

TWG MEETING JUNE 21, 1995

56 people

Non-use value - Final summary will be available in september
GCES report,

Loretta wanted to know what the results of the study were
in relation to the tribes involvement,

Robert Amberger

- Says that NPS will work through the Research Center for approval within the Park for research,
- Discussed legal dispute with ~~Hualapai~~ Hualapai, over ownership and studies/work done on the river.
- Determination of cost effectiveness of studies would be determined by the Research Center.
- The Transition/technical work group is not the authority on what happens in the canyon. If the work group can function in such a fashion as to address the concerns/legal requirements of NPS, Secretary of Interior, Arizona Game & Fish, etc. Then additional work would not be necessary, outside

Research Center 1hr. discussion

Data base management. Center director position description included in the handout,
power related funding would be used for...active work on monitoring
some members of the tribes feel that removal of the
Native american coordinator is of great concern

They will move forward with hiring the research director,
who will be responsible for hiring the director
Passed out report from subgroup. due in two weeks July 5th
Monitoring subgroup - Duncan Paton
passed out draft transitional Monitoring report.

they don't want to drop monitoring of some of the resources
to continue so that when the research center is in place and
the ROD is signed, they will have consistent data and not
need to begin again.

Himalayan think that they need to continue with the level
of monitoring they have had in the past. Duncan said they
need scientific evidence

June 24 complete document. (Final)
date when comments are due. June 30th

Management Objectives Tom Moody
Passed out GCT suggestions of objectives

Tom feels that a set of objectives should developed.

Rob Arnberger suggests that one of the ~~monitor~~ subgroups
should continue and work on management objectives
- Rick suggests that another mix of individuals should
work on this.

Reclamation will head the subgroup and chose the ~~st~~ chairman

Cultural Resources Signa Carvalele
FY96 - Budget July 10th - Programmatic agreement.

Beach Habitat Building flows.

to spill at low reservoir would violate the provisions of the
1968 Act

handed out copy of overheads & AOP paragraph for
spike,

AGENDA
Transition Work Group Meeting
LaQuinta, Phoenix, Arizona
June 21, 1995

9:30 a.m.	Welcome and Introductions	Rick Gold
9:45 a.m.	Status ROD	Gordy Lind
10:00 a.m.	Status of GAO Audit	Steven Lloyd
10:15 a.m.	Status Non-use Study	Gordy Lind Dave Harpman
10:30 a.m.	Subgroup Reports	
	Research Center	Duncan Patton
	Transition Monitoring	Gordy Lind Duncan Patton Dave Wegner
	Cultural Resources	Jan Balsam Signa Larralde
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Beach Habitat Building Flows	Randy Peterson
1:30 p.m.	Reclamation's Plan for Implementation of Final Biological Opinion	Christine Karas
1:45 p.m.	Selective Level Withdrawal	David Trueman
2:00 p.m.	GCES Status	Gordy Lind Dave Wegner
2:15 p.m.	Wrap-up	Rick Gold
	Next Meeting	
	Possible agenda items for next meeting	
3:00 p.m.	Conclude	

the trigger for the spill would change from year to year. There would ~~be~~ no spills in the low water years.

Habitat maintenance flows. 30,000 cfs would maintain the ~~base~~ waters.

Creda - supports full reservoir spills
they feel that long term beach habitat flows will require NEPA; a test is covered by the ROD

long range intent is to not change frequency of spills.

the spill in '96 is a much greater loss of power revenues because of the 5 year delay in the GCPA. ? They have estimated losses of as much as \$5,000,000.

Nepa & ESA on Kanab ambersnail and Southwestern willow flycatcher.
for 1 yr 1996 spike.

Biological Opinion Chris K.

handed out on BO implementation.
asked for comments.

Razor back workshop. in fall '95

Second population hump back chub.

Selective Level Withdrawal,

develop model to predict temperatures

primary

GIES- Review of Reports by external reviews
some comments,

Signatures
Need review
would like to send out tomorrow
Steve
Steve
Sy
Comm
6/28

TRANSITION WORK GROUP MEETING SUMMARY
JUNE 21, 1995
PHOENIX, ARIZONA

Rick Gold, Reclamation's Deputy Regional Director, Upper Colorado Region, welcomed the group. He proceeded by having everyone introduce themselves (attendee list attached). The agenda was reviewed and two additional items were added: 1) Discussion of the May 12, 1995, letter from Rob Arnberger, and 2) Discussion of management objectives criteria for transition monitoring. There were no correction to the March 23, 1995, meeting summary.

