

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group
Agenda Item Information
May 1, 2007

Agenda Item

Roles Ad Hoc Group and Recommendations Update: AMP Effectiveness Workshop

Action Requested

- Information item only; we will answer questions but no action is requested.
- √ Feedback requested from AMWG members. Seeking two volunteers from the AMWG to serve on the proposed Workshop Advisory Group which is being established to help design and oversee the workshop. Other participants will include representatives of DOI, TWG, SA and GCMRC
- Motion requested.** The following motion is provided as a courtesy to AMWG members. However, no motion is presumed to be made unless and until an AMWG member makes the motion in accordance with the AMWG Operating Procedures.
MOTION:

Presenter(s): John Hamill, Chief, GCMRC

Previous Action Taken

- By AMWG: Recommended approval of \$46K in GCMRC FY 07 budget to organize and conduct a workshop to discuss and resolve issues related to the effectiveness of the AMP
- By TWG: The following motion was passed on April 19, 2007:
The TWG agrees with the recommendation by the Science Advisors on improving AMP effectiveness presented on April 19, 2007, and proposes that the AMWG seriously consider appropriate actions to be taken on those recommendations.
Voting results: Yes = 15 No = 1 Abstain = 0
- By an Ad Hoc Group:
- Other:

Relevant Science

- √ There has been no relevant research or monitoring on this subject.
- The following describes the relevant research or monitoring on this subject:

Background Information

- √ See attached.

Draft

Statement of Work

GCDAMP Effectiveness Workshop

NEED FOR PROJECT

The thematic basis of the project is that disputes surrounding natural resource and ecosystem management reflect the interdependence and complexity of human social systems and natural ecosystems. Policy decisions about natural resources and ecosystems are made within the context of diverse and often competing values and interests. Scientific information and technological solutions alone are no longer sufficient for managing complex natural systems. Advances in technological methods for analyzing and designing natural resource management systems have occurred independently of advances in methods for resolving conflicts and analyzing the performance of the institutions through which we manage natural resources. Disagreement over problem definition and conflict over solutions never go away. These factors are compounded by uncertainty in the science and the decision-making. Programs like the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (AMP) must find ways to enroll disagreement, conflict, and uncertainty as virtues that enable a creative tension that results in innovative solutions. This process (a “workable disharmony”) requires continual learning and ongoing conversation; all stakeholders, including the scientists, must participate in it.

The Department of the Interior’s (DOI) Adaptive Management Technical Guide (2007) concludes that for adaptive management to work effectively stakeholders must be willing to work collaboratively in a group environment to plan specific courses of action:

“Consensus on goals and objectives at the beginning of an adaptive management project sets the stage for an iterative, adaptive management cycle (Rogers and Biggs, 1999). However, consensus must continue through the life of the project. Consensus is sustained by ongoing collaboration, through which potential conflicts arising from the inevitable surprises in experiential learning can be resolved (Lee, 1999; Holling, 1999).

Consensus is promoted by collaborative frameworks that foster mutual learning, relationship building, and the creation of a shared understanding as the basis for agreement and ultimately changed behavior. Collaborative structures are in essence negotiated agreements among stakeholders, which are embraced and sustained because they accept the outcome of a process they perceive to be participatory and fair (Knopp and Caldbeck, 1990; Lauber and Knuth, 1997)”.

The Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG) was created in 1997 pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act to establish a formal mechanism for Federal and State Agencies, Tribes, and other stakeholder groups to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior. In accordance with its operating procedures, the AMWG develops and approves recommendations by a two-thirds majority of the members voting. This requires some level of

cooperation, but while consensus is initially attempted, consensus building is often frustrated by the fact that the AMWG can simply develop a recommendation to the Secretary with a vote. As such, the question exists as to what extent collaboration should be pursued to build consensus if a position of the stakeholders can be determined quickly with a vote. Resolution of this question needs to take into account that collaborative processes are frequently expensive and time consuming, especially in resolving issues where conflict is extensive.

