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| Bill Chada | Carlee Brown |
| Rob Billerbeck | Leslie James |
| Brian Healy | John Jordan |
| Ryan Mann | Cliff Barrett |
| Mike Yeatts | Randy Seaholm |
| Don Ostler | David Braun |
| Clayton Palmer | Scott Vanderkooi |
| Mike Moran | Bill Chada |
| Helen Fairly | Lucas Bair |
| John Jordan |  |

**Reclamation Budget follow-up: Reclamation has adjusted the funds from the previous draft to now be within the Budget.**

Cultural Resources

D2 - This line provides Reclamation with assistance for the archaeologist position.

* Mike Yeatts suggested new language be added to the workplan: "Some of this funding may be used to support tribal participation (outside of formal consultation) in the development of the HPP, or other planning and compliance documents, where their unique expertise is necessary for adequately addressing issues, particularly associated with the management of their traditional cultural properties."
* This funding will also support a synthesis of all previous 106 compliance activities to date. Reclamation needs this information.

D3 and D4 – Monitoring for 106 compliance in Glen and Grand Canyon

* The language needs to be consistent for both parks
* The area of potential effect is within the CRE at the new high water line
* It was pointed out that Section 106 compliance is driven by the PA not the ROD

D5 – TCP for Navajo, Paiute and Hualapai

* Zuni and Navajo may also want to update

D6 – Associative Values for TCPs

* This project was cut from FY18 and trimmed from $130,000 to $100,000 in years FY19-20 because no specific associative values study has been identified for funding in FY18 and it is likely that folk’s emphasis will be on the HPP in FY18.
* Does this overlap with project J? This funding is to identify associative values, monitor them for adverse effects, but does not place an economic value on them. The process may have some overlap but the goals are different.
* Reclamation will coordinate with GCMRC on Project J to ensure there is no overlap between the projects.
* Reclamation will look into replacing the word “mitigation” with “resolution” in the narrative to be consistent with the statute.
* This funding could overlap with D2. Bill and Mike will work together to find agreeable language to this explain this.

D7 and D8 – Sensitivity training and video

* Funding was reduced in FY18 and spread out to FY19 and FY20 to allow for time to plan out the project. In FY18 a project lead will be identified to lead the planning for the training; coordinating the input from tribal representatives on how best to do the training, and writing up a work plan. FY 19-20 will be for executing the planned training. If additional funding is required for FY19 and/or FY20, the project lead may write a scope of work to identify the specifics of additional funding needs.
* Brian will check with the Grand Canyon Association to see if they would like to cost share.
* Any relevance/usefulness of this to those outside the GCDAMP (e.g., NPS staff, professional river guides and outfitters, private river runners)?

D9 – Hualapai Archive Project

* Project funding was decreased by $20,000 total since last version of the work plan to bring the work plan into budget

D10 – Contingency for 106 compliance

* A small amount ($25K) will be allocated each year and will rollover and accumulate each year if it is not used.

D11 - Tribal monitoring – very similar to previous work plans. Supports Reclamation’s Section 106 compliance.

D12 – GCDAMP Tribal Participation

* These are not power revenues—they are appropriated (non-reimbursable) funds contributed from each of the 5 participating DOI agencies, not GCDAMP funds
* The language will be checked to ensure consistency with the language is past Memo(s).

Projects Funded Outside the GCDAMP. These projects supplement gaps in GCDAMP funded projects and they also fund compliance and management actions:

Razorback Sucker

Brown trout control

Translocations other than Chute Falls in the LCR. Havasu, Shinumo, potentially Bright Angel.

Water Quality-

* GCMRC was awarded additional funding from the Reclamation water quality group that should last through FY19. The funding is from other power revenues (outside of the AMP).
* Glen Canyon NPS is also doing some water quality work with their own funding.
* More detail is requested in the workplan on sampling ie. Locations, parameters, how often (A table would be useful so that the information could be found at a glance rather than reading many pages.)

Overall comments:

* Randy Seaholm felt the vegetation limits might conflict with GCMRC Projects A and B and suggests close coordination on these projects.
* There was no objection to support moving Reclamations side of the budget forward to TWG.

