

Whetton, Linda A

From: Whetton, Linda A
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2011 11:36 AM
To: Aaron, Patricia (Patti); 'Benemelis, Perri'; 'Castle, Anne'; 'Charley Bullets'; 'Downer, Alan'; 'Gimbel, Jennifer'; Gold, Anamarie; 'Heuslein, Amy'; 'Jackson-Kelly, Loretta'; 'James, Leslie'; 'Jansen, Sam'; 'Jordan, John'; 'Kucate, Arden'; 'Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh J.'; 'Kyriss, LaVerne'; 'Lash, Nikolai'; 'Lopez, Estevan'; 'Martin, Steve P.'; 'Orton, Mary'; 'Rampton, Ted'; 'Senn, Michael J.'; 'Shields, John W.'; 'Spiller, Sam'; 'Stevens, Larry'; 'Strong, Dennis J.'; 'Walkoviak, Larry P.'; 'Zimmerman, Gerald R.'; 'Balsom, Janet R.'; 'Barrett, Clifford'; 'Bills, Debra'; 'Cantley, Garry'; 'Christensen, Kerry'; 'Cox, Jerry'; 'Davis, William'; 'Dongoske, Kurt'; 'Hahn, Martha'; 'Harris, Christopher'; 'Joe, Tony'; 'Johnson, Rick'; 'King, Robert'; 'Kowalski, Ted'; 'Ostler, Don'; 'Palmer, S. Clayton'; 'Peterson, McClain'; Ryan, Thomas P; 'Skrzynski, LeAnn'; 'Sponholtz, Pam'; 'Stewart, Bill'; 'Yazzie, Curtis'; 'Yeatts, Michael'
Cc: 'Archuleta, Deanna'; 'Battle, Gladys'; 'Caramanian, Lori'; 'Cherry, Cathryn'; Crawford, Marianne; 'Gourley, James L. (Lonnie)'; 'Halliday, John Dennis'; 'Hamilton, Lynn'; Heffernan, Beverley; 'Johnson, Lynn'; Kelleher, Jayne A; 'Landers, Mary Jo'; Lawler, Deborah L; Lucero, Jeffrey M; 'Lyder, Jane'; 'Nimkin, David'; 'Noojibail, Gopaul'; 'Patterson, Daniel R.'; 'Pellegrino, Colby'; Roberts, Melynda; 'Shulters, Michael V'; 'Sogge, Mark'; 'Stewart, Cheryl'; 'Sucec, Rosemary'; 'Trujillo, Laura'; 'Wegner, David'; 'Wilson, Palma'; 'Capron, Shane'; 'Harms, Paul'; 'Henderson, Norm'; Knowles, Glen W; 'Kubly, Dennis'; 'LaGory, Kirk'; 'McCraw, Patricia'; 'Bennion, David'; 'Makinster, Andy'; 'Seaholm, Randy'; 'Thiriot, James'; 'Bennett, Glenn'; 'Daugherty, Mary'; 'Fairley, Helen'; 'Garrett, David'; 'Grams, Paul'; 'Hamill, John'; 'Kitchell, Kate'; 'Mankiller, Serena'; 'Melis, Ted'; 'Pistorius, Shelley'
Subject: Mark Your Calendars -> Next AMWG Meetings
Attachments: MO_Motions.docx
Importance: High

This is to inform you the next two AMWG meetings will be held:

Date: Wednesday, May 18, 2011

Dates: Wednesday, August 24, 2011
Thursday, August 25, 2011

Meeting arrangements will be provided at a later date.

Attached to this message is a list of the motions discussed and passed at the last AMWG Meeting.

Just a reminder: John Hamill's last day in the office will be next Monday. BIG THANKS to him for all his hard work and dedication. We'll miss you.

