - Project A.16. Is this just another aspect of project A.8?	GCRG	See comment #84 and duplicated below	
108 - L. 65 (A.16, foodbase impacts of fluct. flows): We're OK with zeroing this out for 2005. It seems like the program needs to put its energies into developing the core monitoring program for aquatic foodbase, and given limited funds, we need to lean towards direct effects monitoring associated with the experimental purposes.	GC Wildlands	BAHG recommends having a thorough discussion of the food base initiative, including the changes that are being made in the foodbase program to help TWG understand how different projects fit together. GCMRC should be prepared to have a detailed presentation and discussion on these topics at the next TWG meeting.	
109 - Project A. 17. Can this project be done cheaper? Who is working on this? (WWWWH)	GCRG	Probably not. Proposed for contracting in FY05.	
110 - A17 Mechanical Removal: If outsourced labor doubles from 2005 to 2006 I would expect a decrease in some other costs (GCMRC costs?) to accomplish this work. I'm not clear on what the category "outsourced science/labor" actually represents. Perhaps this could be clarified somewhere in the document.	AZGF		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
<p>111 - L. 66 (A.17, Mechanical Removal): We think the program needs to take a hard look at whether this project continues past two years. It is extremely expensive, and although it appears to be effective in removing trout, what we really need to see is whether it is effective in improving humpback chub survival, recruitment and/or growth rates. We should also be clear that this is no longer an experiment if we continue it into 2005 and beyond – at that point it becomes a management action and it should be evaluated and budgeted as such. So where do we find the project that includes the effects monitoring portion of this project? Will the Status and Trends of Downstream Fish project pick them up? Is the program measuring growth rates of HBC in the treatment reach to see if removal of trout is decreasing competition? The importance of this project needs to be evaluated in the context of all the other actions that can or should be taken to improve HBC, and all the expenditures for HBC should reflect their relative importance in the overall effort to improve the situation of the fish.</p>	GC Wildlands	<p>TWG will consider continuation of this project at Jan meeting. In FY07, (before exp is over), there is potential for this work to be covered by appropriations as part of a recovery program.</p>	
<p>112 - L. 67 &amp; 68 (A.18, RBT diet and predation of Native fish): Isn't this important? If we think we will know everything we need to know about trout predation by 2005, then zeroing this out in 2005 is OK and we should zero it out in 2006 as well. But if we are just zeroing it out in 2005 to save money, then we have a real problem with spending \$586,000 on the mechanical removal and not looking at all at the trout predation question.</p>	GC Wildlands	<p>BAHG would like to see the diet question answered. Is this part of the foodbase work? Will the project be completed in FY04? If not, then additional funding in FY05 may be required.</p>	
<p>113 - Project A. 18. restore funding for this project - critical aspect of the experiment. (WWWWH)</p>	GCRG	See comment above	
<p>114 - L. 97 (A.19, Captive Breeding Program): If this is a relic, and now we have a genetic refugia project for HBC instead, then just pull this out.</p>	GC Wildlands	<p>At the AMWG meeting, a decision was made to move 40K in FY04 from genetics management plan to refugium plan. How can we have 100K for refugium when plan is not yet done? FY05 work plan does not mesh exactly with HBC plan and this needs to be fixed in final FY05 work plan. Also, if \$40K is being carried forward from FY04, show it as part of FY05</p>	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
		<p>budget as carry forward money.</p> <p>Note from Randy S: In FY07, (before exp is over), there is potential for this to be covered by appropriations as part of a recovery program. More discussion of this issue is clearly needed.</p>	
115 - A19 ( and others) HBC actions: Several HBC project descriptions need to be cleaned up, esp. regarding genetics planning. Perhaps the HBC ad-hoc can help.	AZGF	OK	
116 - L. 157 (A.19): The project name in the workplan seems misleading. We gather that this project is not about maintaining the genetic material specifically from the 30-mile aggregation. Why do we think this will cost \$100,000 in 2005 when only \$40,000 was budgeted for 2004? What is FWS's role in this project?	GC Wildlands	See the comments above about clarifying genetics planning in general.	
