

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group

August 2024 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. 10 respondents participated, all AMWG members. 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?
• Status of/reporting on SMB experiment (x5) ◦ Discussion about how the SMB flow/temp data collected in the summer/fall and winter of 2024 will inform the decision-making for SMB flows in 2025 and later. And how that data will be compiled and presented to the AMWG and TWG. • Triennial Work Plan and associated recommendation (x5) ◦ All the discussion time on Day 1 • Operations Planning Updates • Preservation/conservation efforts on water – coordination between federal and other stakeholder partners • Tribal presentations on Tuesday • Funding to continue the work of the AMWG and Indian Tribes • Establishment of a subgroup/Ad Hoc Group for Tribes • Bill's AMWG review • Ed Keable's presentation on Grand Canyon and the work and issues at GCNP • LTEMP SEIS update • LTEMP 2.0 and what might be included or retired
What participants liked about the meeting (+)
GENERAL + All in all, very well done FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION + Fast and good presentations + Meeting/facility/organization -- all excellent + Wonderful to have this meeting on the South Rim + Great info with adequate time for each agenda item + Having the discussions tie to decisions (instead of just informational updates)

- + Letting tribes speak and groups actually discuss allowed for a positive environment compared to past.
- + I appreciate Terra's increased facilitation of issues.
- + Good time management despite going over; it was not as much compared to other meetings
- + I appreciate Wayne's steady leadership as exemplified by the handling of the issue raised by Zuni.
- + Members appeared to come to the meeting prepared; despite some minor amount of posturing, we moved quickly and painlessly through the agenda.
- + Attending virtually, the audio is getting better and better with each meeting. There were fewer times I struggled to hear the speakers this time.
- + The audio has improved immensely.

CONTENT

- + Quality of information
- + Content, cultural sensitivity/tribal presentations

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

CONTENT

- Δ Only topic that needed more time was the SMB experiment update
- Δ The FACA 101 was perhaps not as helpful as it could have been. I think more people were looking for specifics from SOL about the scope of our committee and the delegated authority to our specific committee, and less about the reporting mechanics.

GCDAMP GOVERNANCE & PROCESS

- Δ More tribal participation in ad hoc meetings as well as providing technical assistance to the tribes assist them in better understanding the mission of this work group
- Δ The budget process can be improved. The TWG is on it.

FORMAT, LOGISTICS, FACILITATION

- Δ As always, editing the motion language was awkward. Starting at the bottom with the Tribal issues, while important, was a little backward, seeing that there was still issues at the top to deal with. Possibly reading through from the top, emphasizing concepts or sentences one by one would be helpful in order to engage people to speak up. Once you get to the bottom, it's always hard for someone to speak up and say that they still have issues at the very beginning.
- Δ Non-AMWG participants should not have their input immediately incorporated into live-editing. Their input should be directed through their AMWG member. There was one extended event where a virtual non-AMWG participant was providing edits to a document at the expense of the group's time.
- Δ TWG members should not be allowed to speak when the agency's/stakeholder's AMWG representative is present. Comments by TWG members should be reserved for public comment.
- Δ Have all speakers use a microphone
- Δ Moving the tables closer to the screen. It was difficult to read.

- △ Handheld microphones were mixed. Perhaps they should have talked from the back of the room facing the screen. Or podium and mic?
- △ Make sure audio set up is correct.
- △ Tables a little cramped.
- △ Bathroom does not support the amount of visitors.
- △ Flagstaff is beautiful and not as hot as Phoenix but it is not easy to get to. Perhaps consider more meetings in Phoenix, possibly in spring and fall, with occasional meetings in Flagstaff.

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

GENERAL/PROGRAMMATIC

- Update on the Secretary's action on the TWP.
- Resource updates.
- Results from river trips.
- Post 2026 options that are being considered.
- One thing that would be helpful for the AMWG to discuss is the ultimate goal of the program. When will we have been successful? Is the goal to transition to a maintenance program? When do we close doors on research? What are the criteria for saying "no" to a new experiment or management action? Is the goal of the program to grow, or can it transition into a small-but-mighty machine? Is the goal to always have an AMWG, or is there thought about sunseting after certain milestones? How do the ultimate goal(s) of GCDAMP relate to funding realities? The current model is reactive to new threats, but can the program pivot to be proactive instead?

TRIBAL-RELATED

- Tribal workshop was good. Once a year or couple would be good.
- Understanding how we can incorporate the indigenous values into the recommendation process.
- More consideration on how to address/acknowledge tribal issues that the tribes present to the AMWG. Tribes want to be heard, want to be acknowledged regarding their concerns, so it would be extremely helpful to host a cultural sensitivity training on how to better strengthen these relations as well as bringing in more of the 11+ tribes. This should be a continuous effort, many of these tribes have difficulty attending because of funding resources.
- Is there a plan for when Tribes may be invited to share about their research projects? AR Meeting?