Status of the Record of Decision - Gordon Lind is working on the basis for decision section of the ROD. The ROD also must be delayed until resolution of the GAO Audit on the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

GAO Audit - Steven Lloyd discussed the status of the audit. GAO is going to be going through the scoping phase for the next 2-months. Member of GAO were in Salt Lake City June 1-2, 1995, reviewing files and interviewing individuals. They are expected to interview many more of the participants in the future. GAO is in the preliminary phase of determining what their audit will cover. They are reviewing the process that has taken place prior to the actual audit. Rob Elliott questioned whether they are looking at the delivery of product vs. the cost of product. Rick noted that they seem to only be focused on understanding the process.

Non-Use Study - A draft summary report has been produced and review by the Non-Use Committee is underway. The summary report is to be submitted with the ROD. The results of the non-use studies show that there is a definite value and people are more than willing to pay.

NPS Letter - Rob Arnberger stressed that the purpose of the letter was not to create a new procedure or depart from the current process but to make clear that the requirements of the laws that govern the National Park Service must continue to be met. He stressed that we must continue to be aware that there are regulator needs that must be maintained as we do research in the parks. The question concerning the Hualapai boundary dispute was raised. Rob stated that the Hualapai's and the National Park Service need to continue to work together as they currently do until a resolution can be made. Concern was raised whether NPS was going to be constantly overseeing the process. Rob reiterated that the NPS only want to assure that the laws are met. Rick noted that we as a group must remember that we do not direct anyone and must meet the mandates. The Hopi stated their concern over the NPS's views of continuing to look only at the Recreation and public use aspect. They stressed how important it is that we look at all the resources in the Grand Canyon. There are many other issues to address and we must not narrow the scope of research to the parks but must consider all the element of the ecosystem as a whole.

Subgroup Reports

Research Center - Dr. Duncan Patten, GCES Senior Scientist, discussed the past and current process which has led us to the structure of the Research Center. He reviewed the entities within the center. He stressed that the data base must be managed along with research of the traditional values and scientific aspects. He stressed the importance of carefully gathering the long-term data and continuing the current review process. Duncan asked that everyone review the packet he distributed (attachment 2) and provide comment to him by July 10, 1995. He noted that it is extremely important to get the Director of the Center on board as soon as possible so he can be involved in this process and forum.

There was a large amount of concern raised about one individual being able to address both the cultural and social aspects. Suggestions were made to include one specific individual to be a Native American Coordinator. Leigh

Jenkins stressed that the Native American should not limit themselves to only cultural involvement but be included in the biological and physical resources management issues also. Kurt Dongoske explained that as a member of the Research Center Sub-group representing the tribes, he felt that establishing a specific individual as a Native American Coordinator would further remove the tribes. They may not be able to be involved to the full extent possible if they limit themselves to coordinating through that individual. Kurt stated that he fully supported the concept of three individuals (cultural/social, physical, and biological managers).

The question was raised as to who selects the Director. Rick said it was unclear and the Department would determine at what level and who would select. The current proposal is to make this individual at the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science level.

Transition Monitoring - Duncan distributed a handout of the draft Transition Monitoring Program. The program is broken down into the broad areas of physical, biological, and cultural. Duncan would like all of you to review the report (attachment 3) and submit your comments no later than June 30, 1995.

Tom Moody requested that we identify specific management objectives if not for the transition monitoring then for the long-term monitoring program. The group agreed and established a sub-group to determine the objectives. The group also requested that Reclamation be the lead of that group. The Director of the Center will eventually become a part of that group.

The historic preservation plan is being edited.
Cultural Resources - Signa Larralde reviewed the status of the group and explained that the signed Programmatic Agreement is essentially a roadmap to protect the cultural resources. The ethnographic reports are being completed and will be so by the end of this year. The draft budget for FY96 includes GCNP, GCNRA, and remedial action funds for tribal participation in the cultural resources monitoring. Comments on the budget are requested by July 10, 1995.

Beach Habitat Building Flows - Randy Peterson reviewed the BHBFB proposal. He explained that Reclamation had been asked by the Secretary to try resolve the legal issues associated and determine a way to complete the flow. Questions concerning NEPA compliance were raised. Rick stated that we need to determine what conditions trigger NEPA compliance. They group also discussed the possible spill that could take place in the next couple of months if forecasts were not correct. There are people preparing to gather data if a spill should take place.

Biological Opinion - Chris distributed a copy of the approaches that are being taken to implement the Biological Opinion and requested comments immediately (attachment 4).

Selective Withdrawal - The funds have been approved to begin initial planning. The selective withdrawal group has recommended they begin the following:

1. Temperature modeling studies
2. Primary productivity study

After testing and evaluation of the recommendations, possible alternatives are to do an environmental assessment to determine potential risks.

GCES - Reports are gradually being completed. Approximately 1/5 of the reports are in.

Next Meeting: August 30, 1995, 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., in Phoenix, Arizona.