

Memo

To: AMWG and TWG members and alternates
From: Anne Castle, Secretary's Designee and Chair of the AMWG
cc: Interested parties
Date: May 5, 2010
Re: AMWG webinar on the FY11-12 Budget

This memorandum will give you some additional information about how we will manage the upcoming AMWG webinar on the FY 11-12 budget:

Thursday, April 29, 2010
11 a.m. to 2 p.m. PDT
12 p.m. to 3 p.m. MDT
2 p.m. to 5 p.m. EDT

Non-federal participants: 1-888-790-7012, passcode 1421568
Federal participants: 1-203-320-3258, passcode 1421568

Sign on to <https://usgs.webex.com/usgs/j.php?ED=135461657&UID=1123935522> to participate in the webinar part of the meeting.

YOUR BUDGET PRIORITIES AND CONCERNS

We will use the TWG issues of concern and the responses from the AMWG members to those issues as the framework for the webinar. However, it is likely that we will not have time to address every TWG issue and AMWG comment during the three hours. If you have comments on issues not covered or any additional comments, please send them in writing to Linda Whetton (lwhetton@usbr.gov) and Mary Orton (mary@maryorton.com) by close of business Friday, May 14. Your comments will be used by Reclamation, GCMRC, and TWG to further develop the detailed budget that will be presented to the AMWG for consideration and approval at the August 2010 meeting.

HYDROGRAPH ISSUE

A number of commenters have raised issues concerning the development of the hydrograph associated with the 2011-12 budget. I will address this topic further at the beginning of the webinar on May 6. A detailed discussion of the hydrograph was not contemplated by the Federal Register notice provided for this meeting. In addition, this issue is seminal to the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and involves multiple considerations, but we will not have time for a meaningful and appropriately detailed discussion of the hydrograph development process during the webinar. We do intend, rather, to address the development of the hydrograph with appropriate background information and time for discussion at the August AMWG meeting. This will also give the DOI agencies time to meet on this issue in advance.

I have asked that TWG to follow its historical procedure for the budget development process, namely, discuss (from the standpoint of technical merit) and recommend to AMWG a hydrograph for FY11-12. It should be kept in mind that hydrograph alternatives will be considered in the process of developing a long-term experimental and management plan, which we hope to initiate by the end of calendar year 2010.

DOCUMENTS

Be sure to review the AMWG website

(<http://www.usbr.gov/uc/rm/amp/amwg/mtgs/10may06CC/index.html>) for last-minute documents posted for the webinar. You will want to have all those documents downloaded for your convenience during the call, as well as in case your computer has difficulty interfacing with the webinar platform.

BUDGET PROCESS

After you hear a presentation from Shane Capron, we will accept a motion on the budget process agenda item.

FY11-12 PRELIMINARY BUDGET

For the preliminary FY11-12 budget agenda item, please note that, because of our time constraints, we are encouraging robust discussion and comments for the benefit of the next step of budget development by the TWG. It is not necessary to have motions or consensus for the budget in general or any specific items. After appropriate discussion of a particular issue, Mary Orton will sum up what we heard (including any disagreements) and we will move on to the next issue.

We plan to follow this outline for this agenda item:

- A. Introduction by Anne Castle
- B. Budget overview
 - a. Dennis Kubly, Reclamation (5 minutes)
 - b. John Hamill, GCMRC (15 minutes)
- C. Budget issues
 - a. Sufficiency and uncertainty of budget / Moving money from 2 contingency funds (6 *AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss these items.*)

TWG Issue #3. TWG is concerned about the continued use of the experimental fund for other purposes within the budget. Without setting aside the experimental fund, it may be difficult to carry out flow experiments in the future. Should there be an HFE in FY11 or FY12, having this small amount of money available for data gathering and analysis would mean no meaningful study. The default would be determining the effect of an HFE through the monitoring program alone. An HFE should be only be conducted to answer direct science questions. Therefore, a science plan should be developed and funding should be identified for this purpose. (10/3/3)

TWG Issue #4. (line 24) TWG is concerned about the continued use of the warm water nonnative fish contingency fund for other purposes within the budget. (no objection)

- b. **TWG Issue #10.** (line 160) Evaluation of rainbow and brown trout movement . . . this funding is inadequate for the purpose of studying and implementing possible alternatives to lethal fish removal. We suggest an increase to \$200,000 to \$300,000. Alternatively, we suggest a budget correction after tribal consultation and resulting actions [are] identified. (no objection) *(9 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*
- c. **TWG Issue #2.** (line 175) Humpback chub translocations above Chute Falls have been deferred by GCMRC. TWG believes this is an important compliance requirement, and a project that has shown great potential for positive effects on the LCR population and should be funded in FY11 and FY12. (no objection) *(6 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*
- d. **TWG Issue #1.** Implement a new start in the work plan for power economics, which will be carried out by WAPA in FY 2011 and 2012, as described in the proposal provided by WAPA dated 3/15/10. WAPA will perform these tasks with no cost to the GCDAMP, and will provide the actual cost as a cooperator in the budget spreadsheet. The work will be part of the work plan and coordinated and reviewed by GCMRC. The workplan would be developed by GCRMC and WAPA in coordination with the TWG. This will result in costs to GCMRC that will need to be provided to oversee and provide peer review of this project. *(10/3/3) (4 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*
- e. Deferred project, line 184, Phase I – Results of Economic Value Workshop. (This issue came from AMWG members, not TWG.) *(2 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*
- f. 2004 AMWG priorities need to be revisited. (This issue came from AMWG members, not TWG.) *(4 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*
- g. **TWG Issue #11.** (line 168) Increased mainstem monitoring should be funded in FY 11 and 12. (no objection) *(2 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*
- h. **TWG Issue #8.** (line 71) The FY11-12 budget/workplan should include \$25,000 to fund an Extirpated Species Workshop to achieve the following:
 - 1. Finalize and prioritize species list.
 - 2. Assess current compliance environment for various implementation strategies.
 - 3. Develop a strategic framework for implement extirpated species goal within AMP.This work could be funded by reducing the DASA 12.D5.10 cooperative agreement by \$25,000. *(12/3/1) (2 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*
- i. **TWG Issue #9.** (line 188) The FY11-12 budget/workplan should include \$89,568 to fund deferred project DASA 12.D9.10-11. This one-time study is needed to aid the AMP in quantifying a desired future condition for sediment resources. This work could be funded by reducing the DASA 12.D5.10 cooperative agreement by \$89,568 for one year or \$45,000 over two years. *(11/3/2) (2 AMWG members indicated they wanted to discuss this item.)*