The U.S Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (2006) recently completed an evaluation of the conditions for a successful collaborative recovery planning process for the threatened desert tortoise. The Roles Ad Hoc Group (2007) reviewed this report and concluded that many of the general conditions identified in that review for a successful collaborative process have been met for the AMP. These conditions include:

- **Does leadership support a collaborative approach?** Department of the Interior (DOI) leadership supports the concept of collaboration as the preferred mean to resolve natural resource problems.
- **Is the AMP a high priority?** Glen Canyon Dam operations and conservation of resources in the Grand Canyon is a high priority for DOI and AMP stakeholders.
- **Are there adequate funding and staff resources?** The AMP is one of the best funded and staffed efforts of its kind.
- **Is there a shared base of information?** A rich and broad database has been developed for the Colorado River ecosystem (CRE); the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC) was established specifically to provide science support to the AMP.
- **Are solutions negotiable?** While there are certain legal and operational constraints associated with the operation of GCD, many of the important issues are negotiable within established constraints.
- **Are the parties interdependent?** The history of the issues related to GCD operations and the willingness of parties to continue to participate in the AMP clearly suggests that there is a realization that one party cannot get one's own interests met without accommodating the interests of others. This interdependence is likely to continue into the future.
- **Will there be continuing relationships?** All the parties involved in the AMP have a long-term interest in the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and the conservation of resources in the Grand Canyon.

While many of the ingredients for a successful collaborative process exist for the GCD AMP, the Roles Ad Hoc Group identified several missing elements or issues that need to be addressed to increase the overall effectiveness of the AMP (see below).

PROJECT SCOPE AND GOALS

The AMP Effectiveness Workshop will focus on the following recommendations from the Roles Ad Hoc Group Report (2007) that are intended to improve the overall effectiveness of the AMP:

- **Establish a common mission/goal for the AMP.** By definition a collaborative process involves participants working together to achieve a common goal or solve a shared problem. While the vision, mission, and goals were finalized and endorsed by the AMWG, it's unclear whether program participants are willing to work collaboratively and compromise to achieve the mission and goals of the AMP. **As a requirement for continued participation, all participants should formally commit (through a resolution/agreement) to work collaboratively to carry out the mission and intent of the AMP.**
- **Create incentives for participants to work collaboratively to achieve common goals and desired future resources conditions.** Incentives are needed for all the involved stakeholders to genuinely want to work to make the collaborative process successful. Without incentives that meet each stakeholder's self interest, there will not likely be enough motivation and commitment to work through difficult issues and challenges.
- **Define desired future resources conditions.** The draft AMP strategic plan recognized the importance of specifying desired conditions or targets for resources in the CRE. However, to date quantifiable targets have not been established for AMP goals including the AMWG's priority resources (humpback chub, sediment, and cultural resources). These targets are needed to guide and focus science and management activities.
- **Update or develop a charter and operating procedures for all the elements of the AMP (AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and Secretary's Designee) to reflect a more collaborative approach.** All parties need to clearly understand the mission and responsibilities of the group they serve on and the protocols or processes for how business will be conducted.
- **Utilize facilitation and mediation expertise more broadly throughout the AMP.** Sophisticated process design, facilitation, and mediation expertise is needed for a collaborative process to effectively address complex controversial issues involving the many diverse interests represented to the AMP and that have a long history of conflict. Currently, the AMWG utilizes a professional facilitator for all of its meetings; a professional facilitator should be similarly utilized for all TWG meetings.
- **Establish a full time Executive Coordinator/Manager for the Program.** A program as technically, politically, and structurally complex as the AMP needs a lot of care and feeding to be successful. A full time Executive Coordinator/ Manager is needed to lead the Program, facilitate timely resolution of differences among parties, and ensure that those operating protocols are fairly and consistently enforced at all levels of the Program.
- **Determine if there is adequate time for collaboration to be successful.** Successful collaboration, especially to resolve controversial issues, takes time. There is an urgency to address the decline of certain resources such as humpback chub and sediment, and

there are firm deadlines associated with the completion of the EIS for the long term experimental plan. The DOI needs to assess whether effective collaboration is possible within these time constraints.