117 - Project A. 19. I thought AGF/FWS were going to fund this one. Cut? (WWWWH)	GCRG	FWS is funding genetics management plan.	
118 - L. 98 (Pop. Genetics of HBC): If this is done, then pull it out. But isn't this the work that the Douglases were doing? And isn't it scheduled to be completed in 2004 or 2005?	GC Wildlands	BAHG: get the report!	
119 - Project A.20. I can't see how this will help. Cut (WWWWH)	GCRG	BAHG does not agree.	
120 - L. 160 (A.20, HBC translocation to tribes): We need more details to help us understand what will be done for \$50,000 in 2005.	GC Wildlands	More detail should be included in final version of FY05 work plan	
121 - Project A. 21. Perhaps the only additional HBC action that needs to be implemented. Should add the task of further development of HBC ad-hoc recommendations. (WWWWH)	GCRG		
122 - L. 162 (A.21, Dam Ops Exp.): This project was not intended to be a project to plan experiments over a multi-year period. In 2004, planning is appropriate. In 2005 and beyond, there should be additional experimentation involving dam operations to benefit humpback chub being implemented. Any funds for planning should be minimal in out years, but we need to anticipate additional experiments, potentially starting as soon as 2005.	GC Wildlands	The project description in the work plan sounds like the MATA workshop we just completed. It was not the intent of the HBC Ad Hoc to spread \$\$\$ over 3 years for planning, which is how it sounds now. BAHG would	

Comments	From	Response	Responder
		like to know why project description does not conform to the original project description in HBC plan and would like break down/clarification of the current proposed budget.	
123 - Project A. 22 cut. impossible goals (WWWWH)	GCRG		
124 - A.22 HBC actions – scientific/recreation impact: For this and other projects that will be going out for competitive bid, I suspect the amount allocated may be insufficient. Check your math on the % outsourced. It is hard to know what the cost will be for a project when the scope of work is not clear. Most other planning type projects were flagged with cost estimates of \$50,000 (HBC actions, think this was estimated by the HBC ad-hoc).	AZGF	Review project objectives and funding for sufficiency. Please clarify why budget does not seem to match the one proposed in HBC plan.	
125 - Project A.23. cut. Should be integrated with downstream fish monitoring (WWWWH)	GCRG		
126 - L. 168 (A.23, fish monitoring below Diamond Crk): Why isn't this already incorporated into A.9? Why isn't the \$10,000 coming from the LCRMSCP for this identified under available funds? If that \$10,000 doesn't have to come out of power revenues, more power revenues are available for another project.	GC Wildlands	BAHG would prefer to see pilot proj. developed in FY04 with the \$50K, to develop appropriate protocols for RFP in FY05. The plan is to get \$25K from LCRMSCP to match 25K from AMP in FY05.	
