# Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program

# Technical Work Group: Budget Ad Hoc Group

Conference Call #1, March 7, 2017 – Meeting Notes

## Attendees

The following people identified themselves as being on the call.

Cliff Barrett, UAMPS

Carlee Brown, Colorado

Chris Budwig, Anglers

Shane Capron, WAPA and BAHG Chair

Marianne Crawford, Reclamation

Craig Ellsworth, WAPA

Helen Fairley, GCMRC

Paul Harms, New Mexico

Leslie James, CREDA

John Jordan, Anglers

Vineetha Kartha, Arizona

Ryan Mann, AGFD

Michael Moran, GCMRC

Jessica Neuwerth, California

Clayton Palmer, WAPA

Jenny Rebenack, NPS

Ben Reeder, GCRG

Peggy Roefer, Nevada

Seth Shanahan, TWG Chair

Mike Yeatts, Hopi

Kirk Young, USFWS

The following were not on the call:

Melinda Arviso-Ciocco, Navajo

Janet Balsom, NPS

Kathleen Callister, Reclamation

Kerry Christensen, Hualapai

Kurt Dongoske, Zuni

Katrina Grantz, Reclamation

Christopher Harris, California

Brian Healy, NPS

Don Ostler, New Mexico and Wyoming

Dave Rogowski, AGFD

Chris Schill, GCMRC

Randy Seaholm, Colorado

Larry Stevens, GCWC

Rosemary Sucec, NPS

Scott VanderKooi, GCMRC

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

## Review the Agenda

Shane Capron opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

He said that Mary Orton (facilitator) and Craig Ellsworth (WAPA) would help with meeting minutes. During calls, Mary would help manage the queue if several people wanted to speak at the same time. He encouraged attendees to speak up, ask questions, and have a robust discussion, even as he acknowledged it is sometimes difficult to do this on the telephone. He emphasized that he wanted everyone to have the opportunity to speak and offer input into the FY18-20 AMP budget.

He reviewed the agenda and asked for any additions or questions. There was none.

He noted that everyone was sent that morning the Triennial Work Plan (TWP) process as recommended to AMWG by TWG, and a spreadsheet developed by Craig with input from others that included all the FY15-17 projects, some additional projects that might be required by the LTEMP EIS and ROD, and links to source documents. He said he re-ordered the projects based on the resource areas in the ROD, and provided a crosswalk to current FY15-17 budget project numbers for clarity.

## Review of the GCDAMP Budget Process and Timeline

Shane said that they would use the TWG-recommended budget process. He reviewed Table 1 from that process, and specifically the February, March, and April tasks. (See Table 1, attached.)

He said that now through the April 20-21 TWG meeting, the BAHG would work on input to the budget, and would see the draft budget from GCMRC and Reclamation by April 10. Any input after that would be integrated into the next draft budget, and then a final draft would go to the TWG in June for a recommendation to AMWG. He proposed that the BAHG work through the resource areas, line by line, getting comments from BAHG and getting input on a future recommendation, for example, this is important new project to add, this should continue, this should be eliminated or reduced or have a modified scope. GCMRC and Reclamation will be on the conference calls so they would also receive input along the way and have an opportunity to discuss projects and answer questions.

In response to a question, Shane clarified that deadline for mailing to the TWG, and thus the deadline for having the draft budget from Reclamation and GCMRC, was April 10. The next draft would be developed between the April meeting and the June meeting. He clarified that the first draft was envisioned to be a series of project proposals in abstract form; enough detail to understand scope and funding needs, and probably more projects than funding available. The second draft would add detail, some projects might not be included, and there may be some additions and more detail from the scientists as they flesh out their proposals. He acknowledged that the TWG and GCMRC are a little out of phase, and that the agencies would be getting input along the way from the BAHG regarding the next draft. Mike said that the scientists have finished their extended abstracts, and he encouraged them to work on full drafts and start putting budget numbers on their proposals. He noted there is not much time after the April meeting and the draft needs to be reviewed by the Science Advisors before the June TWG meeting. He asked for and received validation that the draft that goes to the June TWG meeting is close to a final draft. Shane encouraged communication between the agencies and the TWG.

