

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group Meeting
January 17 –18, 2002
(revised 3/12/02)

MOTIONS

MOTION: Approve the April 12-13, 2001, Meeting Minutes.
Motion seconded.
Discussion: None
Public Comments: None.
Voting Results: Yes = 22 No = 0 Abstained = 0
MOTION PASSED.

MOTION: Approve the revised AMWG Operating Procedures.
Motion seconded.
Discussion: None
Public Comments: None
Call for Question.
Voting Results: Yes = 24 No = 0 Abstained = 0
MOTION PASSED.

MOTION: Move to table the discussion.
Motion seconded.
Discussion: The members continued to discuss the proposed language.
MOTION WITHDRAWN

MOTION: Move to accept the following language: **“Evaluate how well the selected alternative meets the resource management objectives of the EIS, ROD, and the GCPA.”**
Motion seconded.

Discussion: The members continued to discuss the proposed language.

AMENDED MOTION: Evaluate how well the selected alternative meets the resource management objectives of the EIS **in response to the GCPA and other authorities under the law.**

AMENDED MOTION: Evaluate how well the **preferred alternative of the EIS ROD and other management actions meet the goals of the GCPA while protecting a mix of benefits defined in the EIS ROD.**

AMENDED MOTION: Evaluate how well the preferred alternative of the EIS ROD and other management actions meet the goals of the GCPA **and** a mix of benefits defined in the EIS ROD.
Motion seconded.

Discussion. The members continued to discuss the language.

AMENDED MOTION: **The AMP evaluates** how well the preferred alternative of the EIS ROD and other management actions meet the goals of the GCPA and a mix of **resource** benefits defined in the EIS ROD.

Public Comments: None
Voting Results: Yes = 22 No = 0 Abstained = 1
MOTION PASSED.

Rick Johnson proposed a REVISED MOTION:
Evaluate how well the selected alternative and actions taken pursuant to other authorities meet the goals and objectives of the Adaptive Management Program.

AMENDED REVISED MOTION: *The AMP evaluates how well the preferred alternative of the EIS ROD and other management actions meet the goals of the GCPA and a mix of resource benefits defined in the EIS ROD.*

Rick suggested it be placed as the second bullet on page 2.

Public Comments: None

Voting Results: Yes = 22 No = 0 Abstained = 1

Robert Begay (abstaining): I'm unsure about what the Navajo Nation recognizes on this.

MOTION: Recommend the Strategic Plan to the Secretary of the Interior as adopted and as amended with the language changes made today.

Motion seconded.

Discussion: None

Public Comments: Thank you Mr. Chairman. My name is David Orr. I'm with the Environmental and Social Justice Organization known as Living Rivers. We have offices here in Arizona and in also in Utah. I'll be making a more detailed set of comments later but in response specifically to the Strategic Plan, I wanted to raise a couple of points that I hope you will take into consideration, both for today and also for the future. It's one of the concerns that our organization has that it has been difficult for us to decide or to ascertain exactly where the decision point is for intervening in providing input to this body on the strategic planning process. We have not been involved in the adaptive management program organization but we have been attending some Technical Work Group meetings over the last six months or so. It's our understanding that you've already voted on the Vision and Mission and the Principles and Goals and so we're not asking you to revisit that today although the comments that we will be submitting will address concerns that we have with some of those points. I just wanted to raise a couple of general observations that I hope will help inform your thoughts. In general, we're concerned that the statement of principles and goals appear to be or could be interpreted to be implicitly prioritizing and if that is not the case, we would ask that you so declare that. There is also no specific mention of whether any of the principles and goals are specifically worthy of funding priority. We do note there is a reference that some of these principles and goals do not fall under the responsibility of the adaptive management program but as a member of the public, I have no way of knowing which of those responsibilities do you believe are within the purview of this body so there are some essentially very vague statements that are being made in terms of how can the public know who to turn to to address specific problems that we would like to see taken care of. We also noticed there has been talk about a cap on funding, specifically for hydropower revenues and that, in turn, implies to us that some prioritizing of the strategic plan goals and principles will be occurring accordingly so we would like to see some statement from this body that would address whether there is in fact a policy that you are going to limit the funding for this program or not. We would like to see you address this concern to the Secretary because we think there is a possibility that there will be efforts to continue whatever funding limitations there are today in the future. Let me address specifically Goal #4, maintain a naturally reproducing population of rainbow trout. We cannot find any legal authority for the adaptive management program to consider this a goal of the program. We would like to have some clarification especially given the apparent conflicts between goals for recovering native fish and the requirement that trout have for maintaining cold water temperatures year round. Finally, maintain power production capacity and energy generation and increase where feasible and advisable in the framework of the ecosystem goals of the adaptive management program. It is our understanding that hydropower production should not be considered to be of equal priority to native ecosystem restoration goals and we have very serious concerns that we will talking about later that will point to a need for looking at providing for or allowing for reduction in hydropower production and we are concerned that the wording of this goal will make that more difficult so without further detail, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you.

Voting Results: Yes = 24 No = 0 Abstained = 1

MOTION PASSED.

Amy Heuslein (abstaining): The reason I abstained is that I don't have a clear picture of the public process for the Strategic Plan. I recognize that we've gotten the opportunity for the public to attend our AMWG and TWG meetings, but I don't know where the public process is for the decision making to include this in her decision on accepting the Strategic Plan or even if there is a public process.

MOTION: In support of Goal 2, the AMWG recommends the following actions:

1. Control brown trout in Bright Angel Creek during CY 2002-2006;
2. Evaluate monitoring and control methods for channel catfish and carp in LCR during CY 2002;
3. Implement control efforts for channel catfish and carp in the LCR during CY 2003-2006; and
4. Establish a TWG ad hoc committee to develop a 2002-2006 research, monitoring, and management work plan for meeting MO 2.5 and MO 2.6. This ad hoc group will report back to the AMWG at the next meeting.

Motion seconded.

Discussion.

AMENDED MOTION: : In support of Goal 2, the AMWG recommends the following actions:

- 1a. Evaluate brown trout in Bright Angel Creek during CY 2002;
- 1b. Control brown trout in Bright Angel Creek during 2003-2006,
2. Evaluate methods to remove non-native fish from the LCR in 2002;
3. Gather public input and conduct public education and environmental compliance on long-term removals in #1 and #2 above;
4. Establish a TWG ad hoc committee to develop a 2002-2006 research, monitoring,

and management work plan for meeting MO 2.5 and MO 2.6 of the 17 August 2001 draft of the AMP Strategic Plan

AMENDED MOTION (first line): In support of goal 2, the AMWG recommends the following actions subject to environmental compliance and the rest of the motion stays the same.

AMENDED MOTION (first line): add "to include recreational use, ESA, and consultation with the tribes."

Amended motions seconded.

Public Comment: (Barry Gold) - As far as the group taking action in moving this motion that you recognize when you move a motion like that this will commit – because we just saw the presentation that Steve made that we've just gotten to the point where funds are available to provide a monitoring program that can actually protect the effects of what your actions are. To make this motion and it has implications that cannibalize to target the existing monitoring program, we're going to lose the power to do that. Randy said this was funded for the first year but you need to recognize that there is going to be a need to be made to bring the funding to the table so we can do this work and not cannibalize existing programs. I just raise the caution.

MOTION TABLED in order for Rick Johnson and Bruce Taubert to rewrite the motion and present at tomorrow's meeting.

January 18, 2002 – Rick Johnson presented an amended motion:

AMENDED MOTION: In support of goal 2, the AMWG recommends the following actions subject to environmental compliance to include assessing recreational use, ESA, and consultation with tribes:

1. Evaluate methods to remove non-native fish from Bright Angel Creek in 2002
2. Evaluate methods to remove non-native fish from the LCR in 2002

3. Gather public input and conduct public education and environmental compliance on long-term removals in #1 and 2 above,
4. Establish a TWG ad hoc committee to develop a 2002-2006 research monitoring and management work plan for meeting MO 2.5 and 2.6 of the August 17, 2001, Draft of the AMP Strategic Plan. The TWG will report back to the AMWG at the next meeting,
5. Using data from #1-4 above to make recommendations on future removal.

AMENDED MOTION: Amend #1 above: “evaluate methods to remove non-native fish, **except rainbow trout**, from Bright Angel Creek in 2002.”

