

**Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group
May 19, 2021 Meeting
Meeting Evaluation Summary**

Participants in the May 19 Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group meeting were invited to provide feedback on the meeting via an online survey; 7 respondents -- 6 members/alternates and 1 staff attendee – participated. Feedback on what participants liked about the meeting (+) and what could be improved (Δ), along with ideas for future presentations, was sorted and is provided in the table below.

What participants liked about the meeting (+)
<p>OVERALL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Updates, voting, changes, process of reapplying, all scientific information were all valuable. + A well-prepared, efficient meeting; appreciate the good preparation. + Good job with challenges of virtual meetings. + Thank you for the professional and respectful environment to all parties involved in achieving our mutual goals. + Thank you for an interesting and well-run meeting. <p>FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Extremely well organized and conducted. + Platform worked; ability to ask questions good; good presentation ppts. <p>PRESENTATION CONTENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Good list of agenda items and opportunities to review budgets and the budget process. + Good presentations of pertinent information + The information and levels of detail were appropriate.

What participants would like to change about the meeting (Δ)

FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION

- Δ This consolidated agenda and time is understood, as we can't meet in person. But it sure cripples the ability to have off-line conversations and conduct business and establish and advance relationships. So look forward to being back together!
- Δ Connectivity is a problem no matter how hard we try to make it work.
- Δ Maybe consider sending out the presentations a bit ahead to encourage more discussion/questions at the meeting?
- Δ Some increase in detail and discussion will presumably be possible at the longer August meeting.
- Δ Maybe consider breaking the meeting into two segments to allow a bit more time for Q&A for each topic. Hard to judge what topic(s) will generate questions, however!
- Δ Always time management is our struggle.

CONTENT

- Δ Some of the Tribal related items discussed during the recent TWG meeting should have been reviewed during AMWG so that the Agency and other Reps could hear about them and be part of a discussion.

What special topics or presenters would you like us to consider including for 2021 AMWG meetings?

- Δ **Tribal related items** discussed during the recent TWG meeting
- Δ Spend some time really talking about **drought conditions** and how the real world of **climate** will impact the resources and the program.
- Δ Presentation by WAPA on **the Basin Fund** and how hydrology and market prices are creating a perfect storm. If desired, bring in a direct customer perspective such as Kevin Garlick, or NTUA, or other CREDA members.
- Δ The **humpback chub** and the response to the early intervention trigger; **any findings related to the spring disturbance flow**.

Are there any pressing topics or issues you feel the AMWG ought to address more frequently/in more depth during 2021?

- △ The whole **Power Revenue versus** requirements to address and take actions on AMWG issues related to **impacts of Glen Canyon Dam on the natural and cultural environment** will need to continue to be ironed out.
- △ **Climate and drought**
- △ **Priorities** -- I think the last process during the TWP was helpful, as it helped bring in stakeholder perspectives about program projects/elements.
- △ I also think that **scenario planning with drought assumptions** (such as 7.48MAF) are good discussions to continue -- diving into different resource impacts.
- △ **AMWG 101** will be good - but I understand that staff only has so much bandwidth for immediate issues such as interim guidelines, drought, etc. Maybe the Ad Hoc that was originally supposed to be working on the Admin History could be asked to regroup, as opposed to putting the burden on BOR? That would be up to BOR.
- △ Either a three-year or five-year **check up on long term projects** in depth to fit with budget/plan renewals.
- △ If we have significantly **warmer release temperatures**, more information on how GCMRC is **monitoring for effects** would be useful.