Linda Whetton
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
125 South State Street, Room 6107
Salt Lake City UT 84138-1147
Tel: 801-524-3880
Fax: 801-524-3858
EM: lwhetton@usbr.gov

Whetton, Linda A

From: Whetton, Linda A
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 2:42 PM
To: 'Benemelis, Perri'; 'Castle, Anne'; 'Charley Bullets'; 'Downer, Alan'; 'Gimbel, Jennifer'; Gold, Anamarie; 'Halliday, John'; 'Heuslein, Amy'; 'Jackson-Kelly, Loretta'; 'James, Leslie'; 'Jansen, Sam'; 'Jordan, John'; 'Kearns, Leanette'; 'Kucate, Arden'; 'Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh J.'; 'Kyriss, LaVerne'; 'Lash, Nikolai'; 'Lopez, Estevan'; 'Martin, Steve P.'; 'Orton, Mary'; 'Rampton, Ted'; 'Senn, Michael J.'; 'Shields, John W.'; 'Spiller, Sam'; 'Stevens, Larry'; 'Strong, Dennis J.'; 'Walkoviak, Larry P.'; 'Zimmerman, Gerald R.'; 'Balsom, Janet R.'; 'Barrett, Clifford'; 'Bills, Debra'; 'Cantley, Garry'; 'Christensen, Kerry'; 'Cox, Jerry'; 'Davis, William'; 'Dongoske, Kurt'; 'Hahn, Martha'; 'Harris, Christopher'; 'Heffernan, Beverley'; 'Joe, Tony'; 'Johnson, Rick'; 'King, Robert'; 'Kowalski, Ted'; 'Ostler, Don'; 'Palmer, S. Clayton'; 'Peterson, McClain'; 'Ryan, Thomas P'; 'Skrzynski, LeAnn'; 'Sponholtz, Pam'; 'Stewart, Bill'; 'Yazzie, Curtis'; 'Yeatts, Michael'; Aaron, Patricia (Patti) M; 'Bair, Janet'; 'Battle, Gladys'; 'Caramanian, Lori'; 'Cherry, Cathryn'; Crawford, Marianne; 'Gourley, James L. (Lonnie)'; 'Hamilton, Lynn'; 'Johnson, Lynn'; Kelleher, Jayne A; 'Landers, Mary Jo'; Lawler, Deborah L; Lucero, Jeffrey M; 'Lyder, Jane'; 'Nimkin, David'; 'Noojibail, Gopaul'; 'Patterson, Daniel R.'; 'Pellegrino, Colby'; 'Roberts, Melynda'; 'Shulters, Michael V'; 'Sogge, Mark'; 'Stewart, Cheryl'; 'Sucec, Rosemary'; Tighi, Shana G; 'Trujillo, Laura'; 'Wegner, David'; 'Wilson, Palma'
Cc: 'Chelle Lopker'; 'Mark Paczkowski'; 'Bennion, David'; 'Harms, Paul'; 'Henderson, Norm'; Knowles, Glen W; 'Kubly, Dennis'; 'LaGory, Kirk'; 'McCraw, Patricia'; 'Capron, Shane'; 'Makinster, Andy'; 'Seaholm, Randy'; 'Thiriot, James'; 'Wicke, Marc'; 'Daugherty, Mary'; 'Davis, Phil'; 'Fairley, Helen'; 'Garrett, David'; 'Grams, Paul'; 'Mankiller, Serena'; 'Melis, Ted'; 'Pistorius, Shelley'; 'Vanderkooi, Scott'
Subject: AMWG Meeting -> May 18, 2011
Importance: High

This is a reminder the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work group Meeting will be held:

Date: (Wed) May 18, 2011
Time: 8:30A – 4:30P
Location: Fiesta Resort Conference Center
Fiesta I Conference Room
2100 S. Priest Drive
Tempe, Arizona 85282
<http://www.fiestainresort.com>

A block of rooms has been set up under the “Bureau of Reclamation” for the night of May 17th at the rate of \$126 + tax.
The room block will close on Friday, May 6, 2011.

PLEASE NOTE: Ms. Castle has requested a “working lunch” for the meeting date. More details will be provided as the meeting draws nearer.

The meeting documents have been posted to the following URL. If you would like a meeting packet, please let me know by responding to this message as soon as possible.

<http://www.usbr.gov/uc/rm/amp/amwg/mtgs/11may18/index.html>



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, D.C. 20240

MAY - 4 2011

MEMORANDUM

To: Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group

From: Anne Castle, Secretary's Designee, 
Assistant Secretary for Water and Science

Re: Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program Workplan and Budget – Technical Work Group and Adaptive Management Work Group Suggested Roles

I am writing to provide you with updated information on the development of this year's Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (GCDAMP) workplan and associated budget. Over the past months, we have had many conversations about how the Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG) can most efficiently utilize its time and further improve the effectiveness of the GCDAMP, consistent with the goals of the Grand Canyon Protection Act. I am acutely aware of the fact that the stakeholder groups represented on the AMWG provide top level leadership as their designated AMWG representatives, and I want to ensure that the collective knowledge, judgment, and experience of AMWG members is put to the most valuable use.

