

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group
FINAL Conference Call Minutes
December 17, 2003

Conducting: Michael Gabaldon, Secretary's Designee
Time Frame: 1-3 p.m. (Mountain time)

AMWG Members:

Robert Begay, Navajo Nation
Amy Heuslein, BIA
Pamela Hyde, Gr. Canyon Wildlands Council
Leslie James, CREDA
Clayton Palmer, WAPA

Andre Potochnik, GCRG
Nikolai Ramsey, Grand Canyon Trust
Mark Steffen, Federation of Fly Fishers
Bruce Taubert, AGFD

Alternates:

Wayne Cook
Jeffrey Cross
Christopher Harris
Robert King
Randy Seaholm
Sam Spiller

For:

John Shields, WY State Engr. Office
Joe Alston, NPS
Jerry Zimmerman, Colo. River Board of CA
D. Larry Anderson, UDWR
Rod Kuharich, CWCB
State Supervisor, USFWS

Science Advisors:

Jill Barron
Dave Garrett
Lance Gunderson

Margaret Palmer
Bill Roberts

Interested Persons:

Bill Davis, CREDA
Denny Fenn, USGS/GCMRC
Steve Gloss, USGS/GCMRC
Norm Henderson, TWG Chair
Glen Knowles, USFWS

Dennis Kubly, USBR
Jeff Lovich, USGS/GCMRC
Bob Lynch, Attorney at Law
Bill Persons, AGFD
John Weisheit, Living Rivers

Meeting Recorder: Linda Whetton

Welcome and Introductions. The participants introduced themselves. A quorum (15 members) was present.

Purpose of Conference Call - Mike said the conference call would focus on a couple of items: (1) AMWG member responses to the Science Advisors proposal for protocols to be used on interactions between the two groups, and (2) WAPA's flow proposal for winter fluctuations. He asked Dennis to introduce the first item

Science Advisors Proposal - Dennis said that during the October Science Symposium there was a luncheon meeting comprised of some AMWG members and science advisors to talk about protocols process for interactions in the future. The science advisors agreed to draft a document to that effect and to provide those protocols to the AMWG for their consideration. A conference call would then be set up to seek input from the AMWG members on the draft document. Once the science advisors modified the document, it would be included in the AMWG mail out and it would be on the agenda for the AMWG Meeting on March 3-4, 2004, with the intent that a decision would be made on future interactions. He asked if that was the understanding of everyone in terms of process and timing. Dave Garrett said there was an attachment of a proposed schedule of 24-month reviews which everyone received and the science advisors would also like to address that in today's discussion as well. Dennis said the GCMRC Science Advisors protocols were posted to Reclamation's web site this morning and should be available within the next few hours. Dave said the science advisors would like to recommend that the section in quotes that they presented in **Attachment 1** be added to the operating protocols approved by AMWG in December 2000.

The following documents were provided by Dave Garrett to the AMWG prior to the conference call and Reclamation also posted them to the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management web site:

- **Attachment 1** – Proposed Additions to GCD AMP Science Advisors Operating Protocol
- **Attachment 2** – Proposed GCMRC Science Advisor 24-Month Review Tasks and Schedule, October 2003-October 2005
- **Attachment 3** – Observation and Recommendations Operating Protocols for Science Advisors dated December 2000
- **Attachment 4** - Operating Protocols for GCMRC Science Advisors, dated May 2001
- **Attachment 5** - Memo from GCMRC to TWG, Subject: Response to Proposed Non-Native Fish Suppression Flow Changes for January-March 2004, dated Dec. 17, 2003
- **Attachment 6** – WAPA Flow Proposal with graph

Dave said what he tried to do in Attachment A was to try and summarize the operating protocol as much as possible before they presented the proposed addition but it doesn't summarize all of the elements of the operating protocol. Dave said Attachment A is a proposal by the science advisors to add a paragraph to the original operating protocol. One thing omitted from the operating protocols was how the science advisors obtained their annual charge of reviews, in other words, who tells the science advisors what to do annually and where do they get their annual line of work. He and the science advisors have developed proposals for two years and have provided them to the GCMRC as their general charge to conduct reviews. That has not been the best protocol and they suggested a paragraph be added on page 5 under Administration

that says, *“the science advisors will receive their charge from AMWG and that AMWG will annually go through a process to receive input from the science advisors, GCMRC, TWG, and the Secretary’s Designee to constitute the annual review charge.”*

