

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program
Retreat Summary
June 28 and 29, 2004

prepared by Mary Orton, Facilitator

The Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program held a retreat on June 28 and 29, 2004 in Scottsdale, Arizona. AMWG members and alternates, TWG members, GCMRC program managers and leaders, and some of the Science Advisors were invited to attend.

In the first exercise, the participants began with five themes: AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, Science Advisors, and Budget. They identified numerous issues within those themes that they wanted to discuss during the retreat, and grouped them into clusters of like issues. They then used a "dot voting" exercise to choose the issues to discuss. Following are the clusters of issues as named by the group, with the number of dots each cluster received.

AMWG

Role and Function (39)
Implementation (27)
Stakeholder Interests (12)
Foundation (6)
Secretary's Designee (4)
Communication
Meetings

TWG

Function (21)
Structure (4)
Communication (1)

GCMRC

Role (21)
Permitting (7)
Products (1)

Science Advisors (SAs)

Interaction (9)
Participation
Membership

Budget

Budget Process (13)
Tribal Funding (10)
Budget Management (9)

Based on the results of this exercise, the group agreed to further discuss the role and function of the various parts of the AMP: AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and SAs. They divided into two groups to discuss the issues, and came together for the final hour of the retreat to report to each other. Consensus was reached on many issues within the individual groups. In plenary session, the full group agreed to the following:

- The retreat attendees agreed that representatives of all components of the AMP would get together to develop workplan/budget guidance. The next AMWG meeting is scheduled for August 9 and 10, 2004. The attendees agreed to add an additional day, August 11, in order to accommodate a workshop on developing priorities. To be invited to the meeting and workshop: AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, PA signatories, and SAs. The priorities will be approved by AMWG during their meeting. Pam Hyde, Clayton Palmer, Bruce Taubert, Jeff Cross, and Sam Spiller will help develop the detailed plans for the workshop.
- The Secretary's Designee will cull through the retreat results, identify easily implementable actions, make some assignments, and make recommendations to the AMWG for follow-through on these.
- Other items will be addressed in AMWG meetings in a time set aside at each meeting specifically for those issues.
- AMWG to prioritize the issues to be addressed.

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program

Retreat, June 28 and 29, 2004

Scottsdale Plaza Hotel, Scottsdale, Arizona

Attendees

Joe Alston – National Park Service	Arden Kucate – Pueblo of Zuni
Mary Barger – Western Area Power Administration	Rod Kuharich – Colorado
Daryl Beckmann – Bureau of Reclamation	Phil Lehr – Nevada
Robert Begay – Navajo Nation	Mike Liszewski – GCMRC
Tim Begay – Navajo National	Jeff Lovich – GCMRC
Jeff Cross – National Park Service	Aaron Mapatis – Hualapai Tribe
Jonathan Damp – Pueblo of Zuni	Ted Melis – GCMRC
Helen Fairley – GCMRC	Don Ostler – New Mexico
Denny Fenn – GCMRC	Clayton Palmer – Western Area Power Administration
Lisa Force – Grand Canyon Trust	
Michael Gabaldon – Secretary's Designee	Bill Persons – Arizona Game and Fish Dept.
Dave Garrett – Science Advisors	Randy Peterson – Bureau of Reclamation
Lance Gunderson – Science Advisors	Andre Potochnik – Grand Canyon River Guides
Chris Harris – California	Randy Seaholm – Colorado
Norm Henderson – National Park Service	John Shields – Wyoming
Amy Heuslein – Bureau of Indian Affairs	Sam Spiller – US Fish and Wildlife Service
Pam Hyde – Grand Canyon Wildlands Council	Mark Steffen – Fly Fishers of America
Loretta Jackson – Hualapai Tribe	Larry Stevens – Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
Leslie James – Colorado River Energy Distributors' Association	Bruce Taubert – Arizona Game and Fish Department
Robert King – Utah	Bill Werner – Arizona
Glen Knowles – US Fish and Wildlife Service	Mike Yeatts – Hopi Tribe
Dennis Kubly – Bureau of Reclamation	Jerry Zimmerman – California

Welcome and Introductory Remarks

Michael Gabaldon, Secretary's Designee, welcomed the attendees and reminded them that they were limited to discussing administrative matters during this retreat, because the meeting had not been noticed to the public. He said that Assistant Secretary of the Interior Bennett Raley would be present after the retreat ended tomorrow to hear a report about retreat results.

Mary Orton and Kathy Bond, facilitators, welcomed the attendees and told them that the retreat agenda had been developed by the AMWG Retreat Committee – Amy Heuslein, Pam Hyde, Randy Peterson, Nikolai Ramsey, Sam Spiller, and Bruce Taubert, with lots of help and input from Dennis Kubly and Linda Whetton – and with the feedback from the AMWG and TWG members who had commented on the draft plans for the retreat. They said that the group had already listed more issues than could be addressed at the retreat, and that they would be asking them to identify how those issues would be addressed in the future. They emphasized that the goal is improvements, not solutions, and gave an overview of the retreat agenda.

Issues Identification

The retreat attendees identified and grouped issues that they were interested in discussing during the retreat. The following issues and groups of issues were identified. The attendees also prioritized the groups ("clusters") of issues. The number following the cluster name indicates the number of dots the group members assigned in the prioritizing exercise.

AMWG

Cluster A: Role and Function (39)

