# Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program

# Technical Work Group: Budget Ad Hoc Group

Conference Call #2, March 10, 2017 – Meeting Notes

## Attendees

The following people identified themselves as being on the call.

Cliff Barrett, UAMPS

Carlee Brown, Colorado

Shane Capron, WAPA and BAHG chair

Marianne Crawford, Reclamation

Craig Ellsworth, WAPA

Helen Fairley, GCMRC

Paul Harms, New Mexico

Christopher Harris, California

John Jordan, Anglers

Vineetha Kartha, Arizona

Ryan Mann, AGFD

Michael Moran, GCMRC

Clayton Palmer, WAPA

Jenny Rebenack, NPS

Peggy Roefer, Nevada

Scott Vanderkooi, GCMRC

The following were not on the call:

Melinda Arviso-Ciocco, Navajo

Janet Balsom, NPS

Chris Budwig, Anglers

Kathleen Callister, Reclamation

Kerry Christensen, Hualapai

Kurt Dongoske, Zuni

Katrina Grantz, Reclamation

Brian Healy, NPS

Leslie James, CREDA

Jessica Neuwerth, California

Don Ostler, New Mexico and Wyoming

Ben Reeder, GCRG

Dave Rogowski, AFGD

Chris Schill, USGS

Randy Seaholm, Colorado

Seth Shanahan, TWG Chair

Larry Stevens, GCWC

Rosemary Sucec, NPS

Mike Yeatts, Hopi

Kirk Young, USFWS

Mary Orton of The Mary Orton Company, LLC attended as facilitator.

Shane thanked everyone who provided comments on the draft spreadsheet. He noted that everyone had received an updated version that morning that included all comments received, and thanked Craig and Mary for putting the comments together. He asked about comments from the three Ad Hoc Groups. Vineetha said the Socioeconomics AHG planned to have its comments submitted by March 16.

Shane gave an overview of the budget development process as he saw it unfolding, and as had been discussed at the last meeting. The BAHG would start discussing the budget at a high level. On April 10 the TWG would see the draft budget from Reclamation and GCMRC. The spreadsheet that Craig created and that now includes all received comments was a tool to have everything in one place: current projects, LTEMP projects, “hot topics” from the last TWG meeting, conservation measures from the Biological Opinion (BO), LTEMP required actions, etc. It could also include everyone’s comments and ideas.

He noted he was also trying to make sure TWG is ready to make a recommendation to AMWG by June: staying at a high level now, having discussions that GCMRC can absorb, then seeing their draft budget on April 10. He reminded the group that they have three more BAHG meetings after this one, scheduled through March 23.

He also said the group has options. It doesn’t need to use all the meetings that are currently scheduled. The group could continue soliciting input on the spreadsheet, have short conference calls, and send the spreadsheet with all the comments to GCMRC and Reclamation for them to consider as they are finalizing their budgets. Then at the TWG meeting in April, everyone can sit together and walk through the budgets in some fashion.

How much time should we spend, and what is our objective? Should we just provide written comments to GCMRC and Reclamation by March 23? Shane asked for input and asked for Scott to begin.

Scott said he was surprised at the level of detail in the spreadsheet, and that it might have been good to have had more discussion earlier about expectations. He said he asked his staff to think about what work and what support is needed to implement LTEMP, based on the LTEMP ROD, the objectives and resources, the goals, the resource areas to evaluate before experiments, and the BO. He said he asked them to think about writing Information Needs (INs) in support of LTEMP implementation. This spreadsheet took the last work plan and walked it over, and it seems premature to be at that stage. He said he wanted discussion on key resources, level of information needed, and focal areas stakeholders are interested in; and then move from that high level to a more detailed level. The spreadsheet seems much more detailed than what is needed now.

Shane explained that the process and the spreadsheet were developed to give Reclamation and GCMRC timely advice from the BAHG and TWG. He thought that many projects would need to continue from the current work plan, based on GCMRC’s science plan; and the spreadsheet included conservation measures and other items from the LTEMP FEIS, ROD, and BO. And because the budget might have as much as $1 million less for science because of increased overhead, he thought it would be important to start thinking about what is required and what may be more discretionary.

Scott agreed, and said he didn’t want the scientists to feel any entitlements with their previous projects. He did not want them to assume all would be continued or budget levels would be the same. He wanted them to focus on implementation and monitoring of experimental actions in LTEMP.

He thought it might be good to have a discussion with BAHG on objectives and resource goals, resources that need to be evaluated before experiments, tying that into the science plan, then narrowing down what needs to be done.

Some members said they liked the spreadsheet because it gave so much information and helped them understand the budget and work plan. It helped them understand what might need to be added and what might need to be replaced. One said the spreadsheet should be useful to GCMRC if all BAHG comments were in one place, and it might save time later. Another asked if GCMRC was planning to give the BAHG something similar to work from. Scott said he saw the value of having a spreadsheet like this, and agreed that at some point they would need to go through something like this.

Scott said that having recommendations to delete certain projects, before any discussion, concerned him and he didn’t find it helpful. Some pointed out that with the budget shrinking, it might be useful to him to see where individual BAHG members saw opportunities to cut the budget, and that today was intended to be the start of the discussion. Others said that they agreed it was premature to have “delete” in the spreadsheet. Still others said that if an individual thought a line could be deleted, it did not mean others agreed or that it should be taken seriously at this point in the process. Another said long-term monitoring is not included in the projects, but it provides information on many project elements.

Scott reiterated that he would prefer to have a higher-level discussion first. Mary and Shane offered a number of options:

* Scott could lead the group in the discussion he wanted.
* The group could talk about Humpback Chub as they had planned and Scott could offer input on that subject.
* The call could end and the DOI agencies discuss and agree how to engage the stakeholders in the process.
* The call could end and the TWG leadership (Seth, Vineetha, Shane) could meet with Scott and Katrina and discuss a way forward.

After a brief talk from Scott on Humpback chub, BAHG members suggested that the meeting end and the leadership get together to agree on a process moving forward.

Mary apologized to the group and assured them a better way forward would be planned.

Several members praised the spreadsheet and all of Shane and Craig’s efforts and said it had helped them understand the budget and be prepared for the budget process.

The meeting adjourned.