Seth noted that Scott VanderKooi (GCMRC) and Katrina Grantz (Reclamation) met the day before to discuss schedule and deliverables. Seth said as soon as they further clarified their timelines, he would share it with the group.

Other comments included:

* The draft budget needs to be reviewed by DOI before coming to the BAHG or TWG.
* Request that project summaries include details, as possible, such as sample locations, frequency, and data to be collected.
  + Mike Moran said some of them have this detail, and some do not.

## Budget Development

### Roles

Shane said that the TWP is complicated and a lot of work, so he asked for support from the AMP facilitator, Mary Orton, and received quite a few hours for her from Reclamation. She is reimbursed on a “firm fixed price” basis, which means she is paid a flat rate regardless of how many hours she works, so he intends to use all the hours she is budgeted for. If BAHG calls need her assistance, she’ll help with those; if BAHG calls are easy, he might hold off to have her at a face-to-face meeting later. She will also provide draft and final minutes to all calls and meetings.

A BAHG member asked that any face-to-face meetings be scheduled soon.

### Guidelines for Discussion

Shane noted that the TWP Process provides guidelines about discussion and on what the work plan should be based. Katrina would like to add the new Record of Decision (ROD) to that guidance. We will probably receive input from DOI at some point, and it might change the way we look at projects. We’ll need to ask questions about projects such as, does it relate to issues about which AMWG can make recommendations to Secretary? Does it help implement the ROD? He also referenced the presentation from solicitor Rod Smith from the last TWG meeting, and said he would send out that presentation as soon as Rod gave permission.

He noted the link for the Wiki BAHG page had been sent to members. He said members would find there meeting notes, upcoming meetings, and documents to review.

## Objectives of the BAHG Calls

Shane noted there were three BAHG calls scheduled between now and the April TWG meeting. After that TWG meeting, he said he would be out of the office for almost two weeks, and that others might chair one or more BAHG calls. He said he would be working with GCMRC and Reclamation to figure out how best to proceed.

He said that at the next meeting, they would begin the substantive review, resource area by resource area. Some areas might have more discussion than others. The spreadsheet that Craig put together shows where each of the projects comes from: the FY15-17 budget, conservation measures, or the dot-ranking exercise from the last TWG meeting. Project numbers are for this spreadsheet only and may change. He encouraged feedback on the spreadsheet and how to make it more useful.

He requested initial comments on projects and spreadsheet format by 3:00 pm MT on Thursday, including input from the Trout Ad Hoc Group (AHG), Cultural Resources AHG, and the Socioeconomics AHG. He invited input in columns K (narrative) and L (add, continue, eliminate, reduce).

Craig gave more detail about how the spreadsheet was organized. Socioeconomics projects are sorted by resource area. “Hot topics” included were only those that received two or more dots during the dot-ranking exercise. Craig said he had to shorten the description of some of those new projects so he requested members let him know if he didn’t get it right. Some projects on the spreadsheet may be funded outside the AMP.

He and Shane encouraged feedback on how to improve the spreadsheet. Shane asked about the spreadsheet, and there appeared to be general agreement to use it. Comments included:

A member said he didn’t get the impression that the TWG was prioritizing projects with the dot-ranking exercise, so some may have been left off that are important. Shane encouraged members to add back in projects that were not included when they make their comments. All the projects from that exercise are on the Wiki and the link is in the spreadsheet.

## Additional Meeting Date and Meeting Plans

Shane asked if the group wanted to work through the table, project by project, at a medium level of detail. He said he wanted discussion on what are the important projects and what might be able to be cut. The latter is important because we know we will have tight budget with higher overhead rates and new mandates from the LTEMP EIS and ROD.