127 - Project A. 24: monitoring fish diseases and parasites. cut. Should be integrated with downstream fish monitoring. Does the suggestion that 04 funds be rolled into 05 mean that 05 does not need to identify funds for this project, since it will be using 04 funds? (WWWWH)	GCRG		
128 - L. 170 (A.24: monitoring fish diseases and parasites): This needs more detail in the workplan. What are we going to get for \$55,000? Can we piggyback this monitoring on other projects for some cost savings?	GC Wildlands		
129 - A24 HBC Action – disease and parasites: If the plan is to spend about \$5,000 in salary to issue an RFP in 2004, for about \$100,000 of work to be done in 2005, I think the budget should show that, and not assume carry-forward from one year to the next. It makes it hard to consider the whole package, and there is a fear that \$50,000 might be approved for year 1, but not for year 2, and the work won't get done. This might make it hard to balance the budget for FY2005 and for FY2006, but lets make it as transparent as possible.	AZGF		
130 - Project A.25. cut. Funds for this effort should come from another source (WWWWH)	GCRG		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
131 - A25 HBC Action LCR watershed management Plan: AMP needs to seek clarification on whether this is to be covered by AMP funds, within the funding cap, or whether it is a BOR obligation. BOR says all compliance activities are to be funded by AMP. I think this is an important issue and needs to be fully discussed in the AMWG.	AZGF		
132 - L. 169, 175, 176: We question the decision to incorporate these into the LCR Watershed Management Plan project. It loads too much into a single project. Also the budget for this project is probably unrealistic – too low. If these projects are kept separate, they can be accomplished individually over a number of years.	GC Wildlands		
133 - Pg. 101, Project A.25 LCR Watershed Management Plan: Back in the mid 90s (1994-1995?) Reclamation provided the Navajo Nation with funding to develop a LCR Watershed Management Plan. The Navajo Nation then subcontracted with SWCA –Salt Lake City Office to develop the management plan. The TWG has never seen or reviewed the LCR Watershed Management Plan developed by the Navajo Nation for this program. CREDA would like to know the status of that plan, when the TWG will be given a chance to review that plan, and whether this project proposed for FY05 is a duplication of effort. CREDA recommends delaying the funding for this project until these questions are sufficiently addressed.	CREDA		
134- L. 171 (A.25, LCR plan): Given the projects that have been combined into this one, it is unrealistic to think that it can be accomplished in a single year, and for \$100,000. GCMRC and BOR need to have discussions with FWS ASAP to determine the lead for this project.	GC Wildlands		
135 - L. 172 (A.26, LCR, Mainstem Pop. Est. for HBC): Can we get a sense of how the \$200,000 figure was arrived at for this project for 2005? What does GCMRC estimate will go into conducting a concurrent assessment?	GC Wildlands		
136 - Project A. 26. cut. Don't we have monitoring programs doing this already? (WWWWH)	GCRG		
137 - Project A.27. ? Huh?	GCRG		
138 - Project A.28. Shouldn't this be done before maintaining a refugia? (WWWWH)	GCRG		
139 - L. 174 (A.28, genetics Management Plan): Has this been folded into the genetics refugium project? It would be unwise to proceed with removal of fish to a refugium without a genetics management plan. If GCMRC is not the appropriate lead on this, then GCMRC and BOR need to have the discussions with FWS to determine who is the appropriate lead.	GC Wildlands		
140 - Project A.29. incomplete budget table. (WWWWH)	GCRG		
141- Project A29: This appears to be the same as Project A12.	AZGF		
142 - DASA – Is this effort an extension of the Remote Sensing Initiative? There is no mention in the DASA description regarding cooperation with participating scientists. The concern here is that these products are being developed independently of the ongoing monitoring efforts without input from cooperating scientists. There needs to be a well defined need for collecting	GCRG		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
these expensive products other than it can be collected. The argument is made that these remotely sensed products decrease the expense and impact of more intensive ground-based operations. However, these products are also extremely expensive and invasive (over flights at 300ft AGL are unquestionably invasive).			