Dave said the Science Advisory Board (SAB) was formed because there were some holes in the independent review panel that are called for under the legislation for the Adaptive Management Program. The SAB was established competitively and he reviewed nearly 500 applicants to select 12. In the protocols it specifically lines out what areas he had to select the scientists from. The names were referred to the GCRMC and the AMWG and eventually they selected the science advisors. The science advisors were explicitly selected to provide independent scientific oversight and technical advice to the AMWG and to ensure that the GCMRC science programs are efficient, unbiased, objective, and scientifically sound. He further identifies the areas of review that they’re charged to evaluate given that AMWG, GCMRC, or the Secretary’s Designee would ask them to do that. Those are results of ongoing monitoring and research, appropriateness of GCMRC’s RFP process, the protocols to be used by GCMRC for sponsored scientific activities, review of their long-term monitoring plan, their annual monitoring and research plan, their budget proposals, and any other programs that are scientific or technical advised that would be proposed by GCMRC, AMWG, or the TWG. Dave stated that the Science Advisory Board is not a FACA committee and was specifically organized as independent science advisors with an executive secretary who coordinates everything. The SAB feels the operating protocols are missing a critical element and there is no specific direction on how they get their direction. The SAB is recommending that the following language be added to SAB protocols:

Annually, the AMWG will in its summer meeting make assignments for the SAB. The chief of GCMRC, TWG Chair, and Executive Secretary are responsible for development of SAB charge. A verbal and written report will be made for documentation. The SAB are to provide a written report at each AMWG meeting following a review. This presents a very structured timely approach as you try to line up in budget and for the SAB to receive a set of specific charges. There is also a 24-month plan of reviews in interaction with GCMRC, AMWG, and TWG. The reason for doing this as a large membership across the country, it’s very hard for the group to plan in a 6-month or less schedule. We don’t need to specifically hit months but want to plan for over a period of time.

Dave added that the language provides a very structured, timely approach annually as the AMWG is trying to line up in budgeting and planning for the science advisors to receive a very specific set of charges. He also referred to the proposed 24-month plan of reviews that they have in interaction with TWG, AMWG, and GCMRC members. He said the reason for doing this is that as a large membership from all across the country and it’s very difficult for the SAB to plan effectively in less than a 6-month period. It’s much better if they can work with the AMP and plan over a longer period of time the various reviews that need to be accomplished. They don’t have to hit specific months but they do like to plan a process over an extended period which allows them to schedule meetings well in advance so that they can get better attendance and individuals can make time available to do the reviews. He asked if any of the other science advisors had any comments. Jill, Lance, and Margaret indicated they were in agreement with Dave’s proposed language.

Dave said SAB would like two directions from the membership: (1) that language be placed in the Operating Protocols so it is clear what is expected, and that it is timely and could be approved in the July meeting, and (2) consideration that the SAB be allowed to respond to review needs and advisory input to GCMRC until such a time that the AMWG can formally approve the proposals.

Pam Hyde asked if the language Dave was proposing to add is exclusive – if one body wants to charge the SAB to do something, is that the only avenue to do so. Dave said he had discussed this with some AMWG members and with GCMRC leadership and one of the problems the SAB has experienced is that they have received some requests from some individuals in the GCMRC which they wanted to respond to and it caused their budget to increase and also caused some difficulty with other reviews they were working on. With a broad-based AMWG group and several program managers in GCMRC and TWG, the SAB could end up working on individual RFP processes, for individual needs of an AMWG member, or for individual TWG members. It would dilute SAB efforts for AMWG which is a comprehensive review by broad-based scientists and could cause just one review by one science advisor, which could cause problems within their own ranks. The SAB would like to streamline the process so that everyone knows exactly what the SAB is doing. If GCMRC or TWG or an AMWG member has a specific need, it should go through the process. Dave proposed adding another sentence: *“This is not to exclude additional potential short-term needs of any of the above bodies which could be handled by direct request to the AMWG Chair.”*

Margaret said the SAB wants to have the flexibility to respond to specific requests and don't want to encumber the process by requiring months and months of advance notice. She doesn't know the best mechanism for accomplishing both the long-term and short-term requests and doesn't want the new policy to stymie the potential role they could play.

