

**Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group
February 9-10, 2022 Meeting
Meeting Evaluation Summary**

Participants in the February 9-10 Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group meeting were invited to provide feedback on the meeting via an online survey; 10 respondents participated -- 8 members/alternates and 2 staff attendees. Feedback on what participants liked about the meeting (+) and what could be improved (Δ), along with ideas for future presentations, was sorted and lightly edited for conciseness and is provided in the table below.

What participants liked about the meeting (+)
<p>OVERALL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Found the meeting as a whole very valuable and interesting. + Most valuable: information gained in hearing the widely different opinions expressed about the AMP processes. + The directness of AMWG members sharing their perspectives is appreciated. + No recommendation, it is sometimes very hard but seems to work out well.
<p>FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Chair/facilitator allowing all to comment while adhering to agenda timetable. + The chair's leadership was very evenhanded and reserved, but also effective. + While the meeting ran over, it provided for a good level of discussion. + The moderation was helpful. + Opportunity to hear about and discuss important issues related to the program. Appreciated the flexibility of the Chair to utilize the lunch break to help us delve into important identified issues, and offer of a Breakout opportunity to help finalize motions. + Appreciated that the agenda was adapted to fit the needs of the group to make more time to discuss the motions. + The format and the content was good. Appreciated having regular breaks, realizing that the Day #2 lunch was short for good reason. + Support the practice of having a separate time for public input at the end of the meeting.
<p>PRESENTATION CONTENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Hydrology summary, TWG update and Tribal perspective were valuable.

- + The presentations were all great, and the meeting went as smoothly as possible given the difficult topics on the table.
- + Presentations were very good, including the project background and summaries included in each one.
- + The presentations were clear, concise, and relevant.

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

FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION

Preparation of Motions

- Δ Proposed motions should be required to be submitted at least two weeks prior to the meeting so that Members with large constituencies can consult with them.
- Δ Require proposed motions regarding TWG be finalized by TWG prior to AMWG meeting
- Δ Consider additional opportunities prior to AMWG meeting for members with differing viewpoints on proposed motions to discuss perspectives in a formal setting open to all members.

In-Meeting Discussion of Motions

- Δ Would like to see AMWG members pressed to present clear and rationally developed statements to support their positions on controversial motions. For example, a statement on the motion like "didn't follow LTEMP" (or something similar) is vague and unsubstantiated without more qualification. It is each representative's right to make a decision that benefits their constituencies' interests, but this could be done with some courage and forthright argumentation.
- Δ Many of the dissenters of the motion resorted to nitpicking the language to bits when they had no intention to support it from the beginning. This was a waste of time, frustrating, and nearly rude at times.
- Δ Want to suggest a process of more formal debate or argumentation where positions are presented more systematically, much like in state ballot measures or courts, and then votes are taken after. The "writing" process seemed chaotic and personality driven.
- Δ Would be helpful to be able to see the affiliation of the speaking stakeholders (assuming webinars are continued). Can that be added to the chat description? or the "name tag" on the screen when people speak? Or going less tech, perhaps include a list of members that can be printed out before the meeting and then referenced individually.

Other Facilitation & Logistics Suggestions

- Δ Suggest that the agenda be constructed to include an extra (hour?) on the last day that is designed for use IF there is need for more time from one or more agenda items during the 2 day meeting. The understanding would be that if that time is not needed, then the second day ends early.

- △ Believe there needs to be allowance and encouragement of others in the program (TWG members, scientists) to feel comfortable speaking during the meeting. While I understand that this meeting is for the AMWG members, others input is valuable and certainly would contribute to better understanding and perspective that would benefit the AMWG members. Currently, it seems in practice that these folks are discouraged from participating.

CONTENT

- Would have appreciated going over what options/experiments were on and off the table for using the 350K af. Like - with no new sediment, a Fall HFE is off the table (correct?).

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

- More discussion about the **AMP experiment design and approval** process.
- Presentation discussing **concepts of environmental symmetry**. There are cases in Amazonia, New Zealand, and India where rivers, forests, and other landscapes have been given special legal statuses akin to personhood.
- A presentation of **low-water impacts at Lake Powell**. In comparison, the archeological and natural resources in the Grand Canyon are in pristine condition, while across an arbitrarily drawn line (the dam) the landscape and all of its amazing elements are destroyed. Presentations with photographic and data evidence would do a great deal have these issues attended to.

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

- **Temperature and DO** issues.
- **Bug flows**-- what are next steps?
- **Impacts to hydropower**, including actual impacts to the nation's energy supply and who is financially impacted.
- A dedicated discussion time regarding potential **management measures to prevent non-native fish passage below the dam** and the time frame in which they need to be implemented to be effective was missed during this meeting. I fear we are losing our opportunity to attempt preventative measures. Due to the time sensitivity, I view this as a higher priority than some of the items on this agenda. I would like to hear more about who is leading planning efforts and the timeline of any items in progress.

- Though it has traditionally been excluded, the management of the dam does impact **resources around Lake Powell**. There needs to be a forum to address issues there. The park is woefully underfunded, which is why they rely on recreation fees and therefore focus their management on recreation and not resource management. There are many very important cultural/tribal/natural resources there that are suffering and it needs attention from DOI, BOR, and NPS. This ought to be included in the scope of the AMWG.
- **How to make the program more adaptive** to reflect the increasingly dire conditions facing the river corridor with lower lake levels and the impacts that poses for the river and its inhabitants. What can be done to utilize the LTEMP ROD to help us rather than impede us from helping improve the system and react more quickly to pressing needs.

Additional questions:

Would you be interested in a Stakeholder River Trip?

- Yes (50%, 5 responses); Maybe (30%, 3 responses); No (20%, 2 responses)

On which dates could you participate?

- June 22-July 1 (5 yes)
- July 13-July 22 (5 yes)

What are dates could you attend a January 2023 ARM/TWG Meeting?

- January 17-19 (4 yes)
- January 24-26 (7 yes)
- January 31- February 2 (6 yes)

*Note: It would be helpful in future questions regarding ARM scheduling to note which dates optimize the amount of data completion we are enabling for presentation. The question as presented may miss some of the nuances in selecting a date that could benefit from additional discussion.