

**GLEN CANYON DAM ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP
ACTION ITEM TRACKING REPORT**

Note: Items marked “Closed” will be removed from the next iteration of the report.
Note: This version of the report initiates a new numbering system for action items.

ITEM NO. / DATE	ACTION ITEM	ASSIGNED TO / DUE DATE	STATUS
Item 2004.Aug.01	<p>Secretary’s Designee establishes the Roles Ad Hoc Group and charges it with to defining roles, responsibilities, and functions of the AMWG, Technical Work Group (TWG), Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC), and Science Advisors (SAs).</p> <p><u>January 2006</u>: Roles Ad Hoc Group forwards its report to the Secretary’s Designee.</p> <p><u>December 2006</u>: Secretary’s Designee requested the AHG review and revise the report.</p> <p><u>April 2007</u>: Roles Ad Hoc Group forwards its report to the Secretary’s Designee, who requested that the Ad Hoc Group review and revise the report.</p> <p><u>September 2008</u>: The Secretary’s Designee indicated that the new Administration would address management actions, the Roles Report and Desired Future Conditions.</p> <p><u>December 2008</u>: Roles Ad Hoc Group forwards its revised report to the Secretary’s Designee.</p> <p><u>February 2010</u>: AMWG passed the following motion: “AMWG establishes a Charter Ad Hoc Group to make a recommendation to the AMWG in no more than a year regarding changes to the Charter. The CAHG will use the Roles Report as a reference.” (emphasis added)</p>	No due date.	Open
Item 2006.Dec.01	<p>Motion passed: Because the lack of a recovery program for the HBC is impeding the progress of the GCDAMP, AMWG recommends that the Secretary of the Interior charge the Fish and Wildlife Service to lead the development of a Lower Colorado River fish recovery implementation program (LCRRIP) to include the humpback chub below Marble and Grand Canyons by the end of 2008. (Recommendation accepted.)</p> <p><u>August 2009</u>: Sam Spiller will provide an update on the process of exploring development of a Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) to the AMWG at their next meeting.</p>	Sam Spiller	Open

ITEM NO. / DATE	ACTION ITEM	ASSIGNED TO / DUE DATE	STATUS
Item 2006.Dec.02	<p>Secretary's Designee Limbaugh directed the Roles AHG to address Dr. Garrett's recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop improved methods and/or procedures for managers to establish and articulate priorities for specific 3-5 year time intervals. 2. Develop improved methods for managers and scientists to permit effective tradeoff assessments. 3. Develop more effective scientist/managers collaborative working procedures. 4. Implement methods to monitor and improve the adaptive management process. 5. Implement methods to define future conditions for the CRE resources of concern. <p><u>February 2010:</u> Re: #3: The Secretary's Designee established the Desired Future Conditions Ad Hoc Group to review the DOI draft DFCs and make a recommendation to the full AMWG. Re: #5: The Secretary's Designee established the Charter Ad Hoc Group to review the charter and operating procedures and make a recommendation to the full AMWG.</p>	Roles Ad Hoc Group	Open
Item 2008.May.01	<p>Motion passed: That the AMWG form a "Lees Ferry Trout Fishery Ad Hoc Group" to make a recommendation to the AMWG by its next meeting on the following two Environmental Assessment (EA) mitigation commitment items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How the AMWG, consistent with the EA, might facilitate discussion among trout fishing guides and anglers, Marble Canyon business owners, recreational rafting companies, and other interested parties regarding proposed experimental actions affecting these resources, to include a projected schedule for meetings, cost-effective location, and whether Federal and State agencies should serve as support to the work of this ad hoc group, and 2. Whether and how AMWG should be involved in updating the Lees Ferry Trout Management Plan, including whether the AMP should sponsor workshops that could be used to help develop the specific aspects of the management plan, and including an assessment of work, projected schedule, and cost-effective locations. <p><u>February 2009:</u> AZGFD led a meeting with the Marble Canyon Business Community that included fishing interests, USFWS, NPS, and GCMRC.</p>	Sam Spiller No due date established	Open