143 - Project A.30.a IF there is not a flight in 05, why fund it? Should we just request 490,000 in 06? If part of this is intended to keep staff on during the "off" year, why not just identify that component as put the acquisition as a request in 06. identifying funding in 05 for 06 seems weird. (WWWWH)	GCRG		
144 - L. 140 (A.30.a: airborne remote sensing): If 2005 is not an overflight year, why is there a \$200,000 project budget?	GC Wildlands		
145 - L. 107 (A.30, b,c: channel Mapping): We see \$10,000 in the workplan for A.30.c that hasn't been identified as coming from another project – is this zeroed out completely or do we need to find \$10,000 for it somewhere?	GC Wildlands		
146 - Project A.30.b Additional costs for LIDAR acquisition are not identified in A.3. (WWWWH)	GCRG		
147 - Project A.32.b. (WWWWH)	GCRG		
148 - L. 108: If it is done, take it out.	GC Wildlands		
149 - L. 109: Same comment as line 86.	GC Wildlands		
150 - L. 161 (TCD): Isn't this a BOR project? Can we get confirmation that it would be funded from BOR appropriated dollars, restricted for this use?	GC Wildlands		
151 - L. 163 (Sed & Turbidity Augmentation): Is there no contingency for following through with sediment and turbidity augmentation actions should the feasibility study indicate that they are feasible and AMWG recommends them to the Secretary?	GC Wildlands		
152 - L. 156, 158, 159: If these are not projects that are going to be done through GCMRC, they don't need to be included as line items in the budget.	GC Wildlands		
153 - Line 165. N/A. 10. Bright Angel Non-native Fish Removal – Is the dollar amount NPS committed to the program split between the 3 years of funding?	NPS-GRCA		
154 - L. 165: Identify these as restricted NPS appropriated funds, only available for this project.	GC Wildlands		
155 - Line 166. N/A. 11. Tributary Non-Native Fish Survey, Removal – This project is being funded in a similar fashion as #10. Dollar amounts for this project need to be included as contributions to the program.	NPS-GRCA		
156 - L. 166: If we include the Bright Angel non-native fish removal project above with a \$167,000 price tag, does the \$0 budget line item here mean that NPS is still looking for	GC Wildlands		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
appropriated dollars for this? Please be clear about it. Perhaps even budget in the amount it would take to do the project.			
157 - L. 167: This project is already included elsewhere. Don't list it in two places.	GC Wildlands		
<b>GCMRC CULTURAL PROGRAM COMMENTS</b>			
158 - Project B.1 Core Monitoring of Cultural Resources: CREDA questioned the timing of this project, especially with the commitment of the Center to develop a comprehensive core monitoring plan for TWG review by January '04 and to have it finalized and ready for AMWG approval by April '04. The Center has not provided a satisfactory response to CREDA's initial comment regarding this project; therefore, CREDA still questions the need to fund this project in FY05 unless the Center envisions that cultural resource core monitoring will not be a part of the comprehensive core monitoring plan develop in FY '04. CREDA does not see the need for this project if the proposed scope of work will be accomplished in FY '04.	CREDA		
159 - Project B.2 Development of Geomorphology Process Model for Predicting Erosion of Cultural Resources: This project is proposed to be a three-year effort, exceeding \$420,000. CREDA questions whether this project will be able to provide the definitive answer to archaeological site erosion that it proposes. Perhaps the funding is better spent on the treatment of archaeological sites and the retrieval of scientific data, rather than the development of predictive models that tell us that archaeological sites will erode when water runs down slope over these sites. This program should be dropped from the budget until a more complete justification is established.	CREDA		
160 - L. 118 (B.2): The ability of this project to develop an accurate and useful predictive model seems somewhat in doubt. What indications do we have that this will be a good use of funds? Should the program be spending its dollars on treating the sites that already need work instead of developing predictive capability if funds are limited?	GC Wildlands		
161 - L. 114 (Tribal Outreach Workshop): If it is done, take it out.	GC Wildlands		
162 - Line 86. Cultural database plan – In previous versions of the budget for FY04, there was a dollar figure associated with this task. Please indicate what funds were reprogrammed to IT and include a description within the IT discussion. If these funds were to be dedicated to developing database layers related to tribal monitoring, it may be more appropriate to categorize them under the cultural program.	NPS-GRCA		
163 - L. 86 (Cultural Database Plan): What is this? Is there a description in the workplan anywhere? If you want a placeholder in the budget, then at least describe what the placeholder is.	GC Wildlands		
164 - L. 89 (Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation): Same comment as line 86.	GC Wildlands		
165 - Line 89. Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation -- The dollar figure from previous	NPS-GRCA		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
FY04 budgets should be shown. We believe the funds were actually reprogrammed to the FIST sponsored eolian transport studies. Please clarify. Additionally, why is this not placed in the sociocultural program? If "cultural resources" only indicate ethnobotanical remains or physical remains (not eligible for listing on the National Register) then clearly state that in the title.			