- A1. How can the roles of the different subgroups be clarified and simplified to increase effectiveness of the AMP recommendations?
- A2. What are the specific roles, responsibilities, and processes of AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and IRPs?
- A3. Clarify roles and responsibilities of GCMRC, AMWG, TWG regarding the functioning of the AMP
- A4. Should the AMWG roles and responsibilities be modified or clarified to make the AMP function more effectively and, if so, how?
- A5. Fundamental role: is the AMWG an advisory consultant or a Board of Directors?
- A6. What is the role of the AMWG under FACA and recent issues related to concern about conflict of interest related to budgets and contracts that directly benefit agencies with AMWG representation?
- A7. What are the most important roles and two most important responsibilities of the AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and Science Advisors, respectively, in the AMP?
- A8. Should the AMWG drive the AMP or should the agencies pose questions for the AMWG to advise them on?
- A9. What functional authority has been delegated to the AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and Science Advisors and the real role and responsibilities of each
- A10. What decision-making power does the AMWG have – or is it limited to making recommendations?
- A11. How do we return control of the process back to AMWG?
- A12. What functions of the four groups of the Adaptive Management Program—GCMRC, TWG, Science Advisors, and AMWG—are working well at the present time? What functions of the four groups are not working well at the present time? What are the problems that exist between or amongst the four groups?
- A13. Do any of the AMP entities duplicate functions?
- A14. Duplication of activities, discussions, budget planning, etc., by TWG and AMWG
- A15. If any of the AMP entities duplicate functions, can one or more of the entities be sunsetted or combined?
- A16. Does AMP have legal obligations outside of NHPA requirements to protect, mitigate adverse impacts to, and improve cultural resources and recreation in Grand Canyon?
- A17. What is (or should be) the role of AMP with relation to compliance activities beyond GCPA? (e.g., ESA, NHPA)
- A18. What is the role of this group in regard to Humpback chub recovery decisions?
- A19. Is it AMWG's function to implement a restocking program for Humpback chub?
- A20. How can the needs of the endangered species (HBC, WIFL, etc.) be adequately addressed through implementation of program activities? (Currently, we talk a lot but actually do little or nothing on the ground!)
- A21. Tribal sovereignty and its unique structure be recognized in the overall AMP and clarify its roles/responsibilities within the GCMRC's goals and objectives as well.
- A22. What is the role of the PA group?
- A23. How is the PA best incorporated into the AMP? Should the AMP Charter or the AMWG operating protocols be modified to explicitly accommodate this incorporation more effectively?
- A24. If an agency or tribe sits at the AMWG table and approves a recommendation, shouldn't that serve as consultation? (i.e., avoid two bites of the apple)
- A25. When do we implement the end game and wind down the AMWG?
- A26. How do we get to the end?
- A27. What changes in protocols and procedures of the GCMRC, TWG, Science Advisors, and AMWG would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of those groups and, by extension, the AMP?
- A28. How should AMWG meetings be structured to take advantage of prior TWG efforts?
- A29. Is the process appropriate in scale for the resources of concern?
- A30. The FEIS requires economic conditions must be considered. How does that occur?
- A31. Do changes need to be made in the recommendation process in the AMWG?
- A32. How can we showcase the AMP's success?
- A33. Standing Ad-HOC GROUPS: budget and planning, core monitoring, research and exp, outreach, reporting (FAC), compliance, adaptive management, programmatic agreement, integration
- A34. AMWG retreats conducted on river trips (include other rivers)
- A35. What are the Secretary's expectations of AMWG?

- A36. Are the documents, i.e., Core Monitoring Plan, GCMRC Strategic Plan, Research Plan, already in development adequate? Are additional plans needed?
- A37. AMWG uses models and “MATA” to define both measurable and attainable evaluation criteria for management objectives.

Cluster B: Implementation (27)

- B1. Clarify role of science/scientific information in decision making of the AMP, especially in decision making by AMWG.
- B2. What is the role of learning and science in the AMP?
- B3. Where does “learning” occur?
- B4. How do we implement the results of the research?
- B5. How do the findings of the AMP get implemented?
- B6. How does the Record of Decision get modified to incorporate what we know?
- B7. Has the AMWG been responsive to new scientific information and appropriately modified its Plan recommendation?
- B8. Is the AMWG constrained to follow the recommendations of the Science Advisors and science review panels?
- B9. Does the political will exist to implement results of good science?
- B10. What is the time scale of adaptive management from the participants’ perspective? I.e., change within a year, multi-year, decadal. Follow on: what is the correct scale for this process?

Cluster C: Stakeholder Interests (12)

- C1. What is the role of the state in separately advising the Secretary?
- C2. Dissension – how much is too much? Does being a member of AMWG involve giving up an independent public voice?
- C3. How does AMP work when stakeholders make management decisions outside of AMP process?
- C4. What responsibilities do AMP members have to support decisions made by the Secretary of the Interior based on their recommendations?
- C5. How, when, and CAN we make recommendations that are NOT unanimous??
- C6. Create checks and balances and strive to incorporate differences of agency values to the table.
- C7. How does each agency interact, interchange with management objectives in the AMP without being too opposite in views?
- C8. How can the AMWG hope to provide sound advice to the Secretary of the Interior when the desires of the stakeholders are so diametrically opposed?
- C9. How can the AMP succeed if some stakeholders are advantaged by the failure or stalling of the program?

Cluster D: Foundation (6)

- D1. The AMP has plenty of documentation on role and responsibilities (charter, strategic plan, solicitor’s opinion, etc.). Tension in the process may be due to misunderstandings or lack of awareness of the existence of this literature. How will we utilize that body of information?
- D2. How do we assure our efforts adhere to the foundational documents?

Cluster E: Secretary’s Designee (4)

- E1. How is member status re-evaluated?
- E2. Have some AMWG members been members so long that they have become frustrated or impatient with a process that is designed to proceed at somewhat glacial speed?
- E3. GCD FEIS, ROD, AMWG charter, and other operational documents specify the Secretary’s Designee is to oversee the AMP. This is not happening. Should GCDAMP be restructured or different assignments be made to actually accomplish this?
- E4. What can be done to improve DOI feedback and leadership? (What happens to our recommendations?)
- E5. How can the process of recommendations to the Secretary and subsequent feedback be improved?
- E6. How does the AMP report progress to the Secretary?

- E7. No annual reports from AMWG to Congress and Governors. Why? As per GCD FEIS and Charter, these are to occur each year.
- E8. Shouldn't we have a set of sheets for Interior and actions by Interior? Energy?

Cluster F: Communication

- F1. How can communications among the four groups in the AMP be improved?
- F2. Mechanisms for dealing with dissent? Advisors? Science? Actions?

Cluster G: Meetings

- G1. Should AMWG meet more often to deal with AMP issues? Why or why not?
- G2. Does AMWG need to change the number of meetings they have (are they often enough to deal with the workload of the AMP?)?
- G3. Standing quarterly AMWG meetings (fixed dates)

Cluster H: None

- H1. How much are we truly going to validate as to where we stand on all the scientific approach within the Grand Canyon Act on behalf to the welfare of the ecosystem for the next 100 years?
- H2. Is change required for adaptive management?

