

# Glen Canyon Dam Technical Work Group Meeting

## June 20-21, 2012

### FY2013-14 Biennial Budget & Workplan

#### DRAFT MOTIONS

##### **If there are no policy issues for AMWG to consider:**

The TWG recommends that AMWG recommend the FY2013-14 Biennial Budget & Workplan from the Bureau of Reclamation and Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center to the Secretary of the Interior for approval.

##### **If there are policy issues for AMWG to consider:**

The TWG recommends that AMWG recommend the FY2013-14 Biennial Budget & Workplan from the Bureau of Reclamation and Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center to the Secretary of the Interior for approval, with the following changes: ...

##### **If there are technical issues for DOI to consider:**

The TWG requests that the Department of the Interior consider the following issues in the development of the FY2013-14 Biennial Budget & Workplan from the Bureau of Reclamation and Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center: ...

#### REPORTS AND QUESTIONS

The discussion of these items (1-9) may lead to additional technical issues.

**1. What recommendations from the Socioeconomic Ad Hoc Group will be addressed in the budget?**

The DOI Interagency LTEMP team has been requested to give an update on their progress determining the socioeconomics issues that will be addressed under LTEMP.

**2. Has the federal salary freeze been reflected in the Reclamation salaries in this BWP?**

Glen Knowles will report whether the Reclamation FY13-14 budget includes the freeze.

**3. P. 12: Recommend that until the POAHG has a specific work plan recommendation with deliverables, this activity be reduced, with the funding potentially provided to have a synthesis of the Knowledge Assessment workshops completed this year.**

It is unlikely that POAHG will have a budget completed before the TWG meeting.

However, the chair expects to have it completed before the AMWG meeting in August.

#### Project C

**4. P. 96: Clarifying question: please clarify the statement “Equalization resulted in the evacuation of cold water from deep portions of the reservoir. These unusual conditions resulted in the warmest release temperatures since 2005, reaching 15.2°C on November 12, 2011, in spite of higher reservoir elevations.”**

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

### Project F

5. **P. 138: F.7.1 – This sentence doesn’t seem to fit together: “Monitoring will focus on midday collections because drift rates tend to be more variable, but higher, during nighttime hours. Seven samples will be collected every six weeks from each location.” Is it important to sample midday because of variability, or better at night?**

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

6. **P. 135: F.4.3 – We had been promised by FWS and GCMRC a Chute Falls translocation plan before the next budget cycle. It appears that document has not been prepared and no mention of it is in the description. Please clarify when we can expect to see a Chute Falls translocation plan? We believe it is important to understand the goals of the project, methods, research plan, important results to date, rationale for continuing it, etc. The second to last sentence on the next page talks about a peer review; that would be helpful, but we think a draft translocation plan would be a good starting point.**

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

### Project J

7. **P. 198: On the bottom of the page this research question is highlighted, “Therefore, a key research question that needs to be resolved is not whether cultural sites are eroding or otherwise changing but whether they are eroding or changing faster or in a significantly different manner than they would if the dam were not present or was operated differently than it has been up until now.” – Question, is this the right question? I understand that we want to understand changes if the dam were operated differently. Is it appropriate to have the larger question, if the dam were not present?**

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

### Project L

8. **P. 233: Table, in the line starting “Participation in phone calls...,” “50%” should be changed to “5%.”**

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

### General

9. **Many river trips are identified in this work plan. A table of proposed projects and the time of year when these trips would take place would be helpful to determine whether we have the logistical support to conduct all this work, especially if non-native control takes place.**

GCMRC will prepare this report.

### TECHNICAL ISSUES FOR TWG’S CONSIDERATION

#### **BOR Budget and Workplan**

10. **P. 6: Consider changing “Experimental Carryover Funds” to “Experimental Funds” and changing “Native Fish Conservation Contingency Fund” to “Native Fish Conservation Contingency Fund Carryover”. Rationale: the experimental fund is an annual fund, when it carries over it goes to the native fish line. (Shane Capron)**

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

**11. SAs' involvement in the LTEMP**

Leslie James and Don Ostler will present a proposal for the SAs' involvement in the LTEMP for a possible recommendation to AMWG.

**USGS Budget and Workplan:**

**Project A**

- 12. P. 57: Project A.4 may be of immediate concern to GCDAMP, especially with the HFE implementation looming in the horizon. Recommend that project should be funded. (\$243,300 FY13, \$249,800 FY14)**

If funding for this project has not been identified, it may need to be discussed at the TWG meeting.

**Project F**

- 13. P. 132: F.1, Question – It looks like only one annual trip is being planned. Please clarify whether it is one trip or two. If it is one, please explain why only one trip is needed now when we used to conduct two, and AGFD has provided a rationale for two in past discussions.**

NOTE: This issue was not addressed at the BAHG.

- 14. Proposal: Maintain the annual creel surveys (\$25,000 FY13, \$25,000 FY14)**

- A memo from Bill Stewart on this issue was sent to all TWG members. Historically, AGFD has funded a creel survey at Lees Ferry. Due to recent budget cuts, they can no longer fund it annually, and there will be no surveys in FY13-14. The 2009 PEP panel recommended maintaining the survey. These surveys are important to obtain data not gathered with electrofishing. They see the larger fish caught by anglers that are not as vulnerable to electrofishing. They also see what is being harvested, and can assess how management recommendations are affecting the fishery.