The AMWG has recognized for some time that the GCDAMP is transitioning its adaptive management process from a concentration on large-scale experimental science to more focus on management actions based on learning gained from existing and ongoing science. An important element of this transition is the refinement of the activities and priorities of the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC), as described in my memorandum to Kate Kitchell, Mark Sogge, and Ted Melis dated March 31, 2011 that was distributed to the AMWG.

In 2010, the AMWG established a two-year non-rolling process for review of the GCMRC/Reclamation workplan and budget, partly in order to reduce the amount of time spent by the AMWG stakeholders (as well as GCMRC) on detail-level budget issues. Similarly, the excellent assessment conducted by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (USIECR) in connection with the review of the AMWG Charter notes the view expressed by many AMWG members that the AMWG has been excessively focused on the GCDAMP budget. The review concludes that the AMWG would be better utilized if the discussions were directed more toward policy consultation and conducted at a more substantive, less detailed level.

More specifically, we have had multiple discussions at AMWG meetings on the shared desire and need to avoid “getting in the weeds” on budget issues. The USIECR report also recommends, based on input from AMWG members, that the Secretary should delineate more specifically the issues on which the AMWG’s advice is requested and focus the agenda on those science and policy priorities. This recommendation is fully consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee Act and its implementing regulations.¹ This memo sets forth a vision for effective utilization of the expertise of the AMWG and Technical Work Group (TWG) in connection with the AMP workplan and budget review, consistent with the factors and sentiments set forth above.

The AMWG has received the Streamlined GCMRC Biennial Workplanning Process, which was distributed with the March 31, 2011 memo on priorities. I’ve attached a copy of that document to this memo for your convenience and for your consideration. This proposed process and timeline reflects the priorities and transitions described above, and the implementation of the two-year non-rolling budget and planning process. It also provides target dates for workplan and budget review. As the second year of a two-year budget cycle, a full work plan would not be developed in FY2012 because second year changes would be expected to reflect only minor corrections, consistent with the process AMWG adopted on May 6, 2010 (“During the second year of the budget, a full work plan would not be developed, rather a memo from GCMRC and/or Reclamation, outlining changes to the workplan would be provided in addition to a modified budget spreadsheet.”).

I recognize that it was only a year ago that AMWG approved the biennial budget process, and this proposed GCMRC Workplanning Process timeline represents additional tweaking. I believe, however, that it is consistent with the process and planning document that the AMWG approved on May 6, 2010, which was explicitly intended “to reduce the effort currently expended on the budget process while maintaining a high-quality adaptive management program.” The streamlined process proposed by GCMRC is intended to make more effective use of AMWG, TWG, and Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) members’ time, and is also consistent with the discussions about GCDAMP policy and priorities described above.

¹ See e.g., 41 C.F.R. § 102-3.95(b): “Focus on mission. Advisory committee members and staff should be fully aware of the advisory committee's mission, limitations, if any, on its duties, and the agency's goals and objectives. In general, the more specific an advisory committee's tasks *and the more focused its activities are, the higher the likelihood will be that the advisory committee will fulfill its mission.*”

The revised draft FY2012 workplan and budget has been developed over the last two months by GCMRC and Reclamation based on input from the TWG and the DOI agencies. GCMRC and Reclamation have also developed a summary narrative describing the decision-making process for the FY2012 workplan and budget, the relationship of various budgeted activities to the priorities established, and the funding requirements of (and necessary tradeoffs for) certain additional activities that have not been budgeted but that may be of interest to the TWG and AMWG. The workplan summary is organized around the four DFCs: Colorado River Ecosystem, Cultural Resources, Recreation, and Hydropower. As explained in the memorandum, the budget also considers the 24 recommendations TWG provided following its March 2011 meeting as well as other priorities. These materials were shared with the DOI agencies in April and are being provided to the AMWG, BAHG, and TWG with the AMWG meeting materials. It should be emphasized that the workplan summary and budget overview provided to the AMWG do not reflect detailed review and subsequent feedback by the BAHG or the TWG as those processes will occur subsequent to the provision of the AMWG meeting documents. These materials are intended to allow the AMWG to focus on “big picture” issues at the May 18 meeting and provide any associated input to GCMRC, Reclamation, and TWG representatives to inform the next stages of review.