TWG

Cluster I: Function (21)

- I1. What are the problems with the current roles and responsibilities of the TWG?
- I2. Should the TWG roles and responsibilities be modified or clarified to make the AMP function more effectively and, if so, how? What changes to the operating protocols or charter are needed to effectuate these new roles and responsibilities?
- I3. What steps can the TWG take to be more effective in their meetings?
- I4. How can the tasks of policy and technical determinations best be divided between the AMWG and TWG?
- I5. TWG should only deal with technical issues and not get involved in policy issues

Cluster J: Structure (4)

- J1. Is the TWG necessary?
- J2. Eliminate TWG, replace with "Ad-Hoc" groups established by AMWG
- J3. What membership requirements should there be for AMWG and TWG members? What changes would be required to put these requirements into effect and how important are they?
- J4. Should TWG Chair not be a stakeholder? (I.e., use a professional facilitator.)

Cluster K: Communication (1)

- K1. What is the AMWG's responsibility to provide clear charges to the TWG, and does TWG have any responsibilities beyond responding to the AMWG? If so, what are they and where do they come from?
- K2. Are AMWG members being fully briefed by their TWG reps prior to AMWG meetings?
- K3. Do we have/can we create an annual calendar online illustrating all AMP-related science trips?

GCMRC

Cluster L: Role (21)

- L1. How does GCMRC see their role? How does the AMWG see their role? If the views of GCMRC and AMWG are different, what actions can be taken to achieve some balance between the viewpoints of GCMRC and AMWG in the amount of administration and the amount of science that is conducted by GCMRC?
- L2. What are the roles of GCMRC in administering and assisting with science and conducting synthesis vs. collecting data?
- L3. What would the likely effects on GCMRC and AMP science be of changing the proportions of administration and science conducted by GCMRC?

- L4. What changes could be made to further ensure the independence of GCMRC with respect to ensuring objective science?
- L5. The independence of GCMRC, as the science provider to the AMP, is compromised by being too involved in the machinations of the managers on the TWG and AMWG. How can objective, independent science be protected from this conflict?
- L6. Is GCMRC too involved in AMWG's and TWG's bureaucratic processes, so that they cannot focus enough energy on the science end of the business in the AMP?
- L7. What does GCMRC do? What is their function? Are they (GCMRC) appropriately staffed?
- L8. Are we giving the USGS/GCMRC enough latitude to manage their programs?
- L9. Can GCMRC turn down assignments from AMWG?
- L10. Is the GCMRC obligated to follow the recommendations of the AMWG?

Cluster M: Permitting (7)

- M1. How do we resolve permitting issues among stakeholder agencies (i.e., NPS and GCMRC)?
- M2. Retreat objective #1: add "Role and responsibility of land managing agency." How do we assure that the recommendations of the AMWG do not conflict with NPS responsibilities?
- M3. What are the responsibilities of permitting agencies or the tribes to voice their concerns prior to a project being accepted for funding?
- M4. How can NPS be more equal player in permitting science trips?

Cluster N: Products (1)

- N1. What is the schedule of scientific products that GCMRC must produce without fail?
- N2. Can GCMRC produce a regular (annual/biennial) "status of the resources" report?
- N3. How can up-to-date science be disseminated to AMP members in a timely manner?
- N4. Are the workload and schedules placed on GCMRC by AMWG and TWG reasonable for the GCMRC staff to accomplish? Is there a feedback loop that allows reconciliation of workload and schedule when expectations cannot reasonably be met?

Cluster O: None

- O1. Are additional GCMRC and AMP planning documents needed to make the program run more efficiently?

Science Advisors (SAs)

Cluster P: Interaction (9)

- P1. Who do the SAs report to?
- P2. How should the SAs' schedule of activities be set to best complement the rest of the program?
- P3. What are the most effective lines of communication for the SAs with other program groups?
- P4. What should the review process be for SA reports?
- P5. How can the SAs' programmatic review best be incorporated into the AMP process? What is the optimal timing for completing the review and incorporating recommendations into the AMP process?

Cluster Q: Participation

- Q1. How can the program best use the services of the SAs and make them available to scientists, managers, and stakeholders without overburdening them and compromising their ability to help us do high quality, credible science?
- Q2. All Science Advisors attend all AMWG meetings.

Cluster R: Membership

- R1. Who are the Science Advisors? Is there a list? Where?
- R2. Should the Science Advisors have a tribal representative? Or member?

Budget

Cluster S: Budget Process (13)

- S1. How can the AMP budget process be changed to be more effective and efficient?
- S2. How should the AMP budget process be amended to meet the needs of the program and best utilize recommendations from TWG, GCMRC, and the SAs?
- S3. Is the TWG budget process now underway adequate to meet AMP needs?
- S4. What questions remain unanswered or issues unaddressed in the TWG Budget Ad Hoc approach to the budget process?
- S5. How should the tasks of recommending a budget be divided between the AMWG and TWG?
- S6. If TWG members are technical advisors to AMWG and presumably representative of each AMWG stakeholder, why do some AMWG members feel the need to micromanage or second-guess them, particularly with respect to budget formulation?
- S7. The AMWG should stop nit-picking on the details of the AMP budget – the AMWG should develop recommendations assoc. with activity implementation, not agency budget.
- S8. How do we become more efficient in management of budget?

Cluster T: Tribal Funding (10)

- T1. What is a more efficient method for funding tribal participation in the AMP?
- T2. Why does the AMP pay for the Programmatic Agreement?
- T3. Why does AMWG ignore Tribal funding?
- T4. Tribal funding? By agencies?

Cluster U: Budget Management (9)

- U1. Is the budget adequate to accomplish the goals and objectives of the AMP? If not, how do we best deal with it?
- U2. When will we reduce the budget?
- U3. What happens to the AMP if there are no power revenues to fund it? (due to drought or otherwise)

Cluster V: None

- V1. What reporting of budget expenditures or review of work products is needed by TWG and AMWG to meet their responsibilities to the program?

Substantive Issues

Because this was not a noticed FACA committee meeting, the attendees were able to discuss only internal administrative matters. The following questions were deemed too substantive for discussion at the retreat.

- When do we return to historic operations?

Other

Jeff Lovich said that the following question was factually inaccurate, and the GCMRC was not refusing to proceed with mark-recapture population monitoring. He clarified that GCMRC asked the AMWG to reconsider its decision, but that they feel they are obligated to implement the recommendation if not changed by AMWG. The retreat attendees agreed not to consider this question.

