TWG Budget Motion

- August 6, 2025
- 17 of 20 voting members present
- Motion passed by consensus

☐ n Dam Adaptive Management Program FY26 Proposed ☐ Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center Science Activities ☐ Reductions — 6 August 2025

Canyon Dam Adaptive

"_m budget for FY26 is

nt of the reduction is

vuine expected to be no more
accommodate a timely

menua minum the Adaptive
gement Work Group, new budgets have
been developed by the Bureau of Reclamation

nu he USGS Grand Canyon Monitoring and
search Center projecting budgets at reduced

BUDGET REDUCTION SCENERIOS				Percent of Element Funding					
5%	10%	15%		5%	10%	15%			
\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	A.1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	A.2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	A.3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
5%	10%	15%		5%	10%	15%			
\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	B.1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
\$0.00	\$139,210.00	\$208,815.00	B.2	0.0%	22.3%	33.5%			
5%	10%	15%		5%	10%	15%			
-\$18,670.96	-\$18,670.96	-\$11,828.96	C.1	-6.8%	-6.8%	-4.3%			
\$68,082.90	\$68,082.90	\$68,082.90	C.2	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
\$95.95	\$12,672.95	\$37,828.95	C.3	0.3%	33.5%	100.0%			
\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	C.4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
5%	10%	15%		5%	10%	15%			
\$0.00	\$44,932.97	\$67,399.46	D.1	0.0%	12.6%	18.9%			
\$0.00	\$14,685.34	\$22,028.00	D.2	0.0%	19.1%	28.6%			
\$0.00	\$24,360,11	\$36,540,17	D.3	0.0%	20.1%	30.2%			

	27 TWP)										
Reclamation Budget Summary FY25-27		Original Proposed in FY26		5%		10%		15%	5%	10%	15%
GCDAMP Total		12,500,000	\$	11,875,000	\$	11,250,000	\$	10,625,000			
Reclamation Total (20%)		2,500,000	\$	2,375,000	\$	2,250,000	\$	2,125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 375,0
GCMRC Total (80%)		10,000,000	\$	9,500,000	\$	9,000,000	\$	8,500,000			
'aptive Management Work Group		225,000	\$	160,000	\$	140,000	\$	140,000			
percent of BOR budge	t	9%		7%		6%		7%			
'G Direct Costs and Administration		140,000	\$	140,000	\$	140,000	\$	140,000			
Vlember Travel Reimbursement		5,000	\$	5,000	\$	-	\$	-		\$ 5,000	\$ 5,0
cilitation and Notetaking		65,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,0
`utreach - Reclamation public affairs, POAG		15,000	\$	15,000	\$	-	\$	-		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,0
Worn	\$	215,000	\$	210,000	\$	200,000	\$	200,000			
percent of BOR budge	t	9%		9%		9%		9%			
ıp Costs (BOR)	\$	200,000	\$	200,000	\$	200,000	\$	200,000			
Reimbursement	\$	10,000	\$	10,000	\$	-	\$	-		\$ 10,000	\$ 10,0
	\$	5,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,0
	1										

Background

The Technical Work Group (TWG) recognizes uncertainty regarding current Federal Budgets and acknowledges the potential for limited available funding for the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (GCDAMP) in Fiscal Year 2026 (FY26).

The TWG tasked the Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) to work with the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC) and the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) on developing the FY26 Budget and during the July 2025 TWG meeting, GCMRC and BOR were asked to develop three reduction scenarios: 5%, 10%, and 15% reductions.

Background continued

The BAHG met with GCMRC and BOR on August 1, August 4, and August 5, 2025 to provide feedback on these scenarios and come to a recommendation. The TWG met on August 6, 2025 to come to a recommendation.

Motion

The TWG recommends to the Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG) no changes to the FY26 Budget adopted in the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program Triennial Budget and Work Plan – Fiscal Years 2025-2027 (FY25-27 TWP).

However, should reductions be imposed, the TWG recommends the lowest possible reductions should be applied to meet the available funding and continue to achieve the GCDAMP agreed upon work plan goals.

Motion continued

Should FY26 budgets be less than what was in the FY25-27 TWP, the TWG further recommends that the FY26 Budget Scenarios presented to the TWG by the GCMRC and BOR on August 6, 2025 should guide revisions to the TWP to meet the available funding.

Additional TWG Input

- By being responsible and offering guidance for cuts, there is concern that the guidance will be used to justify cuts (self-fulfilling prophecy)
- A potential 15% cut was discussed as "catastrophic"
- It is uncertain if the potential cuts would enable the program to continue to meet its obligations
- Some work would be delayed but delay tactics make future year work planning efforts more difficult
- Cuts to program functions (e.g., travel reimbursements) were favored but these cuts can undermine the foundational values of the program