ITEM NO. / DATE	ACTION ITEM	ASSIGNED TO / DUE DATE	STATUS
Item 2008.May.02	<p>AMWG recommends to the Secretary of the Interior to direct the DOI agencies, in collaboration with the tribes, to commit to establish, beginning in FY09, a tribal liaison position and its functions that will represent tribal concerns and interests in the GCDAMP.</p> <p><u>July 2008</u>: The Secretary accepted the recommendation. The Secretary indicated the DOI Regional Directors would interact with the tribes and report to the AMWG, and asked the AMWG to make further recommendations on proposed duties, interaction with AMWG, where the position should be housed, and funding sources.</p> <p><u>September 2008</u>: Martha Hahn reported a group was formed to help facilitate integrating their work with the proposed tribal liaison position. They're going to develop an outline on how the liaison position will work which will include possible funding sources.</p> <p><u>August 2009</u>: Secretary's Designee Anne Castle reported that DOI representatives met with members of various tribes and discussed a specific job description. This position would act as liaison between the tribes and the Secretary of the Interior to allow the tribes to have more effective representation within the AMWG. It would be housed in the Secretary's Office, while the person might be located either in the Phoenix or Flagstaff area or in Washington, DC. Funding still needs to be arranged and they need to discuss what would be needed to effect the goals expressed by the tribes.</p>	<p>Regional Directors and AMWG.</p> <p>No deadline established.</p>	Open
Item 2008.May.03	<p>The Secretary's Designee reported the Regional Directors (RDs) would work on updating the GCDAMP strategic plan and make a report at an upcoming AMWG meeting.</p> <p><u>September 2008</u>: Larry Walkoviak said the RDs asked their staffs to start discussions on updating the Strategic Plan and developing desired future conditions. He said he would work with the Secretary's Designee to develop a more complete discussion on the DFCs AHG Report for an agenda item at the next AMWG meeting.</p> <p><u>February 2010</u>: AMWG establishes the DFCs Ad Hoc Group. See Item 2010.Feb.02 below.</p>	<p>Regional Directors</p> <p>No due date.</p>	Open

ITEM NO. / DATE	ACTION ITEM	ASSIGNED TO / DUE DATE	STATUS
Item 2009.Apr.02	<p>Motion passed: In recognition of GCDAMP goals toward management of the Colorado River through an ecosystem approach, AMWG directs the TWG to establish the Species of Concern Ad Hoc Committee (SMCAHC) and requests the participation of GCMRC in that ad hoc committee, to produce a draft report to be presented to AMWG on or before by May 1, 2011, that contains the following with regard to species of management concern in the CRE: A review of information about an assessment of the status of habitat needs and availability, and ecosystem roles of the species.</p> <p><u>June 2010</u>: The TWG Ad Hoc Group was formed.</p>	TWG; May 1, 2011	Open
Item 2009.Aug.02	<p>Motion passed: The AMWG has received and accepts TWG's evaluation of the HBC Comprehensive Plan and amends it to include annual monitoring of the abundance of HBC associated with the nine HBC mainstem aggregations listed in Valdez and Ryel (1995). AMWG forwards the Plan to the Implementation Plan Ad Hoc Group, with a request to review and make a recommendation to the full AMWG on the following items: 1) Determine which actions identified in the Humpback Chub Comprehensive Plan can be accomplished under the AMP, and 2) Explore the various options for completing actions that do not fall under the authorities of the AMP.</p> <p><u>February 2010</u>: The Secretary's Designee agreed to recruit additional leadership and membership for the HBC Comprehensive Plan Implementation Ad Hoc Group.</p> <p><u>July 12, 2010</u>: In an email message to the AMWG, the Secretary's Designee requested volunteers to serve and co-chair this Ad Hoc Group.</p>	<p>Co-chairs of AMWG HBC Implementation Ad Hoc Group are Bill Werner and Nikolai Lash.</p> <p>No due date.</p>	Open
Item 2010.Feb.01	<p>Motion passed: AMWG establishes a Charter Ad Hoc Group to make a recommendation to the AMWG in no more than a year regarding changes to the Charter. The CAHG will use the Roles Report as a reference.</p> <p><u>March 22, 2010</u>: In a memo to the co-chairs of this Ad Hoc Group, Secretary's Designee Anne Castle requested "that the CAHG also review and make recommendations on potential modifications to the Operating Procedures to improve the effectiveness of the AMWG." She also requested that the CAHG specifically consider and make recommendations on the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Composition of membership of the AMWG. 	Charter Ad Hoc Group, Ann Gold and Jennifer Gimbel, co-chairs.	Open