- The GCMRC has stated in writing they will not proceed with mark-recapture population monitoring of humpback chub population at LCR/CR confluence. AMWG recommended to the Secretary of the Interior this be done. USFWS has stated in writing this needs to be done pursuant to recovery goals. AZ G&F has concurred with USFWS. WHY?

Small Groups

The participants worked in two groups on the issues of roles and functions of the various parts of the AMP: AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and SAs. The two groups, Vasey's Paradise and Lava Falls, made the following reports:

Vasey's Paradise Group

TWG Role and Function

1. Create, with GCMRC, the work plan (including technical information).

Working well:

- Development of planning docs that will serve as the foundation for the creation of the budget and workplans and reduce level of effort.

Needs improvement:

- Putting the workplan together is not working. TWG needs to get a draft, detailed workplan from GCMRC to review and comment on in a timely fashion. Need more detail, more timely. TWG is not meeting often enough to review and comment on that workplan to get it to the point where they can make a studied recommendation to AMWG.
- By the time we get it, too late to make considered changes. Want more input into actual projects and workplans.
- Projects should be agreed upon by collaboration between GCMRC and TWG.
- Whether program managers put together first draft, or AHG of TWG assists in putting together first draft, should come to TWG in September, 13 months before beginning of FY.
- If we (GCMRC) were collaborating with TWG up front, it probably wouldn't be that much need for the level of detail to reassure the TWG.
- If the program would provide GCMRC with their priorities, this would be a lot easier.
- GCMRC workload is not workable – AMWG need to give more sense of priorities to GCMRC. Scheduling will not help.
- Panel including TWG, GCMRC, BOR, and PA get together to develop project list 15-18 months in advance. Workplan flows from project list that has been agreed to by all those component parts. (GCMRC does not feel this is workable.)
- If the USGS budget is sent in early, the work should be given to TWG early.
- If AMWG's priorities mean that agencies don't have enough staff, or more than GCMRC budget, need to have that feedback soon.
- May mean an extra meeting by AMWG.
- AMWG should not use the final budget project to do prioritization of projects.
- TWG members should bring stakeholders' concerns to the budget process – not the AMWG members.
- If agency is voted down in TWG, stakeholders can bring it up again in the AMWG.
- We complained about being force-fed the budget. This may have caused the budget to come late, but it was too late for input. We were just given the details. There needs to be some other process that involves the AMWG accepting recommendations from GCMRC and the TWG to be able to make recommendations back down the line.
- No attempt to economize, restrict the wish list. We are doing things that are non-essential. We need to focus on where the science is taking us. Seems that it is an entitlement. I've been faced with budget cuts and freezes in my agency – no choice. I don't know if it has to be Secretary or Secretary's Designee – efficiency and priorities have to be put into this.
- The issue of funding is prioritizing. We can't be all things for all people. I'm not asking for more money – but clear direction on top priorities.
- Make sure cultural and recreational are part of the priorities.

- Need to be able to interact and clarify with AMWG outside of meetings.
- AMWG gives direction, GCMRC and TWG makes workplan, then AMWG approves or changes, recommends to the SOTI.
- Walk-down table of each item and amount for priorities from TWG, based on guidance from AMWG. Give AMWG something to shoot at (straw dog).
- Not sufficient to have simply annual budget. Need to do two-year and five-year planning process.

Consensus on steps towards improvement:

- **Clear direction from AMWG before development of workplan on priorities for the future.**
- **Based on that clear direction from AMWG, the team to work on workplan development includes GCMRC, PA, TWG, and BOR (for its piece of the budget). May have to include AMWG as well.**

2. Work with GCMRC and Science Advisors to ensure best science is incorporated into recommendations.

What needs improvement?

- Science needs to be separate from politics. If they are together, science is usually compromised. AMWG needs to decide on experimental flows.
- Increased emphasis in socio-ecosystem – human-dominated ecosystem.
- Far less micro-management of the science. Science can be compromised by people getting too deep into our business. Allow us to disengage from business activities of TWG and AMWG, including whether we contract out or do science in house and how many computers we have. If our products are meeting your needs, these details shouldn't be discussed.
- Right balance between doing the science and coordinating the science isn't micro-management.
- Micromanaging budget process may be because priorities aren't set.
- That's the purpose of the AMWG – to ensure that we provide the best type of adaptive management, oversee all the bodies that report to us. I don't know what GCMRC is all comprised of, the products, next steps – I see a lot of things that come up on short turn-around basis that we have to respond to. At that point, we do have to make decisions, and we may not make the best decisions based on inadequate information. How do you create that balance? That management of these things? We need to decide the best way to proceed. Compliance issues should be what drives the recommendations. Trout removal was almost a done deal until tribes said they had concerns – no consultation before that. Could set back the whole EA process. Need to make the process work. GCMRC has to show us what they are doing, have to report to AMWG.
- Agree that TWG shouldn't micromanage, but competitive outsourcing ensures independent science – not micromanaging.
- Separating science from politics – what does this mean? Don't know how you separate politics and science. Schmidt, et al., 1998: managers need to provide value judgments, scientists tell you what the trade-offs are – cannot separate them.
- Politicians shouldn't try to push the science in a certain direction. It is OK that policy makers reject the science – but we need to do the science on our own.
- GCMRC was originally designed to be small group, program managers, not doers. Maybe it's cheaper to do it in house. It's a matter of what you bring forth to AMWG to demonstrate you are producing the best, most efficient operation. Part is what we are asking GCMRC to do – maybe it's too much. Gets back to issue that AMWG needs to deal with: are we willing to pay for the workplan?