- **Determine if a balanced range of interests are willing to participate.** For a collaborative process to be perceived as legitimate, it must involve a balanced range of participants with diverse perspectives. All the major interest groups, State and Federal agencies, and Native American tribes are engaged in the AMP, however, some participate more actively than others. The effect that cultural and gender differences have on the ability of stakeholders to participate in the process in an equitable fashion needs to be investigated. In addition, some stakeholders feel disenfranchised because some interests have more representation on the group; this is especially significant when consensus is not achieved and issues get resolved by a vote.

The primary goals of the AMP Effectiveness Workshop are to get a commitment of all AMP parties to:

1. Work collaboratively to embrace and support a common mission and processes for the AMP.
2. Develop and complete critical elements of an action plan to address the above issues and recommendations over the next 5 years.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S)

GCMRC will administer the project for the AMP. An AMP Project Advisory Group will be established to help design and oversee the workshop. A facilitator will be hired through contract or cooperative agreement to plan and facilitate the workshop and provide a report of workshop results and recommendations.

GENERAL METHODS

A 3-step process is recommended for implementation of this project:

1. Project scoping:
 - Establish a project advisory group to help design the project and evaluate results. The project advisory group would be made up of representatives of the TWG, AMWG, Science Advisors (SAs), and the Secretary's Designee. Proposed members of the Advisory Committee include:
 - Secretary Designee: Mark Limbaugh/Rick Gold
 - AMWG: Two members
 - Technical Work Group: Kurt Dongoske and Dennis Kubly
 - GCMRC: John Hamill
 - Science Advisors: Dave Garrett

- Develop a survey questionnaire concerning the attitudes and belief of AMP participants concerning the issues and recommendations identified above. The questionnaire would be administered by mail to all members of the AMP including Secretary's designee, AMWG, TWG, and GCMRC Program Managers. Phone interviews would be conducted for individuals who did not respond to the mail survey. Results of the survey would be analyzed and presented to the Project Advisory Group for evaluation.
2. Results of the AMP survey and other information (Science Advisors AMP review, roles report, etc.) would be used as the basis for developing an agenda for a 2-day workshop for AMP participants. The workshop would focus on:
 - Providing refresher training on concepts and practical application of adaptive management and collaborative resource management. Training will be provided by experts in collaboration, partnerships, Native American involvement and/or conflict resolution
 - Developing an action plan for addressing priority issues, needs, or opportunities related to the effectiveness of the AMP

The workshop will be held in a centralized location to minimize travel costs. All AMP participants (including the Secretary's Designee) will be encouraged to attend.

3. Workshop findings and recommendations developed through the workshop will be reviewed by the AMWG and recommendations forwarded to the Secretary for consideration and implementation.

PRODUCTS/REPORTS

1. Summary of workshop findings and recommendations
2. An action plan for implementing workshop findings and recommendations

Recommendations and approaches developed through the workshop will be reviewed by the AMWG who will make recommendations for implementing and testing over the 2008–11 program period.

DESIRED OUTCOMES

1. Commitment of all AMP parties to work collaboratively to achieve a common mission and processes.
2. Increased understanding of the issues and concerns with the operation and effectiveness of the AMP.
3. Increased understanding of the practical application of adaptive and collaborative management in the AMP.

4. Improved relationships among the AMP stakeholders that will result in more effective incorporation of scientific information into management decisions.
5. Specific practical recommendations addressing key issues related to the effectiveness and use of science information.
6. A specific action plan for implementing the recommendations.

MILESTONES (COMPLETION DATES)

1. Establish a Project Advisory Group: May 1
2. Hire Facilitator: June 15
3. Design and administer AMP effectiveness questionnaire: July 15
4. Plan and conduct AMP Effectiveness Workshop: September 1
5. Complete workshop summary/action plan: November 1
6. AMWG review/recommendations: December 15