166 - Lines 115 and 116. N/A, N/A, 5 - 6. In previous versions of the FY04 budget, dollar figures were provided for these two line items. Please provide an explanation of where these dollars went. Did these funds also go to the eolian transport study, if so indicate in both areas.	NPS-GRCA		
167 - L. 115: Same comment as line 86.	GC Wildlands		
168 - L. 116: Same comment as line 86.	GC Wildlands		
169 - L. 117: If it is done, take it out.	GC Wildlands		
170 - Line 119. Evaluation & Plan for Cultural Monitoring -- A brief description of what this would include would be useful. Is this program intended to satisfy the legal requirements of NHPA Section 106 as stated in the 1994 Programmatic Agreement? Will this program satisfy the requirements of GCPA for <b>all</b> cultural (heritage) resources?	NPS-GRCA		
171 - L. 70 (B.5, Impacts to Concessionaires, anglers from exp. flows): We agree with postponing this until 2006 if it will be paid out of power revenues. The program may want to consider recommending to the Secretary that NPS seek appropriated dollars to do this in 2005.	GC Wildlands		
172 - L. 71 (changes to camping beaches from exp.flows): Same comments as line 69. Is this a core monitoring issue?	GC Wildlands		
<b>LOGISTICS</b>			
173 - Project C.1 Coordination and Support Program-Logistics Operations: CREDA questions why the Center cannot project the funding allocations for logistics operations in FY '05 and FY '06. The Center has been in operation for more than eight years and should be able to provide the TWG and AMWG with anticipated projected amounts for these out years based on what was actually spent over the last eight years.	CREDA		
174 - L. 142: If logistics are being allocated to specific projects, don't give it a separate and blank line in the budget. But we do need to examine how to cut down logistic costs within this program. Can we get some information on how many trips we estimate will go out? How many boats per trip? (Maybe that could be indicated project by project.) How many trips combine two or more projects? Can more trips be combined? Do the trips use volunteer assistance? Can we increase the use of volunteers?	GC Wildlands		
175 - Project C.1. we should have budget #'s identified with this spreadsheet – even though they are distributed to each project. This is a critical part of the program (WWWWH)	GCRG		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
176 - Project C.2. and C.3. These both seem like aspects of the survey operation, why not combine? Also, what are the effects of additional experimental flow work on these projects? More detail is needed here. Also, integration of historical datasets should not be implemented until the control network is completed. Survey operations should focus on science support. (WWWWH)	GCRG		
177 - L. 106 (C.3, Control Network): How dire is this need? What is being done in 2005 that is in addition to 2004 that increases the budget by \$64,000? Can any of it be deferred? If we do it now instead of later, will we save \$ in 2006 and beyond due to increased accuracy? Is doing this worth not collecting the data that we can't collect due to cuts in other projects?	GC Wildlands		
178 - L. 138 (Survey Ops): We need to know how much of this line item is allocated to each of the projects identified.	GC Wildlands		
<b>INFORMATION OUTREACH</b>			
179 - Line 141, D.1 Please explain in greater detail what this money will be used for. The current draft work plan does not suffice.	NPS-GRCA		
180 - Project D.1. I'm not understanding why this project is needed if these elements are already covered by the library, database and systems administration. Need more info on how this project is different/needed/integrated (WWWWH)	GCRG		
181 - L. 141: Why now? As with the Library...the program can't be spending \$100,000 on the website while we are cutting core monitoring. And we haven't had a SCORE report for four years. We need to pare this line item down.	GC Wildlands		
182 - L. 137 (Library): Why the increase? The program may have to delay some of the scanning project to keep costs down here. We can't be spending \$99,000 on the library while we are cutting core monitoring.	GC Wildlands		
183 - L. 139 (Systems Admin): Increased disk storage should be a priority, but the increased web presence and public accessibility to information may need to be deferred. How much could be saved if this were to happen?	GC Wildlands		
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>			
