

**Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group
Vision Statement Presentation
July 21, 1999**

prepared by Mary Orton

Vision Development on the River – The Process

May 15, 16, and 17, 1999

General discussions were held on vision development as the river trip begins.

May 16 and 17, 1999

A “graffiti board” was available for participants to make anonymous comments to be considered for the vision statement.

May 18, 1999

Six participants rode together all day to develop vision language on the first “vision boat.” Norm Gaume, Amy Heuslin, Rick Johnson, Andre Potochnick, Ted Rampton, and Fred Worthley. They used the comments from the graffiti board and brainstormed a draft vision statement. The full group briefly discussed the draft that night.

May 19, 1999

The six “visioners” from the first vision boat divided themselves among the three boats to discuss and revise, with the other participants, the draft from May 18. That evening, the full group discussed the three revised drafts, along with the original version. The vision was redefined to be more future-oriented, vague and poetic, and the group also agreed to develop a mission incorporating the constraints and sideboards. The group also agreed that the two statements would be combined and, collectively, called the vision. This was due to concerns that the vision alone might be used inappropriately to misconstrue our meaning – a concern first expressed by Robert King. Several participants volunteered to craft more language the next day.

May 20, 1999

The second “vision boat” is constituted: Tim Begay, Brenda Drye, Cisney Havatone, Amy Heuslin, Rick Johnson, Robert King, Steve Magnussen, Mary Orton, and Ted Rampton. They developed language of both a vision and a mission, building on the work of the first vision boat and incorporating the changes in format discussed on May 19. The full group discussed the language that evening and made some changes.

May 21, 1999

The full group discussed and modified the vision/mission statement in the morning and again in the evening and reached consensus on the statement. Work began on definitions of some essential phrases.

Vision of the Vision: How the Pieces Fit Together

This “vision of a vision” was adopted on the river on May 19, 1999. Each piece flows from the previous one.

VISION – The vision describes the end game, what we want to see in the Grand Canyon as a result of our work. It is not necessarily achievable, not time-specific, is a very broad, overarching statement that may be more poetry than prose.

E.g., “AMWG’s vision of the Grand Canyon is a healthy, dynamic, natural ... ecosystem that preserves spiritual and aesthetic values...”

MISSION – The mission describes the sideboards and constraints under which we work, is more legalistic, and describes what we do.

E.g., “AMWG’s mission is to protect, mitigate impacts to, and improve the values for which...”

GOALS – Goals will be developed for each resource, and will flow from the vision and mission. They are more defined than the mission but are still broader than the objectives.

E.g., “Protect cultural resources and traditional cultural properties...”

OBJECTIVES – Objectives are “SMART”: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, a Reach,” and Time-specific. They constitute the specific MOs that guide our work.

E.g., “Restore [this much] sediment to [these sites] by [this time]...”

DRAFT AMWG Vision Statement - 5/21/99

The Grand Canyon is a homeland for some, sacred to many, and a national treasure for all. In honor of past generations, and on behalf of those of the present and future, we envision an ecosystem where the resources and natural processes are in harmony under a stewardship worthy of the Grand Canyon.

We advise the Secretary of the Interior on how best to protect, mitigate adverse impacts to, and improve the integrity of the Colorado River ecosystem affected by Glen Canyon Dam, including natural biological diversity (emphasizing native biodiversity), traditional cultural properties, spiritual values, and cultural, physical, and recreational resources through the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and other means.

We do so in keeping with the federal trust responsibilities to Indian tribes, in compliance with applicable federal, state, and tribal laws, including the water delivery obligations of the Law of the River, and with due consideration to the economic value of power resources.

This will be accomplished through our long-term partnership utilizing the best available scientific and other information through an adaptive ecosystem management process.