- Re: small staff: Mark Schafer said “appropriate staff,” not “small staff.” Focus should be on product, not process. If we get clear direction from AMWG, and we deliver the products you need, process become irrelevant. Until you get those products, these are empty words.
- Separation of science: once cost is assigned, question of scientist giving some indication of trade-off – that’s the purview of science. Can give the costs of the decision or long-term strategy. So strategic plan and annual plan are critical. AMWG needs to look at long-term strategy and prices that go with that.
- With priority setting, and providing budget, comes accountability. I haven’t seen yet a good report on what the accomplishments are - what did we get for that dollar spent?
- Scientists’ results have worked.
- No more tentative results – trustworthy results, some peer review before being presented to TWG. Trade off is timeliness.
- Others frustrated with only final reports.
- Activate science advisors to do review.
- GCMRC policy is to share preliminary results with TWG, but not to AMWG. This broke down January 2002 when we had a sediment presentation, peer-reviewed and published, followed very preliminary report on HBC, not peer-reviewed.
- Preliminary results have to be clearly identified as such, and AMWG members need to understand the difference between preliminary and peer-reviewed.
- Preliminary results are shared only at the TWG level. Peer-reviewed results only are shared at the AMWG level. Peer review can be the Science Advisors’ review.
- If AMWG members are given preliminary data, they should not act on it, unless it was an emergency.
- When ad hoc committees are established at a technical level, AMWG members should refrain from participating.
- Not realistic to keep information from AMWG. Can’t make major decisions based on preliminary info, and TWG plays a role in guiding us here. Can’t set up a formalized system.
- TWG members briefing AMWG members is the ideal way to go. Mixed models from AMWG. Recent motion mandates GCMRC gives preliminary results to AMWG. Seems AMWG wants to evaluate preliminary data.
- I’m not sure it’s broken. Have to be careful not to make bad decisions based on preliminary information.
- Information is dangerous. It also can be shared, or maybe it won’t be shared. We will revisit this policy at GCMRC. We ought to be transparent at GCMRC; we need to make it clear when information is preliminary. Can’t always wait until final peer-reviewed results. All scientific data is preliminary – designed to be repeatable, can get different results. Our job as scientists is to put up the caveats.
- Overlap and duplication between AMWG and TWG – things like presentation of information. Is TWG info getting carried up the ladder – or do we make presentations to AMWG, too? What are the guidelines so we don’t unnecessarily duplicate work/presentations? How much info does AMWG need? Do they ask for it from us, or do we decide? How can we be more efficient?
- AMWG needs to decide what they want from TWG and how they want it.
- From a land management standpoint, we need to react on best available science. Some of this is AMWG’s responsible to determine what is best available science. It may be that it’s a preliminary report. If consequences are severe, and we don’t act, could have serious consequences. May get

burned at times. We may have lost time and energy by acting on the preliminary Humpback chub information, while not acting could have cost us a species.

- Managers can use a risk assessment technology. Could be asked of the Center or SAs. Managers always look at that; can be done quickly and cheaply.
 - If AMWG is developing clear priorities for annual and five-years, the projects will dictate when and how the reports are given to them. Reporting, prioritization, and planning need to be synchronized. There may be different levels of reporting as well.
3. Advice from my agency's TWG member on how these issues are playing out with the rest of AMWG – I get a sense of where others are coming from.
 4. Conduct functional, efficient meetings, well-informed, provide best possible guidance to AMWG
 5. TWG needs to concentrate on technical issues – rather than trying to make policy issues – limit to technical issues, not political.
 6. Prioritize research and monitoring needs, budget formulation in support of research and monitoring, as directed by AMWG
 7. Support the needs of AMWG
 8. Recommend prioritize research and monitoring technical management needs and budget cooperatively with GCMRC
 9. Review technical information and provide recommendations to AMWG based on that review
 10. Serve as the workhorse of AMWG and reviewing GCMRC's responses to requests from AMWG for budget, workplans, science plans, etc.
 11. Provide technical expertise and recommendations to AMWG re: science research of GCMRC
 12. TWG helps the AMWG to do its job – cooperates with GCMRC in helping AMWG
 13. Provide a review of scientific studies and proposals
 14. AMWG's financial manager – formulates, justifies and executes the budget of AMWG and provides fund status
 15. TWG is in a technical support role – also has responsibility of reviewing recommendations on budget, review science, and make policy recommendations to AMWG
 16. Develop white papers from TWG spelling out recommendations with conflicting opinions – so AMWG can weigh what was discussed
 17. Assist in implementing AMWG policy directions
 18. TWG does not develop budgets, but reviews, comments, and makes recommendations – but has no final say. Let the decision-makers make the decisions.
 19. Need technical information from all the parties.
 20. Recommend adjustments and modifications to workplans, etc., consistent with high-level direction provided by AMWG
 21. TWG should not provide any dissenting comments to the Secretary of the Interior. This should come only from the AMWG.
 22. Provide a report card on the implementation of the workplan
 23. Schedule of proposed actions and trouble shooting – what worked, what didn't work and why.
 24. Don't restrict TWG's avenues for communication
 25. Should TWG meetings be public?
 26. TWG helps AMWG identify successes – progress we can all acknowledge

27. TWG's communication as TWG should be limited – not the individual agencies/members. Before a letter is sent to the Secretary of the Interior, I hope it could be addressed at an AMWG meeting.
28. Should TWG differences with AMWG be communicated to the Secretary of the Interior?

Science Advisors Role and Function

1. Provide review of the program.
2. Respond to specific requests from AMWG to review/critique GCMRC science plans and/or address other, more specific pressing science needs in the program.
3. Evaluate science research programs within the AMP.
4. Conduct periodic review of the AMP's progress
5. Individual review panels - come together when needed, disband when done – shouldn't be an enshrined institution
6. Add "as appropriate and directed by AMWG" under each of the above bullets.
7. Provide independent, external peer review of AMP research and monitoring programs, proposals, and projects.
8. I'm fine with the operating protocols as written.
9. Provide peer review for draft reports.
10. Distinguish between IRPs and science advisors and PEP panels
11. Long-term structure of SAs: how does the structure change through time? What are the terms? How are the members selected?
12. Come to an AMWG meeting
13. Services of SAs should be available to AMWG, TWG, and GCMRC
14. Another science support arm of the AMP
15. Focus on major program review, science monitoring, and management
16. Should not be involved in reviewing the function of the AMWG
17. Tasks should be reviewed or commented on by all parts of the AMP.
18. Science Advisors should be directed to review science function of the program.