Pam Hyde said that she wanted to make sure that the intent of the proposed language is that all requests will essentially go through the Chair, whether they are accomplished as a part of the regular set procedure or some other specific request that might come up later. She said she also wanted to make sure that the science advisors don't have a situation where their work is interrupted by additional requests.

Randy Seaholm said he would like to see all the requests go through the respective chairs and also simultaneously all the responses back to the SAB come back through the chairs to the entire group so that everyone is working from the same knowledge base.

Dave concurred with Pam and Randy and offered that the following sentence could be added at the bottom of the paragraph: *“This does not preclude short-term or emergency requests from the above chairs that would occur in an interim period. These could be forwarded to AMWG and approved in scheduled conference calls.”*

Comments:

- If every single thing has to have a formal approval by the whole committee that's pretty cumbersome. If a reasonable request comes in, the SAB could inform the AMWG but she

doesn't want to see everything go through a 4-6 month approval process as that would be really problematic to the science. (Margaret Palmer)

- Have some type of table on the AMP web sight showing the requests and status of work. (Sam Spiller)
- The request should come from the leadership of the AMWG, perhaps not through a formal process but at least through the AMWG chair. You may get these ad hoc requests and then there is no control over the activities. (Norm Henderson)

Dave said another sentence could be added: "This does not preclude that this couldn't happen and it could be approved by just saying a conference call of the chairs." The SAB Executive Secretary would be responsible for arranging a conference call between the AMWG Chair, TWG Chair, and GCMRC chief and discussing the request(s). This would then put the final decision on the AMWG Chair or an appointee and we could then post it after that as Sam had suggested. We want everyone to know what we're doing and that no one feels that we are doing without other people knowing.

Comments:

- If the chairs could make a quick decision via e-mail and then if there are concerns, they could schedule a conference call. I like the idea of having a web site with all the reports and reviews available. (Margaret Palmer)
- Like the idea of establishing a web site but a list server would notify people more promptly. (Lance Gunderson)
- We're centering here on a compromise in which the SAB would notify the three chairs and then the AMWG would be notified and given a certain time frame in which to respond to any concerns they had. If there weren't any concerns, then the SAB could move forward on the work but if there was any controversy, then more input would be sought from the AMWG. (Bruce Taubert)

Dave said the SAB was established to respond to GCMRC in less than 3 weeks, from the time they received a request and submitted a report. Dave said if there was a request to meet a specific need, then they could start. This would honor some of the needs of adaptive management. If a specific request came in to meet a Washington Office need, the SAB could immediately move on it and then move on the process. If during the interim someone notified Mike of a major concern, the SAB could stop their work. It's up to the AMWG to determine why kind of response they want.

Comments:

- In favor of streamlining the process. (Randy Seaholm)
- Support this additional language as it makes it more effective in how the SAB communicates. (Andre Potochink)
- Important to tie in budget schedules with SAB work. (Dennis Kubly)
- GCMRC would support
- Make sure that the turnaround time will be 6-8 weeks on a request. Just want to make sure that everyone is comfortable with that. (Margaret Palmer)

- The SAB knows what direction the AMP is going but if they change, then the AMWG needs to be involved and give approval. (Bruce Taubert)
- Need to be timely in handling requests. (Sam Spiller)

Dennis said the FY05 budget will be on the AMWG Agenda in March and the TWG is trying to work on FY06 for January approval. He asked if the time of year should be tied to budget approval rather than a month of the year.

Dave said they could continue trying to get a 24-month plan and thinks it would help everyone. He also said they could do a subset of a 12-month plan. The SAB could do a trial over the next 6 months. When they receive requests, there would be a notice given. The SAB are now developing their internal operations where there has to be notice of all the science advisors. At that time, they would notice the various chairs through e-mail. If there were any concerns, they would initiate a conference call and then it would go through a formal review process. There would be a formal notice from the beginning of all the parties and that is what's hasn't been happening. For example, AMWG, TWG, and GCMRC would know what the SAB is doing. The SAB would go ahead and start working on the request but there would be a triggering device if they needed to shut down.