Following input from the BAHG and Science Advisors, the TWG will consider the revised FY2012 workplan and budget materials at its June meeting. That process will allow for any TWG recommendations to the AMWG on significant unresolved issues to be considered at the August AMWG meeting. I will be seeking your feedback on these proposed process changes at the May 18 AMWG meeting in order to help further refine our efforts, especially as we move toward planning for FY2013 and beyond.

This revised workplan process invests the BAHG and TWG with significant responsibility for working closely with GCMRC and Reclamation to resolve detailed or complex issues. The goal is to elevate to the AMWG only science and policy issues related to the workplan and budget and avoid detailed discussion of specific line items at the AMWG level. Consequently, I am asking the TWG members and TWG Chair to determine how best to ensure that in-depth financial questions and tradeoffs are addressed at the TWG level and not elevated to the AMWG. This will necessarily require the exercise of judgment by the TWG and TWG Chair to distinguish policy issues from budget detail. It will be necessary for TWG members to be fully prepared to discuss and resolve issues at the TWG meetings rather than waiting until the August AMWG meeting to make recommendations for program changes. The TWG Chair has the authority to guide the TWG in these discussions, and must also ensure that the BAHG and TWG review of the workplan and budget occurs in a timely manner.

As AMWG members we must all be cognizant of the need to credit the work performed by the skilled members of the TWG and BAHG, as well as GCMRC and Reclamation, and to focus our discussions on policy issues rather than budget detail. At the May 18 meeting, we will dedicate some time for discussion about the types of budget policy issues the AMWG would think appropriate to be raised by the TWG, so as to provide further guidance.

I greatly appreciate the thoughtful comments of many AMWG and TWG members on this subject and the efforts to more effectively utilize the time and expertise of the AMWG for the benefit of the entire Adaptive Management Program. I believe the proposed changes move us in a positive direction, and look forward to discussing them with you further at our upcoming meeting in Phoenix.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kate Kitchell, Mark Sogge, Ted Melis

CC: Suzette Kimball, Mike Shulters, Deanna Archuleta, Lori Caramanian

FROM: Anne Castle, Secretary's Designee, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science

DATE: March 31, 2011

RE: Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC) Science Planning

As we discussed in my office last December, GCMRC is in the midst of a transition. With the lamentable departure of John Hamill, GCMRC will soon have a new Chief. In addition GCMRC is nearing the final year of its five-year science plan and, therefore, is beginning to consider the next five years of Grand Canyon science, and begin its science planning process. This process will inform how GCMRC proposes to commit its resources over the next few years. There are a number of factors influencing this planning process, and we have discussed the priorities for the program that will be used to focus the work of GCMRC and facilitate planning.

First, we have learned a great deal from past GCMRC science. There is a large degree of consensus around the idea that we are at a transition point between an almost wholly experimental science program and one that includes more components of management support. This is something that has been talked about for many years. The work being done now on the two EAs (HFE Protocol and non-native fish control) highlights this transition, even though the HFEs and non-native fish control remain experimental in nature. And this is what adaptive management is all about. So the science plan for GCMRC needs to reflect this course adjustment.

Second, we have had and are likely to continue to experience very limited budgets. We cannot expect any additional funding for the operation of the Adaptive Management Program and its research and monitoring component. So we have to plan very wisely to deal with this limitation.

As a result, we need to focus on priorities. We'll do that by looking at the Desired Future Conditions (DFCs), still in draft but nearing a final recommendation to the Secretary, but we also have to narrow the field because the DFCs are very comprehensive. Our first and foremost priority is compliance with the Endangered Species Act, which means focus on the native fish and particularly the humpback chub. Second, we need to focus on sediment, which was an instigating factor for the Grand Canyon Protection Act and continues to be an issue with resources downstream of the dam. That includes being able to respond if the high flow protocol goes forward and it calls for a high flow experimental release. Third, and these are competing priorities, we need science on both non-native fish control and the recreational trout fishery. These are the primary areas where I have asked GCMRC to concentrate its resources.

These priorities are largely consistent with those adopted by the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG) in August 2004. Those priorities focused on the humpback

chub, sediment, and the “best” flow regime (no specification of what resources it would be best for). In addition, the 2004 priorities posed questions about cultural resources and the operation of a Temperature Control Device (TCD). While cultural resources remain a very high priority, it is not clear that there are significant science questions involving those resources, or the TCD, that require attention at this time. These conclusions may change over the course of the next five-year plan.