GCMRC Roles and Functions

1. Conduct and coordinate the science – give to AMWG who communicates with TWG and gives TWG direction.
2. Small group to establish and implement long-term monitoring program to carry out the purposes of the GCPA.
3. Developing annual reports: technical and administrative
4. Act as technical advisor to AMWG and Secretary's Designee
5. Conduct science research in relation to the FEIS
6. Translates direction from AMWG into scientific plans, then implements those plans, using the best scientific practices
7. Facilitate and manage monitoring and research related to Tribal needs; guarantee integration of Tribal concerns in research and monitoring.
8. Cooperatively with TWG, integrate science and monitoring and management application
9. Manage, maintain, administer research and monitoring programs related to AMP

10. Provide objective, INDEPENDENT science to AMP in a timely fashion
11. Coordinate, facilitate, administer science features necessary to meet the goals of the AMP
12. Synthesize data and report to the program
13. Key words: credible science, have openness to science otherwise not entertained by the process, advocate for the best science. Allow them to conduct science where appropriate.
14. Provide a proposed budget and workplan to TWG for review and recommendation to AMWG, based on the FY schedule requirements.
15. Should operate within/recognize/appreciate the constraints of the working environment of the Park and Tribes and conduct work in the most environmentally sensitive and cost-effective way possible.
16. Work with TWG and SAs to make sure the best possible science is incorporated into recommendations to AMWG
17. How do you implement the best science within a political environment? Agencies should direct GCMRC in terms of what kind of science they need – give that direction to GCMRC
18. Ongoing integration of Native American concerns – participation on every research trip and project
19. Synthesis, data management, and archival and availability of information to the process and to the public
20. Periodic report on work – midterm, draft reports, final reports
21. Largely a contracting-out kind of organization
22. Provide information using the best methods.
23. Administer scientific, research and monitoring proposals contained in approved workplan, using competitive bid process.
24. We need to discuss the in-house/contract out issue.
25. Support AMWG in a technical advisory role
26. If good science is delivered, shouldn't matter how it is conducted
27. Maintain in-house scientific expertise (what's the right balance?)
28. Develop GCMRC planning documents for TWG review and AMWG approval
29. Prepare annual reports: SCORE report on all resources including cultural resources and Tribal participation
30. Follow federal acquisition regulations in making its determination on who should do research and monitoring for AMP
31. Continue to provide the exchange of information coming through the program – to TWG and AMWG members – online library
32. Is GCMRC autonomous? Give information to AMWG or anywhere? Do they have protocols to follow?

AMWG Role and Function

1. Provide recommendations to the SOTI on program actions to meet the provisions of the GCPA.
2. Establish policy and adherence to agreed-upon standards and operating guidelines.
3. Reviews and approves the budget and recommends the budget to the SOTI, and provides overall oversight to the AMP.
4. Provide advice to the SOTI on dam and ecosystem management in relation to GCPA and other laws. This body has a larger social responsibility to demonstrate that humans can manage one of the world-renowned ecosystems in an intelligent manner.

5. Advise the SOTI on how to operate GCD. Ditto.
6. Provides a forum for stakeholder concerns and opinions.
7. Provides high-level guidance to the TWG and to GCMRC in how to fulfill the terms of the GCPA.
8. To make recommendations to the SOTI re: dam ops after considering the body of scientific and other information available.
9. AMWG needs to remember that it is an advisory committee and not a board of directors.
10. Provide a framework for the AMP policy, goals, and direction and priorities.
11. Make an annual report to the SOTI on current and projected year ops.
12. Make a report to Congress.
13. AMWG needs to be willing to make the tough recommendations.
14. In the charter, it says, if necessary provide recommendations for modifications to the GCD EIS ROD
15. Ensures coordination of operating changes in the annual operating plan for the Colorado River.
16. Implement the decisions of the SOTI based on recommendations to the AMP. What are the roles and functions of the different groups for implementation?
17. Facilitates coordination and input from interested parties.
18. Receives and considers feedback from the SOTI.
19. Encourage public input from interested parties.
20. In charge of consultation with tribes regarding their overall actions.
21. Outreach.
22. Receive and consider recommendations from science advisors.
23. Receive and consider recommendations from ad hoc groups.
24. Initiate the Science Advisors', TWG, and GCMRC activities.
25. What is the relationship with the PA?
26. Communicating with upper basin fisheries, MSCP, and other activities in the basin for the benefit of the SOTI.
27. Receive and consider recommendations from TWG and GCMRC.
28. Recommends to the SOTI to establish and implement long-term research and monitoring activities that ensure that GCD is operated in accordance with the provisions of the GCPA.
29. Facilitate communications among the AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and SAs. Ensure that the process is working – process maintenance function.

Lava Falls Group

AMWG – TWG relationship

1 – AMWG doesn't meet often enough, schedule mismatches cause problems

Solution – AMWG should meet more frequently to improve guidance and communication. This would help provide additional policy.

2 – Poor communication between groups, lack of disclosure

Solution – should take more time for groups to talk to each other. More frequent meetings, “executive summary” science symposiums, and retreats would help inform AMWG of scientific results. TWG members must brief their AMWG members on scientific reports.

3 – Priorities not being set by AMWG

Solution – Every meeting should solicit feedback from GCMRC on key questions. These are the questions managers need to have answered. Prioritization of questions would help GCMRC focus its workload. In the past, the Science Advisors have not communicated well enough with AMWG. A separate meeting of AMWG, TWG, SAs, and GCMRC should set priorities.

4 – AMWG not acting as policy body

5 – Agenda should be set by DOI, not just Reclamation

6 – Are recommendations being set in response to DOI inquiries or proactively?

7 – TWG wants to be more than technical body, making policy decisions, should be giving AMWG technical recommendations

Solution – Some issues, such as budget, have policy and technical issues intertwined. This particular case of the budget may be fixed by having GCMRC present to the AMWG their proposal and have the AMWG lay out the policy priorities prior to TWG technical discussion. Joint meetings may help determine how to deal with uncertainties. Report to AMWG should have more technical detail regarding the discussion and pros/cons of options considered, avoiding policy debate.

8 – AMWG members shouldn't sit on the TWG

Solution – By having AMWG members sit on the TWG, a pure technical recommendation is complicated. In situations where there are limited staff, joint membership may be acceptable, but in cases where there are dual members, the AMWG member should let the TWG member do their job.

9 – AMWG members should be more apprised of the science

Solution – GCMRC presentations to AMWG have been productive, encourage more of these. TWG should help to facilitate the analysis of technical information.

10 – AMWG rehashes what the TWG has already hashed

Solution – TWG responsibility is to AMWG. TWG could offer options to AMWG. Report to AMWG should have more technical detail regarding the discussion and pros/cons of options considered, avoiding policy debate. Research reports should provide clearer information. TWG members should provide greater information to their AMWG members on the TWG debate (communication), individually and as a group. TWG should take on only the technical issues and should let the AMWG know when they believe they have been given an improper task. The AMWG should help define what those issues are. Designee should give clearer direction and leadership in areas where the groups are outside their responsibilities.