Leslie asked Dave for clarification on Attachments 2 and 3. Dave said that **Attachment 2** is strictly an information document. Dave said he talked with Jeff and because they met with GCMRC and anytime from this point on, they are going to share all memos with everyone. He said that **Attachment 4** is a document which gives the SAB the ability to take action. They would like to be able to move on the first 3-4 levels of review or types of review that we had proposed until such a time that AMWG can meet and approve. For example, they would also like to respond to GCMRC on core monitoring, strategic plan, budget issues, other requests, etc.. However, they currently don't have a charge to do that and can't operate without one. They would like tentative approval of this for the first 8 months of charge, between now and next October, until AMWG can formally approve or modify at their March meeting.

Bruce said he had a concern on Attachment A and the appropriateness of the RFP process, an analysis of the mechanism chosen to get the work done appropriate for the best science, least dollar perspective. He said that if the science advisors are looking at 2 and 3, then he was comfortable with the existing wording. If not, he would like to modify the working. Dave said that it covers both the scientific procedures used in RFP processes and the RFP process itself. For example, some times something may be recommended for outside contracting that the science advisors may advise that that might be conducted with existing staff or vice versa. Bruce said that is what he was looking for.

ACTION ITEM: Dave will work with Norm (TWG Chair), Dennis Kubly (USBR), and Jeff Lovich (GCMRC) on preparing the language to the proposal for the March AMWG Meeting.

GCMRC Response to SAB Recommendations. Jeff Cross said he really appreciates the effort of the SAB to report to the AMWG at each meeting but he said he would also like to see a mechanism for GCMRC to respond in a formal way to the recommendations made by the science advisors. He would like to see that mechanism addressed in the protocols. Jeff Lovich

said he could review past SAB recommendations and respond to those accordingly. Bob Lynch said that an agency can't require something to be put into an advisory committee protocol. Leslie asked if a way to resolve that concern would be to have a standing agenda item for report on communication to/from SAB on every AMWG and TWG meeting agenda. Jeff Cross said it doesn't have to be a standing agenda item but that he just wants to see GCMRC respond formally to the SAB recommendations.

RFP Process. Bruce commented that in Attachment B (10/03 to 12/03 and 12/03 to 4/04) he would like to see it some language inserted on the process for determining how the work gets done as there have been concerns about how the decision is made to do work internally (staff) or externally (contractors). He thinks the science advisors have a role in determining whether the right tools are used to get the job done. He would like the SAB to ask GCMRC what their process is. If they don't have a process, then the SAB should help them develop a process so that they can make decisions on how the work is accomplished with the concurrence of AMWG and the science advisors.

ACTION ITEM: The SAB will do a review of the RFP process and provide something to the AMWG for discussion at the March AMWG Meeting.

GCRMC Strategic Plan. Pam said there is a pretty clear message from the science advisors that GCMRC needs to develop a strategic plan right away, with the core monitoring plan as part of it. She feels the AMWG and TWG have been remiss in not figuring out how to help them to do that wondered if there wasn't something that could be done now to help GCMRC formulate a strategic plan without having to institute a hiatus in the monitoring and research program. Norm said that the issue is on the TWG agenda for January and hopefully bring some proposal to AMWG in March to continue to proceed there. Jeff said the GCMRC would gratefully accept guidance on formatting and other issues with respect to how they should proceed. He would like to have some discussions at the upcoming TWG meeting about how to proceed with it. Pam suggested that the Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Group be charged to work with GCMRC on GCMRC's strategic plan and get something moving in January rather than waiting until March. Dave said the SAB would be available to provide whatever assistance they could in developing GCMRC's strategic plan.

WAPA Flow Proposal – Clayton Palmer said he just wanted to make sure that the AMWG members were aware that he has been working with the TWG and Reclamation regarding a change in the non-native fish suppression element of the experimental flows which are scheduled to begin January 1. He has met with the TWG twice and sent to the TWG some spreadsheets and information and received comments from them. Recently in an attempt to keep AMWG up to speed, he also sent the information to the AMWG members and clarified the proposal that WAPA is making and the purpose for it.