It may be helpful to also explain what is not intended by establishing these priorities. First, it does not mean that long-term monitoring of core ecosystem components will not be continued. Second, it does not mean that no other issues should be considered for scientific investigation – if there are issues outside of these priorities that have widespread support and further the purposes of the Adaptive Management Program, they can be considered as well. Finally, it does not mean that we have to have new science in each of these priority areas every year. The intent behind the establishment of priorities is to enable GCMRC to better direct its limited resources and resist the Christmas tree approach to science planning.

We anticipate a two-phase process: (1) developing the FY2012 work plan and (2) following up with a five-year science plan that would be developed next year and be informed by the planning that has occurred at that point through the Long Term Experimental and Management Plan process, with the ultimate goal of integrating analysis of a long term science plan with the LTEMP as part of that process.

In developing the FY2012 workplan, I requested that GCMRC conduct a streamlined planning process that focuses on these key priorities, but also provides for TWG and AMWG input. An outline of the streamlined process is attached. The revised FY2012 workplan and a process for subsequent long-term science planning will be presented to the AMWG at the August meeting this year. The AMWG will be involved in the science plan revision process.

I appreciate GCMRC’s invaluable contributions to the Adaptive Management Program and I appreciate your willingness to re-evaluate GCMRC’s role as we tackle the challenges of the next five years.

Table 1. Approximate timelines for a streamlined process for development of a biennial workplan (BWP) and budget, plus consideration of changes to the second year of the BWP. Dates shown are estimated targets.

Month	Year-1 (development of biennial workplan & budget)	Year-2 (consideration of year-2 of biennial workplan & budget)
November	USGS produces GCMRC annual project reports document	USGS produces GCMRC annual project reports document
January	Annual reports meeting (2 days) followed by 1-day TWG meeting to review budget and provide guidance to GCMRC and BOR. TWG reviews progress in addressing Information Needs and research accomplishments.	Annual reports meeting (2 days) followed by 1-day TWG meeting to review GCMRC budget and provide guidance to USGS and BOR on any potential changes to consider for year-2 of the budget. TWG reviews progress in addressing Information Needs and research accomplishments.
February	Based on a revised Strategic Science Plan and Monitoring and Research Plan, DOI establishes/updates general work plan priorities/hydrograph assumptions and communicates those to AMWG USGS and BOR will meet will meet with the DOI Family to solicit their input on DOI priorities and major issues to be reconciled. Any disagreements will be resolved by DOI in consultation with the DOI Family	USGS initiates internal review of BWP in relation to ASWS priorities and funding constraints. Identifies proposed revisions and analyzes scenarios/implications.
March	USGS and BOR will develop an initial BWP and budget spreadsheet based on DOI priorities and input from (a) scientists and the TWG during the January Annual Reports meeting and (b) the DOI family. Initial BWP presented to ASWS.	USGS provides initial draft BWP spreadsheet for ASWS consideration.
April	USGS and BOR meet with DOI Family to discuss BWP. TWG meets to consider and provide input on the initial BWP. Unresolved issues or conflicting priorities will be resolved by DOI in consultation with the DOI Family.	USGS meets with the DOI Family to solicit input on draft BWP. USGS provides revised draft BWP and briefing to ASWS.
May	USGS and BOR provide a draft BWP to the TWG Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) and Science Advisors for their review and comment.	USGS provides draft BWP to the BAHG and Science Advisors for review. TWG Budget Ad Hoc Group meets to consider and provide input on the draft BWP.
June	TWG meets to provide input on the draft USGS and BOR BWP and provide a recommendation to the AMWG.	USGS provides a final draft BWP to the TWG and Science Advisors for review. TWG meets to provide input on the final draft BWP.
July	USGS and BOR provide a final draft BWP to the AMWG for their review	USGS revises and provides final draft BWP to the AMWG for their review.
August	AMWG meets to provide input on the USGS and BOR draft BWPs and provide a recommendation to the SOI	AMWG meets to provide input on the final draft BWP and provide a recommendation to the SOI
September	Secretary of the Interior reviews the budget and work plan recommendation from AMWG.	Secretary of the Interior reviews the budget and work plan recommendation from AMWG.

