

**Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group
August 18-19, 2021 Meeting
Meeting Evaluation Summary**

Participants in the August 18-19 Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group meeting were invited to provide feedback on the meeting via an online survey; 9 respondents -- 3 members/alternates, 2 TWG representatives/alternates, 2 staff attendees, 1 tribal member, and 1 member of the public – 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"> + This has been very well run and allowed for good dialog despite the webinar issues. Presentations were good, technology worked amazingly well. Great agenda and well executed.
<p>FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + You have the whole virtual situation down. + AMWG's virtual meetings are really well-run compared to most of the virtual meetings I have been on. + Very well laid out and the time seemed appropriate for all the presentations except maybe the Law of the River by Rod. He definitely could have used more time though we caught up soon thereafter. + The breakout groups are super cool, thanks. + I think it was well balanced. We didn't run too long or too short on any topics
<p>PRESENTATION CONTENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Each presentation was clear, presented well, and shared good and up to date information. + It's organized; I appreciated the discussion sessions on impacts of drought; I thought the reports were succinct and direct and helpful; I like the depth of knowledge and the desire to continue to find ways to be more efficient with both time, funding, and projects + Helpful content: the interaction of Hydroelectric and Water storage issues. Specifically Western Area Power Admin presentation - as well as the other various

insights on the process of water release and drought for Glen Canyon Dam operations.

- + Always great to hear from the experts about the current situation, and what is projected for the future.

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

FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION

- Δ Increase participation from AMWG members in setting the agenda items and time lengths.
- Δ In the normal settings when we could meet in person, it was not uncommon to have non-AMWG members speak during the session. It is a regular part of the TWG's practice even with this webinar format. The continued message that only AMWG members should participate is a real disappointment; active TWG members have a valuable voice to contribute to the understanding of the AMWG members during these meetings. I was also very disheartened when I believe a member of the public who was invited to participate in the lunch meeting by the TWG chair was initially denied the opportunity to speak (and later allowed at the end of the lunch meeting time).

CONTENT

- Δ The razorback sucker presentation was excellent but far too fast. I missed some of the information due to the speed.
- Δ *Suggestions for content to be included in future meetings are listed below in the "Topic for Future Meetings" section.*

Feedback on the two new agenda formats used on Day 1 (a panel and a lunch listening session)

Were these formats effective ways to convey information and share input?

(1= ineffective format to share info; 5 = very informative and engaging way to share info)

- **Panel Discussion:** 2 = 14%; 3 = 14%, 4= 43%, 5 = 29%
- **Lunch Listening Session:** 1 = 14%, 2 = 14%, 4 = 29%, 5 = 43%

Do you have other feedback on these new presentation/discussion formats, including ways to improve them?

- **Panel Discussion**

△ I think the panel and lunch ideas were a great idea that should be continued, but I think they were less than their desired usefulness as delivered. There was not enough time in either to have engagement with the participants. The descriptions from presenters in the panel took the bulk of the panel time. In my case, questions that I submitted in advance of the meeting as requested were not addressed.

- **Listening Session:**

- △ The lunch session was shortened (whereas the Thursday lunch time was increased) so less time to interact. Again, a question I posed was dropped without discussion. More time needs to be added to both segments to increase their potential value.
- △ The listening session was poorly organized. What exactly did you want to listen to? The talking points seemed random and very redundant.
- △ Might need boxed lunches if done at an in-person meeting
- + I thought the listening session was good and allowed folks to talk among themselves and with us feds.

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

- Continue in future meetings the brief "**Review of Colorado River Operations Agreements**" - outstanding brief; great reference point for US Federal Government effort - my recommendation is to expand on it, showing relationships of the various Federal, Indian, and State entities for this effort. Also, adding any updates on any litigations that could affect your (the) AMWG objectives.
- **Drought impacts** must remain high on the list for AMWG. Temperature control, dissolved oxygen, warm water predators and impacts to the river corridor from these conditions must remain at the forefront.
- The **Lake Powell and Lake Mead Recreational changes** that the low water is making the NPS do in this drought.

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

- For the next while, I think we should continue to have a **drought impact** session.
- **Drought impacts**

- Robust **climate contingency planning** for program activities
- I think the AMWG should discuss as a topic a study that would explore general (and bounded) **ramifications to Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Grand Canyon National Park of filling Lake Mead at detriment of Lake Powell.**
- Time for the draft **Monitoring Metrics** that will hopefully be circulated before then.

Additional questions:

Would you be interested in a Law of the River 101 webinar:

- Yes (100%, 9 responses)