Last year during the fish suppression flows, WAPA had negotiated specific details of those flows with Reclamation prior to their beginning. The exact hour in which the Glen Canyon would start upramping, etc., was negotiated in a conference call in late November 2002. They discovered over the course of those flows that they had quite a bit of power scheduled from their customers in the early morning and had nothing that could be generated either out of Glen Canyon or the

other units because the other CRSP units were very dry last year. They went to the market to purchase supplemental power to meet the Federal contract commitments and found that the merchants didn't want to sell 4 hours worth of power because it precluded them from being able to sell power all day long to other entities. They could only find the power they needed in the early morning at very great expense and what they had provided to Reclamation as an estimated financial gain in the January-March period ended up being a loss.

They are interested in having the non-native fish suppression flows to the extent that they may prove to be a management action but they're interested in having them compatible with the other resources and meeting contractual obligations that the Federal Government has for the sell of power. They thought about how to find a way to do this without subtracting from or affecting the goal of the non-native fish suppression flow. They have a proposal to begin the Glen Canyon rampup during the January-March period 2 hours earlier which would extend the total ramping and peak release time 2 hours over the course of the day. The spreadsheet describes this. He discussed this with the TWG at a couple of months ago and didn't receive any written comments but did receive some oral comments after the meeting. One of the issues was the concern that if Glen Canyon releases for an additional 2 hours each day, it will release more water and how do you propose to make that up. WAPA's revised proposal was that it would be made up by not having any non-native fish suppression flows on Sunday of each week, which accomplishes (1) it reduces the sediment transport issue and, (2) it may provide some lethal temperatures for trout redds which was something that was observed in the mornings, during the day last year. Clayton said that the spreadsheet he sent out has what is currently scheduled, the rampup starting at hour ending 8:00. In fact, the first rampup started last year in hour ending at 9:00. It was moved up one hour in March. In other words the 9 hours of peak flows were shifted up one hour in March and what he had put down in his spreadsheet was the March schedule.

The proposal was submitted formally to the GCRMC and they are currently taking a look at the resource effects. He was told the other day by Jeff Lovich that was some information gathered and analyzed and they were just about ready to transmit it to the TWG. Jeff said he had that memo completed and will be sending to the TWG later this week. Clayton said he also received an e-mail message from David Topping and David indicated that from a sediment transport point of view that the difference between what's currently scheduled and WAPA's proposal was about 3%, that is WAPA's proposal would increase sediment transportation by about 3% over the current schedule. The procedure is to receive the GCMRC information and have that sent out to the TWG and then have this be an agenda item for the TWG Meeting on January 7-8, 2004. Jeff added that their models have an uncertainty of 15% associated so from a statistical standpoint, the proposed flows would be indistinguishable from sand export under existing flows.

Clayton said he is hoping for some kind of recommendation from the TWG and following that, they would make a recommendation to the AMWG. The AMWG would then discuss and consider the TWG's recommendation and make a recommendation.

Pam said the previous flows underwent NEPA review and a FONSI was issued, and asked if the new flows would require supplemental NEPA? Clayton said talked with Randy Peterson and Dennis Kubly and they wanted to make sure that the proposal had been discussed by the TWG and comments received before discussing further.

Leslie asked how long the determination on compliance would take following a proposal from the TWG. Dennis said his expectation would be similar to what they went through modification of mechanical removal and what they did there and what took the longest was to generate an identification of proposed change and an assessment of the effects and allow a 2-week public review to see whether the public thought that they had missed anything. He estimated the total time at 3-4 weeks. Clayton added that once they have the memo from GCMRC regarding WAPA's proposal that Reclamation could begin its NEPA compliance pending a recommendation by the TWG and AMWG. Leslie asked if a conference call would have to be set today in order to meet all the provisions in a timely manner. Clayton said he talked with Randy and Randy thought that would be best. There has to be another AMWG conference call after the TWG has reviewed.

Bob Lynch said the letter on possible impacts should be sent out as soon as possible. He said that it is entirely possible that if the impacts are negligible in line with the statistical variation on sand transport, that this qualifies for a categorical exclusion.

Conference call ended at 3 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Whetton
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation