

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group August 2023 Meeting Meeting Evaluation Summary

Participants in the August Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group meeting were invited to provide feedback on the meeting via a paper copy or online survey. 22 respondents participated: 13 in person and 9 online; and 16 AMWG members or alternates, 5 staff members of AMWG organizations, and one TWG member. 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. **Bolded** text is intended to highlight key takeaways and themes for easier reading.

What was the most important agenda item/discussion topic at the August meeting? Why?

- *Mentioned in 11 comments:* **HFE sediment accounting window protocol** amendment proposal/motion & subsequent discussion of the SEIS NEPA process with nonnative fish actions
 - Adaptive management in action
- *Mentioned in 9 comments:* **Smallmouth bass update/control options**
 - Warm Water Non-native fish in the Grand Canyon - their status and steps forward to address them before they become established. I think this is the single greatest threat to the Grand Canyon ecosystem.
 - Integration of SMB, HFE, and -12L Slough issues
 - Proposed slough modification - for every step we take, we must consider various perspectives, including Tribal views. The slough mod discussion was an example of a full partner discussion which was fruitful and healthy.
 - Update on the bypass performance during the 2023 HFE
 - DO/temp presentation
 - The chilling of the river necessary
 - Discussion on slough modification and fish exclusion curtain. These items have been delayed for years and if effective, will allow the program to focus on other issues
- *Mentioned in 4 comments:* **2024 Budget and Work Plan**
 - It was another healthy and full discussion. I look forward to the implementation process when funds come in.
- Basin Fund – critical for upcoming SEIS
- Tribal updates

Do you feel you have the information needed to weigh in on topics where a motion is being made? (At this meeting, budget/workplan and revisions to the HFE protocol) If not, how can we help AMWG members better prepare?

- **Yes x 9**
 - Great job providing information before the meeting; would have been nice to have a little more in advance of meeting.
 - Information was provided (I just need to read it).
 - Yes, but I personally participate in the TWG.
 - Yes, I enjoy reading the reports, amendments, etc. Budget discussions are informative.
 - Yes, a lot better conversation model.
- Improvements:
 - It would be good if **motions were sent out in advance with some sort of context** – just a few sentences on why the motion is being offered; what impacts the motion may have, etc. so the agencies can discuss in advance.
 - It would be nice to have the **AMWG materials email** that Reclamation provided **a little earlier** (1-2 weeks in advance).
 - Earlier distribution would help.
 - Having some additional time to review documents/proposed is needed.
 - Engaging with the “motion” topics. It is helpful to introduce and **discuss the topics early in the day** to allow for percolation before decisions are made.
 - I will get to that point but I was not knowledgeable enough at this particular meeting. I will be reading relevant materials to catch myself up to speed.

What participants liked about the meeting (+)

GENERAL

- + The **cordiality and respect** shown by the leadership and members. Also, the high quality and succinctness of the presentations provided.
- + Opportunity to meet with colleagues.
- + Behind the scenes **networking** is invaluable.

FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION

- + Great facilitation, topics, **BIG improvement in audio** as a Webex participant.
- + Audio - two thumbs up!
- + I appreciate the audio system and the co-facilitation by Terra Alpaugh and Secretary Designee Wayne Pullen. Good facilitation encourages a smooth and in-depth conversation.
- + Facilitation was excellent
- + **Discussion was great** and all the voices were heard.
- + Having in person facilitation and **ability to adapt the schedule** so that we could continue valuable discussion.
- + Ability to be flexible on agenda to afford important conversation.
- + Meeting format and topics are **well organized**, it helps to make sense of complex issues we are dealing with.
- + Facilitation and the current agenda/structure provides good guard rails to keep us all on track.
- + In-person meetings so much better than on-line but do appreciate the opportunity to do both at same time.

- + Good discussion and **chance to ask questions** (x3).
- + Enjoyed all the interactions much more constructive, as compared to February. Felt we were back working together to find solutions.
- + Good, comfortable meeting space helps the meetings be more productive. Little America in Flagstaff is good,

CONTENT

- + **Presentation topics & execution** (x 6)
- + GCMZC presentation are especially informative.
- + The integration of science into policy like in the HFE discussion

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

OVERALL

- Δ Remembering to **keep some focus on the big picture of the AMP**, and if (and to what extent) we are where we need to be within the 20-year LTEMP process.

FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION

- Δ **Too much is crammed into each meeting.** More space needs to be made for discussion and/or the facilitator needs to manage time better.
- Δ Putting a little more time in the agenda for items that are likely to prompt questions & discussion, or some additional buffer.
- Δ **Allocate more time for sensitive/urgent topics** like bass, budget, flows, etc.
- Δ Small group discussion on difficult or controversial topics would be nice.
- Δ For the Fed Family meeting, I would like to have a small (60-90 mins) Tribes and BOR Liaison meeting to strategize on issues, positions, projects, etc.
- Δ Process and facilitation wise, perhaps a better understanding to the group on processes and when non-representing AMWG or TWG member may participate or ask questions.
- Δ Also please bring **more extension cords** and outlet splitters for all the folks using computers.
- Δ It was hard to see the big screen in front, mainly because of the lighting on the screen (from the overhead lights).
- Δ It would be good to **encourage/require presenters to attend in-person**, More in-person presenters- makes for more engaging presentations. (x4)

CONTENT

- Δ I am unsure why WAPA presentation was included given that they have given a similar presentation numerous times and WAPA no longer funds the program. I don't feel the benefit from a budget presentation by WAPA. (x3)
- Δ Do we need to provide the **same updates** every day of the meetings?
- Δ NEPA processes will be critical. Would be nice to see an evaluation of resources important to the AMP.
- Δ We had good discussions about actions that might disadvantage smallmouth bass, but conversations were **stopped before timelines and expectations of lead agencies could be identified. More action is needed to follow discussions.**
- Δ Many **presentations were given without introductory context** nor did they have a good "why this matters to you all as AMWG members" discussion. Or a discussion on the **management implications of the data presented**. Therefore, there wasn't any

robust discussion or movements on the data presented at the meeting. I don't know if the AMWG members fully understood the context of what was presented or why it would matter to them and how it could impact management decision and/or how it informs management decisions. I think that type of summary should be required of every presentation.

- △ Some are experts, some are not familiar with topics. Being geared toward both groups is important. Perhaps ask speaker to give a "**for idiots**" slide or two to simplify.
- △ There needs to be some robust discussion of data presented. Data should inform management. Also there should be an **abstract of every presentation** sent out in advance of the meeting so agency representatives can discuss and prepare for the actual presentation and be ready with questions and discussions of management implications and concerns.
- △ If there is a "report of findings" to be discussed, please give an agency representative more than 2 days **advance notice**.

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

- **An AMP review** - where we are in relation to LTEMP goals, and the level of satisfaction among stakeholders of programmatic progress. This might involve a panel discussion around the AMP goals, metrics, questions answered and remaining, etc. Such discussion might help with budget development and would be an important mid-way review of program progress and prioritization of what needs to be accomplished in the remaining decade of the program.
- We should go back to having all stakeholders routinely provide an overview of their connection to the canyon and their program mission and interests
- We should start, once again, with **stakeholder presentations**. Next meeting should be NPS given that the GCPA and this program is specific to resources within Glen and Grand Canyons
- 1) **Alcohol** on the river and dangers, 2) **Geocache-ing** on the river, 3) **Health of Bighorn Sheep**
- **SMB + HFE SEIS update, SMB monitoring/removal update, SMB long-term solutions update**
- An update on the fish exclusion, SMB flow options and HFE amendment. Hopefully more specifics and alternatives will be available for review and discussion. Perhaps if they are willing, to provide **more info on tribal perspectives and trips**.
- Updates on the Nonnative Fish invasion, the LTEMP SEIS, and how the Nonnative Fish Strategic Plan is being incorporated to inform these solutions.
- Discussion on if there are ways we can improve - or better target - monitoring of warm water invasive fish presence and impacts of management actions. Also are there things we can start thinking about now that we would want to implement in say 5 years - like long term should we be looking at limited fish passage tools to protect tributaries from invasive warm water non native fish. I would suggest **more conversations on potential future conditions and future solutions** as it takes some time for a FACA group to get to consensus and recommend actions - also it takes a long time for regulatory processes and paperwork to be completed so we should be acting now on the regulatory side so we can respond in the future.
- More on fish, less on sediment.

- More smallmouth bass- would like some kind of **synthesis/summary of who is doing what, what is being done, overall results**. With multiple agencies, the picture can feel a bit fractured.
- More info on the plans to get compliance in place and actions funded to reduce smallmouth bass.
- The answer to this question will depend on what is going on in the basin. I suspect a fish update from Charles Y. will probably be timely.
- How are we tracking the effectiveness of the invasive fish interventions- rotenone, electrofishing, etc?

If we schedule one or more voluntary AMWG 101 webinars, would you attend? What topics would you like to cover?

- Yes x 14
- Maybe x 1
- No x 2
- Suggested topics:
 - Workplan development (x5)
 - Financing and budget (x6)
 - Basin Fund
 - Law of the River (x4)
 - History of the program
 - Abbreviated cultural competency (sensitivity) section
 - Water/compact and utility planning
 - Knowing the river and background on work conducted at the dam and on the river
 - GCDAMP information management (USGS, NPS, other info sources)

Additional Feedback

- Thanks much to Terra for coordinating this effort, and to Mr. Pullan for such excellent leadership.
- Terra was an amazing facilitator. Thanks for getting the sound figured out on day 2.
- Great meeting! Flagstaff and Little America are both great.
- This is one of the most effective management groups I have been invited to, and I am impressed the SME's ability to address these issues.
- Thought it was a well-run, productive meeting. In-person meetings are always preferred.