

Memo

To: Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG)
From: Mary Orton
Date: May 19, 2008
Re: Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (AMP) Strategic Plan Timeline and Process

INTRODUCTION

In preparation for the discussion on strategic planning at the May 22-23, 2008 AMWG meeting, this memorandum provides a timeline of the AMP Strategic Plan development from May 1999 through January 2003, taken from AMWG minutes and other documents.

WHY WAS THE PLANNING PROCESS SUCCESSFUL?

Important elements of this successful strategic planning process were as follows:

- The two Ad Hoc Groups (AHGs), the Technical Work Group (TWG), and AMWG worked diligently for three and a half years to complete the Strategic Plan.
- The AHGs were part of AMWG, and they worked closely with the TWG throughout the process.
- There was broad and diverse representation of AMP stakeholders on the AHGs, which perhaps allowed the AMWG to adopt their recommendations more readily. However, the AMWG as a whole was also engaged in the process and often amended recommended language from the AHGs.
- The AHGs operated by consensus.
- Two aspects of the process assisted the AHGs in achieving consensus. First, they worked primarily face to face, until the very latest stages of the process. Second, they proceeded from the broad and vague (vision/mission and goals) to the more specific (Management Objectives and Information Needs), which allowed them to develop their own operating protocols and ways to find consensus before tackling the most difficult issues.
- The AHGs frequently asked for feedback and approval from AMWG. At each step, approval by AMWG was provisional, with the explicit understanding that as they considered and accepted elements that were more specific, those elements could engender changes in the elements they had previously considered.

- There was ultimately broad consensus by AMWG on the Strategic Plan.
 - There was no dissenting vote on the January 2002 recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior to accept the Strategic Plan (vision, mission, principles, goals, management objectives, qualitative targets, and narrative sections).
 - The only ‘no’ vote on the final approval in January 2003 was based on a reluctance to designate any Information Needs (INs) as outside the program, not a concern about the Strategic Plan itself.

YET TO BE DONE

At its January 2003 meeting, the AMWG approved a Strategic Plan that included the following elements:

- principles,
- combined vision/mission statement,
- goals,
- Management Objectives (MOs) with qualitative targets,
- INs in sequence order, and
- an indication for each IN whether it was appropriate to be addressed by the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC), and if so, whether it was appropriate for power revenues to be used.

A final Strategic Plan document that reflected all that was approved at the January 2003 meeting was never put together.

In addition, placeholders for quantitative targets for each of the MOs were never filled in. The recent work of the Desired Future Conditions Ad Hoc Group of the TWG represents the first efforts toward completion of this task. AMWG will consider at its upcoming meeting a recommendation from TWG that it complete the job of developing quantitative targets for each MO.

ONE FINAL NOTE ON PROCESS

The AMWG learned how to reach consensus on difficult issues during this strategic planning process. In addition, there are dozens of adaptive management programs that can provide us with ideas and, potentially, models for continuing and completing the AMP Strategic Plan.

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program Strategic Plan Development Timeline

MAY 1999

AMWG members developed a draft vision/mission statement during a retreat on the river.

JULY 1999

The AMWG **approved** the draft vision/mission statement unanimously with no changes. AMWG also created the Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Group (SPAHG) and charged it with developing goals that were consistent with the vision/mission statement.

JANUARY 2000

The SPAHG (with representatives from American Rivers, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Grand Canyon River Guides, Grand Canyon Trust, Hualapai Tribe, State of New Mexico, and Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems) presented draft principles, goals and a glossary to AMWG.

AMWG **approved** these elements with amendments, and charged the SPAHG with developing Management Objectives (MOs).

JULY 2000

The SPAHG (which had added to its membership representatives from Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, and State of California) presented MOs and some revisions to principles and goals.

AMWG members gave comments and suggestions for changes, and asked the SPAHG to revise the document for the next meeting.