184 - Nearly 1/3 of the available funds for the program are being utilized by GCMRC for Administration/Technical Support. The intent of the program was to do research and monitoring and it appears that a large portion of the budget is going to administrative support and not to the resources of concern. We understand that the AMP is a complex program. However, it does not appear that internal cost-saving measures have been creatively utilized. Please indicate where GCMRC is attempting to cut, reduce or save costs in regards to administrative/technical support.	NPS-GRCA		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
184 - As we mentioned earlier, we are concerned to see nearly 1/3 of available funds devoted to Administrative and Support services. Are any of these items also budgeted for in the specific program areas? The comments in this section do not address what the funds are being expended on, nor do they represent a full accounting of the costs associated with administering the program. Much more detail is needed in this section of the budget to explain the \$2 million plus dollars being used as base costs for GCMRC. Please indicate where and how GCMRC is saving money.	NPS-GRCA		
185 - Line 41. Reclamation Administration – it seems that this program funds BOR’s regional archaeologist. Is this correct or does it also include travel for meetings with tribes and PA representatives? PA representatives have requested meeting more than once a year. Will this budget allow for additional meetings?	NPS-GRCA		
186 - With CPI adjustments to administrative and management costs, this portion is going to consume a larger and larger percentage of the available funds over time. The program needs to develop a strategy to ensure that administrative costs don’t strangle the program. It needs to find more efficiencies in administration and management, expand the available funding, or both.	GC Wildlands		
187 - Lines 72-74 E.1, D.2, C.2, 19 – 21. -- Why are these additional costs that are not automatically covered under GCMRC’s day to day administrative costs?	NPS-GRCA		
188 - L. 72 (Admin. support for exp. flows): Whose administrative support? GCMRC? Since we have recommended in general terms that the Experimental Management Actions be incorporated into the program areas under Science Activities, implementation of that recommendation would eliminate the need for this line item. If it remains a line item, then we need a detailed breakdown of which of the general administrative support activities identified in E.1 are being allocated to Experimental Management Actions.	GC Wildlands		
189 - L. 73 (Technical support for exp. Flows): Essentially same comment as line 72.	GC Wildlands		
190 - L. 74 (Technical Support/survey equip. for exp. Flows): Essentially same comment as line 72, but with an additional question – what equipment would we be upgrading and why does it need to be upgraded?	GC Wildlands		
191 - L. 112 (unsolicited proposals): Same comment as line 86. Also, we question why we have this for sociocultural but not the other program areas. ***Please restore some funds for unsolicited proposals	GC Wildlands		
192 - L. 113 (AMWG, TWG requests): Same comment as line 86. Also, we question why we have this for sociocultural but not the other program areas.	GC Wildlands		
193 - L. 128 (Admin Ops): We need a breakdown of these costs.	GC Wildlands		
194 - L. 129 (Program Planning and Management): Why aren’t these integrated into other line	GC Wildlands		

Comments	From	Response	Responder
items? If these are salaries and travel costs that can't be associated with science projects, or with TWG and AMWG meetings, what are they? \$282,000 worth is not an insignificant amount.			
195 - L. 131 (Independent Reviews): How is this broken down? How much for the SAB, how much for peer review of proposals, how much for peer review of reports, and how much for PEP panels?	GC Wildlands		
196 - L. 132 (Public Outreach): This isn't even in the workplan. Perhaps it is not a GCMRC function, in which case it should be in the BOR portion. But someone has to take this on. It should be contracted out, and may even be doable for less than \$50,000.	GC Wildlands		
197 - L. 173 (AMWG Outreach Plan for HBC): This needs to be part of E.5. But as the comment to line 132 already indicated, project E.5 seems to be MIA. That needs to be rectified.	GC Wildlands		
<b>MISC. COMMENTS</b>			
198 - The reference to Davis et al. (2003) is not in the References Cited section.	GCRG		