Amended motion seconded.

Call for the question.

Public Comments: (David Orr from Living Rivers)- It would be appreciated if we could have some clarification of point #5 using data from #1-4 above making recommendations on future removal. The concern that I’d like to express is that I think there is plenty of evidence that future removal needs to be done and I guess I’m just concerned with the open-ended nature of #5 and would like to see some sort of time limit or other sort of clarification on what the table would be for addressing non-native fish in the mainstem below the dam.

AMENDED MOTION (line 1): In support of goal 2, the AMWG recommends the following actions subject to environmental compliance to include assessing recreational use, ESA, in consultation with the tribes **and other affected state agencies**.

Amended motion seconded.

Voting results: Yes = 18 No = 0 Abstained = 1

Loretta Jackson (abstaining): I do support you but I still think that the whole river system should be looked at, that the removal should also have suggested that there would reintroduction of the native species of a type of protocol like that.

MOTION PASSED.

MOTION: The AMWG Concurs with the findings of the TWG White Paper on Sediment.

Motion seconded.

Discussion:

Public Comments: (David Orr) - Living Rivers supports efforts to implement the adaptive management part of the Adaptive Management Program. We think it is important if this program is to function the way it was designed to give the managers the flexibility to do the science driven management experiments that are indicated by the scientific researchers. To not do that seems to indicate a lack of willingness on the part of the body to comply with the intent and purpose, not only of the ROD and also the Grand Canyon Protection Act.

Voting Results: Yes= 22 No = 1 Abstained: 0

MOTION PASSED.

MOTION: Reconsider the vote just taken based on John Shields’ observations.

Motion seconded

Discussion: There was a general feeling among the AMWG members that reports need to be more professional (no typos, have current revision dates, and include supporting documentation as attachments).

Public Comments: None

MOTION WITHDRAWN.

MOTION: In concert with RPA flows for native fish, during 2002-2003 request that the GCMRC, in consultation with the TWG, design an experimental flow sequence that tests hypotheses for conservation of sediment. Report to AMWG in April 2002 on the proposed flow sequence.

Motion seconded.

AMENDED MOTION: In concert with RPA flows for native fish flows, to be implemented in 2002-2003 request that the GCMRC, in consultation with the TWG, design an experimental flow sequence that tests hypotheses for conservation of sediment. Report to AMWG in April 2002 on the proposed flow sequence.

Public Comments: None

Call for question.

Voting Results: Yes = 8 No = 11 Abstaining = 1

AMENDED MOTION FAILS.

Voting Results on Original Motion: Yes = 20 No = 0 Abstaining = 1

MOTION PASSED

Amy Heuselin (abstaining) - I guess I'm just concerned with the issue regarding the 2002-2003, that is not clear to me as far as what that actually means, whether or not we're able to do something come the fall because of the AOP issue or that's a moot point.

MOTION: Remand the Living Rivers letter to the AMWG Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning for consideration.

Motion seconded.

Public Comments: None

Voting results: Yes = 3 No = 14 Abstaining = 2

MOTION FAILS.

Joe Alston (abstaining) - I haven't had a chance to read the letter so I don't know what's really in here and what it states. The letter seems to be two parts, one is kind of a list of concerns the group has about this group itself and that's kind of on the Secretary. She can make her own decisions on that part of the letter and that's the appropriate place for it to go. The second part has to do with the Strategic Plan. It seems like we've gone quite a ways down that process and I'm not sure it makes a lot of sense to revisit the Strategic Plan at this point. On the other hand, I'm not sure that we have just by this last conversation given adequate thought to what we should be presenting to the public and what public involvement should be. I don't think this answers it.

MOTION: Incorporate KAS recommendations from TWG as outlined in Presentation.

Paper.

(Clarification on motion: AMWG accepted the TWG Ad Hoc Group Report and the one page list of recommendations.)

Motion seconded.

Discussion.

Public Comments: None

Voting Results: Yes = 19 No = 0 Abstaining = 0

MOTION PASSED.

MOTION: Approve the FY 2003 Budget (\$9,904,000)

Motion seconded.

Public Comments: None

Voting Results: Yes = 19 No = 0 Abstaining = 0

MOTION PASSED.