JANUARY 2001

The SPAHG (which had added a member representing the Hopi Tribe) reported it had met more than a dozen times since the July 2000 meeting and presented several items for approval. They reported that the TWG had reviewed the items in detail over the past two days and had unanimously recommended the qualitative targets and other aspects of the MOs.

AMWG **approved** the following parts of the Strategic Plan:

- An amendment to Principle 6.
- Changes to 12 goals.
- Qualitative targets for Goals 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

The AMWG also asked the Ad Hoc Group to revise the qualitative targets for Goal 6 based on feedback given during the AMWG meeting.

MARCH 2001

The TWG met in retreat on the river to work on two aspects of the Strategic Plan:

- A narrative that expanded upon and clarified the vision and goals.
- A narrative of background material including philosophy, history, and process.

APRIL 2001

The Ad Hoc Group reported to AMWG that the TWG had unanimously recommended AMWG's approval of the MOs, but that recommendation came too late for consideration at this AMWG meeting. AMWG **approved** the following parts of the Strategic Plan:

- Goal 6, and Goal 2 with changes.
- Qualitative targets for Goals 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, some with amendments.
- The Riparian Issue Paper.

The AMWG also deleted “notes” from the Strategic Plan.

JANUARY 2002

AMWG unanimously (with 1 abstention) **recommended to the Secretary of the Interior** to accept the Strategic Plan (vision, mission, principles, goals, management objectives, qualitative targets, and narrative sections) with amendments approved at this meeting.

AMWG also took the following action:

- suggested the Ad Hoc Group consider a new MO; and
- charged the Ad Hoc Group with further development of the Strategic Plan, including development and prioritization of Management Actions and Information Needs (INs) and identification of which MOs are in and which are out of the AMP

APRIL 2002

The AMWG directed the TWG to develop a recommendation to AMWG of the sequence order of the INs, and gave them the specific process (paired comparisons) they were to use to do so. The INs in sequence order were to be used by GCMRC to develop its Strategic Plan and annual work plan.

AMWG also formed the Ad Hoc Committee on What is In and Out of the AMP (AHCIO) to make a recommendation to AMWG regarding criteria to use to decide whether power revenue funding is appropriate for an MO or IN, for review and refinement by TWG before consideration by AMWG. The AHCIO was chaired by Randy Seaholm of the State of Colorado, and included the TWG Chair as well as representatives from the Arizona Game and Fish Department, Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, Navajo Nation, Southwest Rivers, State of Nevada, State of New Mexico, State of Wyoming, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems, and Western Area Power Administration.

JANUARY 2003

The AHCIO recommended, and the AMWG **approved**, the following:

1. Criteria to use to determine whether an IN is appropriate for inclusion in the AMP Strategic Plan.
2. A charge to the AHCIO to recommend to the AMWG (with review by TWG) the placement of each IN into one of three categories:
 - A. INs that are appropriate for funding by power revenues and for accomplishment by GCMRC.
 - B. INs that GCMRC may address but are not appropriate for funding by power revenues.
 - C. INs that are funded and accomplished under the authority of an entity other than the GCMRC.

3. That if there are INs that AMWG decides are not appropriate for funding from power revenues, the proper role of the AMWG is:
 - A. To recommend to the Secretary of the Interior that those INs should be addressed by an agency or agencies under her purview, when that is the case, and
 - B. To assist any agency or agencies that should address the INs to obtain appropriated dollars to fund that work.
4. To delete certain Research INs (RINs) and substitute a narrative.

AUGUST 2003

By a vote of 18 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstention, the AMWG **approved** the updated Strategic Plan (principles, combined vision/mission statement, goals, MOs, INs in sequence order, and an indication for each IN whether it was appropriate to be addressed by the GCMRC or not, and if so, whether it was appropriate for power revenues to be used to address that IN):

Accept the recommendation and report of the AHCIO as a working document, change wording from “exploration of new techniques may not result in an RFP” to “exploration of new techniques and methods might not result in an RFP,” under Goal 12, and assign Category C to RIN 2.6.1.