**GCMRC Budget**

**Science Adviser Review**

The Science Adviser program reviewed and commented on the previous (May 2017) draft workplan as a whole and project by project. General comments included:

* This workplan should implement LTEMP. Information used to determine the gaps included the Science Plan and the Knowledge Assessment
* An adaptive management process was considered
* Geo-referencing should be considered for a cost share
* Version 3 of the GCMRC workplan (June 2017 draft) incorporated the SA comments and GCMRC is writing up their responses to be distributed to the TWG.

Comments:

* There are citations in the document for “work in prep”. Is this appropriate and how can we review the previous work? - Lucas Bair, will provide white papers and make them available to the TWG. These cannot be posted because they have not gone through USGS review.
* Science Plan- Critical science questions are not addressed. - Scott plans to do an introduction chapter for the final draft that will provide an overview of the various guidance and direction documents that the workplan addresses. A draft of this chapter will be potentially provided by August 3 for review. A table showing guidance documents, where they are covered in the plan would be helpful.

Project A- Streamflow, water quality and sediment – David Topping gave an overview.

* The budget was reduced but the SOW was not. It is planned to be offset with USGS appropriated funds.
* The gaging station above Diamond is fully funded by GCDAMP funds, the other gages are not fully covered by GCDAMP
* It is not clear how the budget cuts in FY18 &19 will be managed. Staff, new equipment, number of sites, etc. will be evaluated. USGS and other sources may be able to help. Shane commented that GCDAMP should consider fully funding this project.
* Scott explained that in order to stay within budget, elements of each project were ranked. If they ranked low they were removed from funding. Then, each PI was requested to reduce their budget by a %. Each PI handled the cuts differently. The cuts were not universal for all projects.

Water Quality questions:

* Would there be a reduction in cost if parameters other than temperature were not taken? – Not much of a reduction and the biologists use the other parameter data.
* Would there be a reduction in cost if the time intervals were changed? – The cost would go up because we would be losing information.
* Is there much drift in parameters? - Yes, in some places there are redundant probes. Depending on the site; maintenance occurs every 2 months if the site is accessible, if the site is remote, every 3 months, National Canyon is maintained every 6 months.
* Are these data for base or experimental purposes? – Both, there will be a publication on base and experimental flows for the next 3 years.
* Monitoring should not be cut. – This project took the least amount of cuts to minimize effects and loss of long term data set.
* In order to use funds from the Experimental Management Funds, the project should provide a description of what will be different during experimental flows. – Most of this is built into the budget already.
  + More people are stationed at sites on the river.
  + In some places technology can be used instead of people.
  + In some cases, extended duration flows, there may need to be more people in the field for a longer period which could require additional funds.
* Projects that might need Experimental Management Funds should be identified in the work plan. Projects that may utilize Experimental Management funds should be those that could not be anticipated in advance of the three year budget and work plan and require timely implementation.

Project B- Paul Grams gave an overview.

* What are the primary objectives of this project? - Determine if there should be more HFEs for sandbar building or, over time is the sand supply being exhausted and depletion is occurring. The goal is to measure the sand to determine which scenario is occurring and how to respond to it. A combination of these events can occur in different areas of the river.
* Cuts to reduce the budget included lab experiments for HFE parameters.
* The budget over the 3 years is not consistent. – The same thing is not done each year, in FY 19 field data collection will occur so it is a higher amount.
* Can a remote camera be used to measure sandbar and campsite area? This is not a reliable method because cameras cannot determine things like slope and in some cases vegetation types.
* What are the intervals for sampling? – It depends on logistics. Upstream is more sensitive due to Paria River sand inputs.
* Is there topographic duplicity in B1 and B2? - No
* Katrina questions identifying that the Experimental Management Fund will be tapped for the lab experiments because this project is known in advance and does not appear to fit the criteria for the Experimental Management Fund.
* Seth advocated for funding the modeling work.

Project J – Socioeconomic Monitoring and Research

* There needs to be a subgroup (SEAHG) discussion on Project J. Scheduled for July 19.
* Is there cost sharing? No.
* Leslie voiced concerns about the revised draft and the focus shifting away from hydropower.
* Clayton was confused about the objectives for element J.2 and would like clarification. He noted that modeling should be done before engaging in large-scale experiments. Also wants to see inclusion of newer information/approaches concerning hydropower valuation.
* Ben asked that the guides’ survey be included in the next (FY21-23) workplan.
* Surveys with tribes is most important.
* Can modeling be cut back?
* Seth advocated for funding the modeling work.
* SEAHG will meet to review above items and report back to the BAHG