ITEM NO. / DATE	ACTION ITEM	ASSIGNED TO / DUE DATE	STATUS
	<p>2. Inclusion of Department of the Interior bureaus as voting members on the AMWG.</p> <p>3. Establishment of the position of executive director for the AMWG, and the source of associated funding.</p> <p>4. Procedure for approval of TWG members and alternates, and subgroup and ad hoc group members.</p> <p>5. Voting procedures of the AMWG (consensus, majority vote, super-majority, minority reports, etc.)</p> <p><u>July 2010:</u> The Charter AHG co-chairs announced an effort to gather data from AMP participants to inform the AHG.</p> <p><u>August 2010:</u> The Charter AHG will provide results from their informational survey to the AMWG.</p>	First AMWG meeting in 2011.	
Item 2010.Feb.02	<p>Motion passed: To establish a Desired Future Conditions Ad Hoc Group to consider and make recommendations to AMWG on the draft Phase I DFC statements developed by the DOI agencies and dated January 22, 2010, and describe linkages among resources, prior to the Phase II development of quantitative DFCs.</p> <p><u>August 2010:</u> AMWG members will submit any comments or questions they have on the Desired Future Conditions Ad Hoc Group Report to Linda Whetton by Sept. 24, 2010. The Desired Future Conditions Ad Hoc Group will address comments received from the AMWG prior to or at the next AMWG meeting in 2011.</p>	George Caan and Larry Stevens, co-chairs; 9/24/10 Feb. 2011	Open
Item 2010.Feb.03	Action item: Provide a list of reports in Grand Canyon Trust's minority report that have been filed and copies thereof.	Secretary's Designee; no deadline.	Open
Item 2010.Feb.06	Action item: The POAHG will have a work session to determine future direction. Develop a list of pending projects, and determine which should be completed and which they need direction on. Make a recommendation at the next AMWG meeting.	POAHG; next AMWG meeting	Open

ITEM NO. / DATE	ACTION ITEM	ASSIGNED TO / DUE DATE	STATUS
Item 2010.Feb.07	<p>Action item: Have a discussion on scientific controls with GCMRC, and the upper basin RIP; and develop a report from TWG to AMWG.</p> <p><u>July 13, 2010</u>: On this date, Larry Stevens and Shane Capron discussed with Tom Czapla and Tom Chart from the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program the relevance of an ecological comparison of the little regulated Canyonlands Reach (the lower Colorado and Green River in Canyonlands National Park in Utah) to the highly regulated Colorado River ecosystem (CRE) in Grand Canyon and lowermost Glen Canyon. The abundance of geomorphic similarities between the pre-dam CRE and the contemporary Canyonlands Reach suggest that comparative analyses may help improve river management downstream from Glen Canyon Dam by providing insight into the ecological status and restoration potential of the CRE. Such a comparison could provide stakeholders with: a) a reality check for grounding CRE management goals, objectives, and expectations; b) greatly expanded experimental opportunities for distinguishing dam from non-dam impacts, at both small and large temporal and spatial scales; and c) clarification of river management modeling assumptions. The call participants expressed interest in assessment of the feasibility and utility of pursuing a comparative river ecosystem analysis of the two reaches. All agreed that proceeding with development of a project must be done in a well-planned fashion so as not to interrupt funding of existing monitoring and research, and all expressed willingness to participate in further discussions, with GCMRC and other parties, before bringing the matter before the TWG. The next step is to begin conversations with GCMRC.</p>	Shane Capron and Larry Stevens; no deadline established	Open