Criteria for Review and Revisions of the Year-two Budget

In order for BWP development process to be successful in reducing the administrative burden on the USGS/GCMRC, BOR and the GCDAMP it must have clear criteria for making changes to the year-two budget. The burden of an appropriate rationale for proposing a change falls upon the proposer to make a persuasive argument. The following criteria will be used by USGS, Reclamation, and TWG in making recommendations to AMWG on changes to the year-two budget:

- **Scientific requirement or merit:** New information gained during the implementation of monitoring and research projects may result in a need to alter methods, scope, or timelines in the work plan or substantially alter or eliminate a project. This is a science-based need based on the experience of implementing an already approved project. This does not represent a shifting priority, but a scientific learning process which results in needed modifications to carry out the goals.
- **Administrative needs:** Administrative or programmatic changes may occur within the time-frame of an approved budget. Examples include the mitigation of an impact as a result of ESA consultation or tribal consultation, a change in the “overhead” charges of a federal or state agency, a significant reduction of the balance of the Colorado River Basin Fund or a failure to secure NPS permits for work in the Grand Canyon. As soon as an administrative event occurs that affects the budget, USGS (or relevant agency – such as DOI) will notify the TWG.
- **New initiatives:** New initiatives or modifications to projects that may or may not be based on a scientific merit must be vetted through DOI. DOI will consider whether to direct USGS/BOR to work on these new initiatives or whether to consider them during the next full budget cycle. Given that the budget will likely be fully accounted for, direction on where to locate the funds within the current budget will be requested from DOI.

Whetton, Linda A

From: Whetton, Linda A
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2011 12:30 PM
To: 'Benemelis, Perri'; 'Castle, Anne'; 'Charley Bullets'; 'Downer, Alan'; 'Gimbel, Jennifer'; Gold, Anamarie; 'Halliday, John'; 'Heuslein, Amy'; 'Jackson-Kelly, Loretta'; 'James, Leslie'; 'Jansen, Sam'; 'Jordan, John'; 'Kearns, Leanette'; 'Kucate, Arden'; 'Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh J.'; 'Kyriss, LaVerne'; 'Lash, Nikolai'; 'Lopez, Estevan'; 'Martin, Steve P.'; 'Orton, Mary'; 'Rampton, Ted'; 'Senn, Michael J.'; 'Shields, John W.'; 'Spiller, Sam'; 'Stevens, Larry'; 'Strong, Dennis J.'; 'Walkoviak, Larry P.'; 'Zimmerman, Gerald R.'; 'Balsom, Janet R.'; 'Barrett, Clifford'; 'Bills, Debra'; 'Cantley, Garry'; 'Christensen, Kerry'; 'Cox, Jerry'; 'Davis, William'; 'Dongoske, Kurt'; 'Hahn, Martha'; 'Harris, Christopher'; 'Heffernan, Beverley'; 'Joe, Tony'; 'Johnson, Rick'; 'King, Robert'; 'Kowalski, Ted'; 'Ostler, Don'; 'Palmer, S. Clayton'; 'Peterson, McClain'; 'Ryan, Thomas P'; 'Skrzynski, LeAnn'; 'Sponholtz, Pam'; 'Stewart, Bill'; 'Yazzie, Curtis'; 'Yeatts, Michael'
Cc: Aaron, Patricia (Patti) M; Beeman, Richard G; Caramanian, Lori; Battle, Gladys L; Rae, Kerry L; 'Daugherty, Mary'; 'Davis, Phil'; 'Fairley, Helen'; 'Garrett, David'; 'Grams, Paul'; 'Mankiller, Serena'; 'Melis, Ted'; 'Pistorius, Shelley'; 'Sogge, Mark'; 'Vanderkooi, Scott'
Subject: Request for Review: Report to Congress
Attachments: GC Draft Rpt to Congress.docx
Importance: High

AMWG Members & Alternates:

Attached is the Glen Canyon Dam Draft Report to Congress for 2010-11. Please review and provide any comments you have to Patti Aaron (paaron@usbr.gov) and Dick Beeman (rbeeman@usbr.gov) by close of business Tuesday, June 14, 2011.

Thank you.

Linda Whetton
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
125 South State Street, Room 6107
Salt Lake City UT 84138-1147
Tel: 801-524-3880
Fax: 801-524-3858
EM: lwhetton@usbr.gov