Budget AdHoc Group Call

July 6, 2017
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Vineetha Kartha, #vice chair for life

Peggy Roefer

Brian Healy

Ryan Mann

Jessica Neuwerth

Mike Yeatts

Seth Shanahan, #second term

David Braun

Paul Harms

Kurt Dongoske

Craig Ellsworth

Carlee Brown

Leslie James

Melinda Ciacco

John Jordan

Cliff Barrett

Oveview of BAHG Process: There will be 5, 2 hour conference calls on Thursdays 10-12MT (Jul 6, 13, 20, 27 and Aug 3). The next 4 calls will be with GCMRC on topics identified in the emails and the calendar invite. These will be led by the experts/authors of these topics.

Next Thursday we are adding an extra hour to follow up on BOR budget in the hour prior to the normal call, **BOR will send out a new invite for that hour.** **Additional comments on Cultural Resource projects should be provided to BOR by Friday.**

Posting deadline of the revised draft budget and workplan to be discussed at TWG meeting is Aug 18, (TWG meeting is August 30-31 in Flagstaff at GCMRC conference room).

This discussion is focused on Reclamation’s side of the budget.

* GCMRC presenters will highlight what changed in this version of the workplan from the previous draft. And will respond to how previous comments were addressed.
* Assumption for CPI for years 2018-2020 is 1%. If it ends up being higher, we can adjust up when the time comes. (Up is easier than down and 1% is manageable to adjust down if the CPI ends up not being that high.)
* Budget review process document is not approved by AMWG yet, there are possibly changes. It should be brought up at the next AMWG meeting (potentially to take place Sept 20-21 in Phoenix, pending DOI review of FACA committees).

Seth- The group on the call should strive for consensus for each element of the workplan. If that is not achieved, that element will be elevated to major concerns at TWG.

Vineetha- Should Adhoc groups be included included? (TAHG, CRAHG, SEAHG)

Shane- Subgroups can meet separately

**Seth will follow up with the ad hoc groups.**

Katrina led the discussion on Reclamation’s side of the budget.

* Roughly $500,000 had to be trimmed for each year of the budget. This resulted in cuts to many line items in the budget.
* The budget will be revisited each year as we move through the 3-year workplan and adjustments can be made.

Section A. Program Management

* AMWG Facilitation - was reduced by $15,000 since Draft 1 because reductions were needed throughout the budget.
	+ The contract instrument, BPA, is not flexible. Even through it is firm fixed price, Mary chooses to bill for actual hours, even if it is less.
* AMWG member travel - Federal agency travel- the budget funds 1 AMWG and 1 TWG member to meetings if requested. NPS utilizes this others may, based on the situation.

Section B. TWG Costs

* TWG Chair/Facilitation – reduced by $10,000.
* TWG other reduced by $5,000.

Section C. Program Administration, ESA Compliance, and Management Actions

* NPS Permitting- decreased by $26,000
	+ Why can’t NPS cover their own permitting process?
	+ Is there a cost share? Yes over $100,000
	+ The key point is- permits need to be provided in a timely manner.
	+ Contract Administration
		- This does not include subcontracts.
		- BOR is tracking this closely and trying to reduce these charges.
		- Stakeholder river trip- delayed to 2019
		- Science Adviser Program – reduced by $65,000
			* External reviews reduced from 3 to 1
			* Standing panel is preferred due to learning curve
			* Knowledge Assessment is on a 3 year cycle
			* Experimental Management Fund – trimmed by $100,000
			* Some GCMRC projects ask for additional experimental funds
			* This fund is for unanticipated issues, for experiments only, not routine monitoring or routine (anticipated) experiments. Experiments like an extended duration HFE, and TMFs. These possible experiments should be outlined with a proposed budget.
			* Expand some discussion of experimental fund to include the annual January meeting to talk about upcoming experiments.
			* Native Fish Conservation Contingency Fund- same as Experimental fund
			* Experimental Vegetation Treatment- decreased to $65,000 year one and $74,000 year two.
			* There are issues with the narrative, the 5 points are not consistent with the ROD – this will be corrected in the next version (was likely a copy-paste error)
			* Coordination with GCMRC did happen.
			* GCMRC is ongoing monitoring through the river corridor
			* NPS is treatments in small areas
			* Sand transport-
			* How is this a result of dam operations? This is a very small impact and there are better places to spend the money.
			* There is no robust data on Aeolian sand transport, no proven hypothesis, it is disingenuous to the program. There are less than 20% of sites effected.
			* How does it make a difference, how will it change dam operations.
			* Veg work will influence the amount of sand on cultural sites and this is influenced by the dam.
			* It could be considered experimental mitigation to sites that would otherwise require some other type of mitigation. And, if it works, it is a relatively inexpensive form of mitigation.
			* Evaluation of (1) means to prevent Fish passage and (2) methods for temperature control- reduced each by ½ (from $100K to $50K)
			* These will be a high level white paper, initially, to gather information about what technologies currently exist and how that may or may not apply to GCD
			* Switched the temp control to FY18 based on TWG feedback
			* Reclamation is working with Science and Technology Program (i.e., external funding) for potential jump start on the temperature methods project.
			* Birds monitoring- no change
* Section D. Cultural Resources
	+ - * Reclamation Cultural resources mgmt., sec 106 compliance: reduced to bring down overall budget
			* This language has been modified based on tribal discussions
			* HPP project management will require outside support because Reclamation does not have enough cultural staff to do all the work.
			* This is not a prudent use of Reclamation funds, it has already been written and can be modified to fit the current situation.
			* It doesn’t warrant an outside contractor.
			* There is a need for someone to coordinate the PA process, much like what Argonne has been doing: meetings, reports, COTR, NPS 106 responsibilities etc. It will require additional assistance from tribal resource specialists.
			* The award could go to tribes for writing and developing parts of the document, it can’t be someone from the outside.
			* Zuni will not consult with someone from the outside.
			* BOR commits to always be there for consultation and will not delegate these responsibilities outside.
			* Responsibilities need to be defined.