11 – AMWG gives unclear direction, TWG second-guesses AMWG

Solution – AMWG should be clear in their direction and follow up to make sure TWG pursues the path laid out by AMWG.

12 – TWG doesn't have enough flexibility

13 – Formal processes need to be improved

Solution – EIS ROD and operating procedures are not being followed. By preparing an annual SCORE report and report to Congress and the 7 Basin State Governors, the AMP would be forced to (1) an evaluation of resources and (2) a consideration of how well our actions are meeting requirements. AMWG members should be fully engaged in preparing for meetings, and facilitator should prompt each member to contribute to discussions, rather than allow a small percentage of the group to dominate the discussion. Agendas should be set with an expectation of discussion of these issues, with sufficient time allocated to accomplish this. Need to look at what has worked in the past, program successes (such as results on sediment conservation efforts).

14 – Relationship between Federal agencies and FACA committee unclear in terms of recommendations vs. decisions

Solution – Recommendation and response process needs to be more explicit to encourage trust among AMWG members. Timing of when Secretary responds to AMWG recommendations may be part of this issue – at that point, DOI agencies will be on the same page.

15 – Question whether AMP has adequate processes for dealing with dissent when consensus is not reached. How does the AMP deal with conflicting scientific opinions?

Solution – AMWG should make the resolving decision on what to recommend to the Secretary when there are conflicts between science, policy, and politics. Peer reviewed, published scientific literature should be used in the representation of scientific opinion.

AMWG – GCMRC relationships

1 – GCMRC size is controversial (small, contract management staff vs. staff to accomplish substantial in-house research. Can best science be accomplished through either approach? How will this be resolved?

Solution – Science Advisors should address which approach produces the best science. Cost efficiency may be on factor to consider.

2 – Need to agree on split between core monitoring and research costs.

Solution – Current development of core monitoring program should help define what is required on the monitoring side.

3 – Question on what “best science” means.

4 – Missing feedback loop on scientific results, including monitoring results, SCORE report. Technical presentations should include more technical detail

Solution – GCMRC is producing reports to the AMWG/TWG, but greater detail would help. Consistency of reporting among all stakeholders important, in addition to greater communication of what GCMRC is doing. Recurring updates on science contracts would build trust among stakeholders. Synoptic form of scientific updates via email (perhaps referring to websites) would give instant updates.

5 – GCMRC role in public information dissemination questioned. What protocols exist? What is the role of GCMRC in the political arena?

Solution – No protocols currently exist. Need clarification.

6 – AMWG direction to GCMRC should be more specific

Solution – AMWG assignments to GCMRC should be realistic and workload should be evaluated and communicated among groups at the time the assignment discussion occurs. Priority list and discussion would help manage workload. Recognized that GCMRC supports the Designee and the AMWG. AMWG needs to meet more frequently to provide guidance.

7 – How should GCMRC best provide science advice to the AMP?

Solution – AMWG should directly ask GCMRC scientific questions about the result of program actions/experiments. AMP lacks (to some degree) an implementation link to incorporate knowledge. The AMP trusts GCMRC to provide good science data. The group did not feel it was getting the data it needs to evaluate impacts on resources. Need to ask the right questions in order to get information to make management decisions. AMWG has the responsibility to ask the right questions.

Science Advisors

1- In the past, the Science Advisors have not communicated well enough with AMWG.

Solution – The various groups in the program have not interacted nor communicated well enough. The recent operating protocols of the Science Advisors should help resolve this issue. Implementation of these tasks needs to be accomplished. Reports to the AMWG and TWG by

the Science Advisor Executive Secretary should be made on specific progress on work items and expected future work timeframes. A better reporting mechanism should be considered.

2 – The recommendations from PEP panels and Science Advisors are not being fully implemented, nor is there a sufficient process for following through with recommendations.

Solution – The AMP needs better follow-through with recommendations. AMWG needs to give specific guidance in response to recommendations, particularly with respect to work plans and budget. Budget constraints and tradeoffs restrict full implementation due to a lack of desire to cut back existing science efforts. There is some dysfunction in how scientific direction is provided to GCMRC. At every AMWG meeting, there should be a report on actions taken by the TWG, GCMRC, and PA groups on the priority questions and what is being accomplished. Once an AMWG decision is made, continued kibitzing by other groups undermines an AMWG recommendation. AMWG guidance should come at the front end of discussions, not at the budget recommendation stage. GCMRC should provide guidance on cost and effort required to address core questions, which should be asked by the managers.

3 – Resource integration is much more complex and difficult to address than single-resource considerations.

Solution – The sediment resource has been addressed much more successfully than the biological sciences, largely a result of a lack of clear scientific results. We need to be clear on our expectations of experimentation, and what role the results will play in our management recommendations. There is a significant question about how much information is required to make management recommendations. The next step may be new ground for the AMWG. There is some concern that the AMWG does not have enough data for this discussion, nor do they know how much data they need. AMWG members must read GCMRC reports, which are generally available and the program should take advantage of existing tools (e.g. conceptual model) to improve understanding.

4 – The AMWG may not have an adequate process for dealing with tradeoff evaluation, especially in cases where our prior management recommendations are not producing expected outcomes. Timing of resource response and status of resources may also play to this issue. A difficult challenge is the status of both sediment and HBC resources. There are no easy answers or cookbook solutions to determining when a policy has failed. Also difficult is the gap between knowledge and action. The role of science is also uncertain. Monitoring has shown results of our assumed “fixes” but a lack of experimentation on alternative operations and management actions has left us without a clear understanding of risk and effects of potential alternatives.

Solution – Science Advisors should provide guidance on level of information needed, resource status, and risk as applied to decision making.

5 – There is a lack of understanding of the role of the Science Advisors.

Solution – We should review the SA operating protocols.

6 – Science Advisors may not be providing sufficient support to the AMP.

Solution – The Science Advisor budget should be reviewed and explored for additional funding to allow greater involvement in the AMP. The SA workplan should include sufficient flexibility to address unanticipated issues not originally part of the 24-month workplan.

Budget

1 – The current budget process places key resource questions at the end of the process instead at the start.

Solution – A priority-setting meeting should occur that involves the AMWG, TWG, GCMRC and Science Advisors to suggest key questions, which then would result in proposed scientific work to address. Feedback on what the questions will cost to answer, in time and money, is given to AMWG, which uses this information to determine AMP priorities.