FISH-RELATED

- Health of the rainbow trout fishery
- Small mouth bass again... and again
- Thorough discussion on SMB flows, especially monitoring, reporting, and off-ramps
- Anticipating a workshop or other TWG/SBAHG discussions before February, suggest block of time on ability for AMWG to opine on SMB experiment for upcoming year.
- Impacts update from WAPA; update on slough from NPS
- Planning for 2025 SMB mitigation.

- Update on plans to reduce entrainment through the dam. Timeline for longer-term solutions
- Wouldn't have minded a little more info on the long term solutions , such as barriers at Lake Powell.

OPERATIONS-RELATED

- Update on the by-pass tube recoating.

Ideas, preferences, and/or advice with respect to how GCDAMP should conduct the 10 Year Review

- Allow input from all stakeholders.
- Everyone at the table. Need to consult with Tribes. Goals need to match Grand Canyon Protection Act. Bias or Upper/Lower Basin need to be left behind as resources like plants and fish do not follow this.
- It might help to start with layers: first an overview of what exists; then a review of the goals, objectives, and milestones in the last 10 years; and then a comparison of GCDAMP's activities as held against those goals/objectives/milestones.
- Start with reviewing the Strategic Science Questions and LTEMP Objectives/DFCs. A basic foundation, particularly for newer members. Include requirements of Bio Op. Suggest including a discussion of how AMWG relates to experiment recommendations vis a vis the P&I team. Prior to establishment of P&I Team, my view is that the AMP had much more involvement/influence, and in fact at one time actually voted on potential alternatives for predecessor LTEMP. Since P&I was established, there are segments of AMP representation who are marginalized in these discussions. GCPA purposely set out categories of representation, and all those categories should be involved in recommendations to DOI on experiments.
- At the July TWG meeting, over lunch, Andrew Schultz mentioned that GCMRC was thinking about having the John Wesley Powell Center (USGS) help with a review of the GCDAMP and GCMRC's work/where the program is headed in the future. I'd like to hear more about what the Powell Center's work might look like.
- I would start with the LTEMP's main goals and resources that are to be protected. I would then section off each experiment type with the resource that is to be protected, along with how many experiments have been conducted. From there, review what has been learned and what experiments remain to be conducted. A strong section on if the purpose and goals of the LTEMP has been completed or if there remain experiments and lessons to learn. I think it will be important to state the sideboards that were tested during the creation of the LTEMP so as to understand what the Post 2026 conditions can be under the current LTEMP ROD. It is important to me that the LTEMP not be scrapped for a version 2 (new EIS or SEIS) if it is not necessary. This would be a massive lift and likely not necessary, at this point. Finally, as part of the 10 year review, I would state the information that we continue not to understand under the current LTEMP followed by next steps.
- Related to funding for TWP:
 - Explore effort to seek outside funding.
 - Work to have USGS fund more of the work that they benefit from
 - Include a tribal knowledge component in the TWP that is adequately funded/

- When budgeting for the future work, there needs to be consideration for what constitutes effective monitoring. In other words, does there come a time to change (increase/decrease) monitoring and impact the budget?

Any feedback on the meeting location at the Grand Canyon. Should Reclamation consider new meeting locations in the future?

- It was great. The room was a little dark, but that's because of the thunderstorms.
- I'm sad to have missed the meeting on the South Rim - especially since it has only happened this one time. I hope you have another South Rim meeting in the next few years or someplace equally stunning (is that possible?). Does the North Rim have the facilities? Maybe on the Navajo nation, or Zuni, or Hopi locations?
- See my answer above. Flagstaff is difficult to access. With our busy lives, much existing travel, and some peoples' limited ability to travel, it may be helpful to pick locations that are more accessible. In addition, most of the time we are in meetings and don't get the opportunity to see the location highlights. That said, the Grand Canyon meeting was very very well orchestrated and a wonderful opportunity to see the canyon, even if it was just for a few glimpses.
- It was a great opportunity to spend time in the area we are all working to protect. Big thanks to Park staff who worked so hard to pull that off. Would like to see a return to the park maybe every other year. Flagstaff is a great location and a lot easier to get to. Perhaps, a meeting in Page, AZ would also afford an opportunity for tours and recreation at Lees Ferry.
- Thanks for a good meeting. From what I gleaned, it was a big success. It sounded like a big lift to make it happen at the South Rim.
- Larger bathrooms.
- Meeting at the Grand Canyon was a terrific opportunity to connect to the resource. I support frequently meeting at this or other relevant locations, such as Page, AZ/Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and/or Glen Canyon Dam or Twin Arrows Resort (owned by the Navajo Nation).
- The host and hospitality were great.
- Loved it! We should plan on this as a regular venue to help center all of us even more on the importance of our work.

Any Additional Feedback

- Lots of positive changes. One of the best AMWGS.