United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
Upper Colorado Regional Office
125 South State Street, Room 6107
Salt Lake City, Utah 84138-1102

IN REPLY REFER TO:
W-6000
ADM-1.10

DEC 29 1998

MEMORANDUM

To: Adaptive Management Work Group

From: Stephen V. Magnussen, Chairman, Adaptive Management Work Group

Subject: Background Information for the January 12, 1999 Meeting, Agenda Item: Strategic Plan/Goal of the AMP

I was recently briefed by the Co-Chairmen (Bob Winfree and Bruce Moore) of the Technical Work Group (TWG) and the Acting Chief (Barry Gold) of the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC) on the issues associated with the above subject agenda item. Since the inception of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program, basic philosophical/ policy concerns keep arising in TWG discussions as they deliberate on the assignments given them by the Adaptive Management work Group (AMWG). Some of the philosophical/policy concerns center on such questions as: legal and geographic scope of the program per the Grand Canyon Protection Act, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and the Record of Decision (ROD); the role of the GCMRC; and funding of compliance activities by the Bureau of Reclamation to name a few. When the discussions turn to these unresolved issues, the discussions are often protracted and consume an inordinate amount of time, taking away from meaningful discussions on technical tasks. The philosophical/policy concerns remain suppressed until issues such as management objectives or scope of Lake Powell monitoring and research arise. These concerns arose during the TWG's December 8, 1998, discussions of the GCMRC FY 2000 - 2004 Strategic Plan and FY 2000 Annual Plan.

You will note that approval of the Strategic Plan and FY 2000 Annual Plan are not on the Agenda. While it was thought that a document would be ready for AMWG review and final approval, discussion at the December 8 TWG turned again to concerns by some members on basic understandings of the scope and requirements of the law and EIS, resulting in no agreement on the language in the Strategic Plan. To assist you in trying to understand the scope of the problem, the Chairman of the TWG prepared the attached list of fundamental unresolved issues. While this is not a complete list, it does illustrate the problem areas.

The TWG Chairman and Acting GCMRC Chief have proposed that the AMWG develop a guidance document that lays out the AMWG's views on these basic philosophical/policy issues. While the past two to three years have been spent getting the GCMRC and the AMP process going with good success, it is now time to assist the TWG by providing guidance from the

AMWG on some of these basic philosophical/policy issues. Resolution of these issues will ensure that the TWG can more effectively utilize their time to focus on the technical issues associated with adaptive management and long-term monitoring and research.

Please review the attached list of issues and be prepared to discuss at the January AMWG.

Stephen V. Magnuson

Attachment

cc: TWG members

Fundamental and Unresolved Issues Related to Implementation of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (AMP)

Prepared by Robert Winfree, TWG Chairperson
December 15, 1998

LEGAL AUTHORITY

Is the legal authority for the Adaptive Management Program the Grand Canyon Protection Act (GCPA), Environmental Impact Statement, and the Record of Decision?

SCOPE

Is the program constrained to determining whether the impacts on the affected resources as described for the preferred alternative are met or exceeded? Alternatively, should it include all monitoring programs and activities that will ensure the dam is operated in such a manner as to protect, mitigate adverse impacts to, and improve the values for which GRCA and GLCA were established, as specified by the GCPA?

What are the implications of the GCPA report language that calls for a focus on downstream resources, in light of Sec. 1805 (b), which requires any necessary research and studies to determine the effect of the Secretaries actions under section 1804 (c) on the natural, recreational, and cultural resources of Grand Canyon National Park and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area?

Is the program limited only to consideration of daily power plant operations impact, or does the GCPA require consideration of documented and probable impacts from all operations of GCD?

Is the program limited to considering only impacts below power plant capacity, or should potential impacts within the design capacity of the dam (256,000 cfs) or potential flood zone be considered?

Is the GCMRC expected to develop a long term plan that addresses all prioritized information needs specified by the AMWG?

When is it appropriate to propose experiments outside the ROD (floods above 45K, load following above 25K)?

ORGANIZATION

What are TWG's responsibilities relative to review and editing of the monitoring and research plans prepared by GCMRC?

What organization is responsible for developing needed AMP planning documents and reports other than science program reporting?

Do recommendations of all stakeholders represented in TWG and AMWG carry equal weight in decisions?

OTHER

Other issues related to compliance, funding, and other topics were identified in the September, 1998 Interagency River trip and are not repeated here.