2 – Alternative funding sources and tribal funding responsibilities have not been sufficiently explored, and further discussion needs to occur to understand current protocols. The AMP should also consider the impacts of long-term drought impacts, including the loss of hydropower generation.

3 – The AMP should discuss ESA/PA compliance funding responsibilities.

Next Steps

The following items of consensus are from the final plenary session.

Consensus on next steps on role and function discussion:

The retreat attendees agree that representatives of all components of the AMP will get together to develop workplan/budget guidance.

The next AMWG meeting is scheduled for August 9 and 10, 2004. The attendees agreed to add an additional day, August 11, in order to accommodate a workshop on developing priorities. To be invited to the meeting and workshop: AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, PA, and SAs. The priorities will be approved by AMWG during their meeting. Pam Hyde, Clayton Palmer, Bruce Taubert, Jeff Cross, and Sam Spiller will help develop the detailed plans for the workshop.

Consensus on how to address remaining questions/issues that were identified at the beginning of the retreat:

- The Secretary’s Designee will cull through the retreat results, identify easily implementable actions, make some assignments, and make recommendations to the AMWG for follow-through on these.
- Other items will be addressed in AMWG meetings in a time set aside at each meeting specifically for those issues.
- AMWG to prioritize those issues.

Meeting Evaluation

The facilitators asked the meeting attendees to write down one thing they liked about the meeting and one thing they would like to have changed for the next time. About 30 attendees responded. The results are as follows:

+	Δ
+ I liked the small group sessions and the ability to really bounce concerns and potential solutions off each other. It really honed my thinking about how to solve the problems we have, and to find common thinking with other stakeholders.	Δ The first session was not very productive. The clustering process kept the group from getting at issues/solutions.
+ Generally well-facilitated. Tough group to facilitate so keeping participants on track was appreciated.	Δ Next time, we need to complete the whole process of determining the issues to address BEFORE the retreat. If members don’t choose to engage in that process before the retreat, they should be alerted that they will be precluded from trying to do it at the retreat.
+ Breakout groups were useful.	Δ Issue ID exercise wasted a lot of time.
+ Break-out groups.	Δ Drop the post-it notes and dots – let the group work on priorities and agenda topics.
+ I thought that the break-out sessions were very helpful and productive. I believe that we made a lot of progress in regaining a “balance” in developing guidance for this program.	Δ Took too long getting started on 6/28, too diffuse.
+ Groups were good forum to air the problems.	Δ Next time, I’d let the free-form vetting process begin sooner, and avoid the ponderous process-oriented activities of the first morning (stickies, dots, etc.)
+ Ability to freely express issues.	Δ Over facilitated, <u>way</u> too much focus on

+	Δ
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + I liked the informal way that AMWG, TWG, SAs, GCMRC members could interact in a mutually interactive format. + Forum for discussion in a relaxed setting. + Opportunity for AMWG/TWG to discuss problems and issues. + The meeting did finally open up the festering issues to discussion and reminded people of original charges. + Opportunity to discuss internal issues, questions, and challenges. We need to continue this process on a more regular basis to improve AMWG performance and efficiency. + It was good for people to express their feelings about shortcomings of the AMP process, the AMWG, and their support groups. + Liked the opportunity to dialogue about the processes. What's broken and what works. + We acknowledged the problems / difficulties and challenges the AMP and its respective committees are facing. + Liked the exchange of diverse perspectives. Helps to get a broad understanding of the various issues. + I think it was useful to have the group talk about where we are heading from a process standpoint and what we can do to improve. + I liked the civility and honesty of the discussions. + Folks were civil to one another, generally cordial and that was not only important but appreciated. + Attendance was good. Two groups worked well. Using computer with overhead better than butcher paper. + Meeting location/facilities were fine. + Great venue – organizers did a great job. + Good to have the cross groups' interaction. + All four groups in AMP invited and good turnout from all. + Participation. + Liked facilitators – they did a great job. 	<p>identifying issues at the start (wasted half of the retreat)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Start with the discussion of problems and issues, no need to decide on questions – get right to issues. Δ Needed to get right to the objectives. The first several hours were not useful. The discussion of problems and solutions was what was desired. Δ Too much time spent on developing the questions – should have started with the initial list and worked from there. Δ Thought we spent too much time on process issues and skirted the real issues “identifying the elephant” in the room. Δ We spent too much time the first day trying to understand what we were going to accomplish. Δ Do more brainstorming in advance, could have allowed more time to come up with steps for improvement. Δ Issues and desired outcomes should have been identified <u>before</u> the meeting and prioritized. We wasted four hours on the first day getting to the point where we started to discuss the issues that were previously identified through the letter and solicited input. <u>A lot</u> more could have been accomplished if we had skipped the identification / grouping / dot exercise. Δ It was not necessary to go through the vetting process – it was already clear to all of us (most of us) that we needed to focus on roles of the various parts of the AMP. Why did we spend ½ day plus getting there? Δ The facilitated meeting arrangement took a long time to get to the meat of the discussion – more BOR involvement earlier may help in planning. Δ Be adaptive and use simple approaches to identifying problems. Δ Did not make good progress in getting to substantive issues. Result was that few issues were discussed or solutions proposed. Δ Need better time discipline.

+	Δ
+ We did “roll up our sleeves” and get some work done.	Δ Needed more time to pull results together.
+ Bennett Raley session.	Δ Needed more time to synthesize and distill information.
	Δ Too many issues to tackle – reduce the scope (prioritize).
	Δ Room lighting poor re: reading material on walls.
	Δ Next time, limit this to AMWG. Everyone else has vested interests in continuation of this process. Ultimately, there was little forward motion.
	Δ Need a way to focus better on solutions.
	Δ Cold.
	Δ The retreat was over-organized and over-structured, in certain respects, including forming a committee to put it together, meeting in a location so far from the airport, spending 30+ minutes with first items – “why we are here” and “also with the “lawyer advice” to only talk about process.
	Δ Minutes excerpt from prior AMWG meeting where retreat was authorized should have been provided, letters from “stakeholders” discussing problems should have been provided and some of the “direct-on” conflicts like recovery goals lawsuit were avoided.
	Δ Leadership in meeting can be stronger. I liked the process better when the facilitator presented guidance on how to proceed with the discussion.