Some members noted that it would take a long time to discuss every line in the spreadsheet. Others said they were interested in some projects but not others. Another clarified that the LTEMP columns were probably going to be necessary to include.

Because of a Programmatic Agreement meeting on Friday that conflicts with the next BAHG meeting, Shane suggested—and the group agreed—to start with the Humpback Chub resource area at that meeting, then Other Native Species, and then Rainbow Trout.

The group agreed to add a BAHG meeting on March 20, 2-4 pm MT. They also agreed to let Shane know if they were unable to make a meeting and would prefer the group not discuss a particular resource area while they were absent.

## Action Items

* Comments on BAHG spreadsheet due Thursday by 3 pm MT to Linda Whetton, Shane, and Mary.
* Mary will send the new meeting schedule, Rod Smith’s presentation, and list of action items out to everyone soon after the meeting.
* At the next meeting, everyone should be ready to discuss and make recommendations (add, continue, eliminate, reduce) on resource areas Humpback Chub, Other Native Species, and Rainbow Trout on BAHG #2, discussion and recommendations

The meeting adjourned.

**Attachment: Triennial Budget Development Process as Recommended by TWG**

**Table 1.** Approximate timelines for the development and implementation of the TWP. Dates shown are estimated targets. Dates are shown which implement the 2018-20 TWP for reference.

| **Month** | **Year-1 (2017)**  **(development of TWP)** | **Year-2 (2018)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| December  (year prior) | GCMRC and Reclamation produces annual project reports document for GCDAMP review. |  |
| January | Annual reporting meeting and information synthesis (2 days) followed by 1-day TWG meeting to review budget and provide initial guidance to GCMRC and Reclamation. TWG reviews progress in addressing Information Needs and research accomplishments. | Annual reporting meeting (1-2 days) followed by 1-day TWG meeting with a primary emphasis on reporting results/findings/scientific advances on previous work plan. |
| February | GCMRC meets with tribes and DOI agencies. GCMRC follow-up with BAHG on priorities and areas of emphasis on TWP. GCMRC meets with cooperators to develop projects. AMWG meeting to discuss initial priorities. DOI and Federal family input. |  |
| March | GCMRC and Reclamation will develop an initial TWP based on DOI priorities and input from scientists, the TWG, and DOI/DOE family. Initial TWP presented to DOI and Secretary’s Designee. |  |
| April | GCMRC meets with tribes and DOI agencies. April TWG meeting to consider draft TWP, including anticipated funding sources. Unresolved issues or conflicting priorities will be resolved by DOI in consultation with the DOI Family. GCMRC begins development of second draft TWP. | BAHG and TWG considers potential changes to the Fiscal Year 2 TWP based on criteria in section 2.7. |
| May | GCMRC and Reclamation provide a second draft TWP to the BAHG, Science Advisors, DOI agencies, and tribes for their review and comment. GCMRC meets with tribes, BAHG, to get input on TWP. GCMRC develops third draft of TWP. |  |
| June | GCMRC and Reclamation finish third draft for review. TWG meets to provide input on the draft GCMRC and Reclamation TWP and provide a recommendation to the AMWG. | TWG recommends Fiscal Year 2 (2019) budget of TWP to AMWG. |
| July | GCMRC and Reclamation provide a final draft TWP to the AMWG for their review. |  |
| August | AMWG meets to provide input on the GCMRC and Reclamation draft TWP and provide a recommendation to the SOI. | AMWG recommends Fiscal Year 2 (2019) budget of TWP to SOI. |
| September | SOI reviews the budget and work plan recommendation from AMWG. |  |
| October 1 | Fiscal Year 1 begins under the TWP guidance. | Fiscal Year 2 begins under the TWP guidance. |
| November 1 | Consumer Price Index becomes available. |  |
| Late November | Science and management meeting with DOI and cooperators. | Science and management meeting with DOI and cooperators. |
| December | Budget is finalized. USGS produces GCMRC annual project reports document for prior year work. | GCMRC produces annual project reports document. |