



# United States Department of the Interior

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Upper Colorado Regional Office  
125 South State Street, Room 6107  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84138-1102

IN REPLY REFER TO:

UC-700  
ADM-10.00

February 13, 2002

To: Technical Work Group Members and Alternates

Subject: Meeting Materials for Technical Work Group Meeting on February 26-27, 2002

Enclosed for your use is a set of index tabs with corresponding materials for the upcoming TWG Meeting on February 26-27, 2002. The Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center will be sending a separate overnight mailing containing information on the FY 2004 Budget experimental flows.

The meeting will be held at the following location:

Embassy Suites Phoenix Airport  
1515 N. 44<sup>th</sup> Street  
"Turquoise Room"  
Phoenix, Arizona

A block of rooms has been reserved at the above hotel. The block will close on **February 20, 2002**, so please make your reservation if you haven't already done so. The room rate is \$107 + tax.

If you have any questions, please contact Linda Whetton at 801-524-3880.

Sincerely,

Randall V. Peterson  
Mgr., Adaptive Management and  
Environmental Resources Division

Enclosure

cc: Interested Parties  
(via e-mail w/encls)

# The Mary Orton Company

4701 East Valley View Drive  
Phoenix, AZ 85044-5752

602.426-9866 voice  
602.426-9867 facsimile  
602.432-2469 cellular

mary@maryorton.com  
www.maryorton.com

## Memo

**To:** TWG Members

**From:** Mary Orton, in behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning:

Kerry Christensen  
Barry Gold  
Rick Johnson  
Ted Rampton

Wayne Cook  
Amy Heuslein  
Randy Peterson  
Bob Winfree

Kurt Dongoske  
Leslie James  
Andre Potochnik  
Jerry Zimmerman

**Date:** March 5, 2002

**Re:** Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning on issues referred by AMWG

---

As you may recall, at its January 2002 meeting the AMWG referred several issues to the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning (AHCSP). You considered the AHCSP's response during your February 26-27, 2002 meeting, and made some comments and suggestions. This version includes changes based on your input. You will have time to discuss this at your March 20 conference call.

### **Issue 1: Development of a process and timeline for prioritization, in order to complete the Strategic Plan.**

The AMWG, at its January 2002 meeting, approved 54 Management Objectives that they believe provide a thorough and well-balanced direction for the Adaptive Management Program and the river ecosystem. The AMWG asked the AHCSP to develop a process and timeline for prioritization.

The AHCSP agreed that the purpose of this exercise is to give direction to the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC) in development of its Strategic Plan and annual workplan. Given that, the result should be a list of the Information Needs in SEQUENCE order, so that GCMRC knows what the AMWG feels should be accomplished first. However, the Core Monitoring INs should not be included in the sequencing, as they must be continued. Recommendations about EINs would generally be made in connection with recommendations to undertake an experiment or MA to which the EINs relate. Management Actions cannot be sequenced at this time, because the MA section of the Strategic Plan has not been written yet.

The AHCSP recommends the following process:

- A. At the May TWG meeting, TWG members hear a presentation from GCMRC that will provide information about resource status and trends.
- B. The second step is the development of important core research questions that should be addressed in the next five years. These questions would form the focus of the program's research program, but not the individual tasks. TWG members would be alerted well before

the May meeting to think about the most important core research questions, such as, "What's happening with the chub?" A brainstorming process will be used to generate these questions from the TWG members at the May meeting.

- C. Third, a paired comparisons exercise is used to put these questions in order of urgency. Which are these questions are the most urgent to resolve? The paired comparisons exercise is one in which the group decides, two at a time, which question is more urgent. There will be discussion before each of the decisions, so that the TWG members can learn from each other about how and why they are making their decisions. The result is the list in order of urgency.
- D. Next, the TWG will conduct a sequencing exercise where the TWG members, working independently, will cast votes on which RINs and SINs should be addressed first. TWG members will be given a list of the RINs and SINs arrayed under the MOs and goals, and asked to distribute 45 votes to indicate which 45 RINs and SINs need to be addressed first. (This number represents about one-quarter of the total number of RINs and SINs.). There is no requirement that a member vote for INs under each goal, and cumulative voting (casting more than one vote per IN) is not allowed.
- E. Those votes are tallied, listed in recommended sequence order, and (probably the next day), given back to the TWG. The group reviews the result for fatal flaws – does the result have any fatal flaws that need to be corrected? These might be violations of legal requirements, putting something early in the sequence that can't be determined until later, etc. This is also an opportunity to compare this sequence order with the urgency of the core research questions that had been decided the previous day.
- F. These results are sent to the AMWG for approval at its July meeting.
- G. After the AMWG acts, the GCMRC uses the list of core research questions in order of urgency, and the approved list of RINs and SINs in sequence order, to produce its Strategic Plan, which will include the Information Needs that will be addressed during the next 5-year period; and its annual workplan, which will include the Information Needs that will be addressed during the coming year. If, during the process of developing its Strategic Plan or annual workplan GCMRC believes that a lower priority IN needs either to be addressed first, or in conjunction with other INs needs to be addressed through a combined RFP, they will bring this recommendation with the accompanying rationale to the TWG for review.
- H. The AMWG approves that Strategic Plan and annual workplan, after review by the TWG.

The AHCSP recommends that this process of putting MOs in sequence order as guidance for the GCMRC should occur periodically, because as conditions change, so will the desired sequence order.

### **Issue 2: Development of a process and timeline for completion of Information Needs and Management Actions, in order to complete the Strategic Plan.**

**Information Needs:** The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning recommends that the TWG, at its February meeting, identify the Information Needs around which it does not have consensus, and approve the rest. Those INs that have not been approved are subject to further discussion between GCMRC and TWG. They will go to the TWG for approval at the May meeting, and then to the AMWG for final approval in July.

**Management Actions:** The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning recommends that after the sequencing exercise is completed, the GCMRC and the TWG jointly develop the Management Actions for recommendation to the AMWG.

### **Issue 3: Development of a process and timeline for identification of which MOs are in and which are out of the AMP, in order to complete the Strategic Plan.**

The AHCSP believes that all MOs and INs that are approved by the AMWG are "in" the AMP. The question that needs to be asked is, "Is this activity appropriate for funding by power revenues?" For example, if it were decided that a particular activity was not appropriate for funding by power revenues,

another agency could fund that activity in its budget, or GCMRC could attain funding from outside the AMP (appropriated dollars, grants, etc.) to accomplish that activity.

The AHCSPP agreed that MOs do not need to be determined to be in or out of the AMP before sequencing, since all MOs and INs approved by AMWG are in the program.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning recommends the following process for identification of which MOs are inappropriate for funding by power revenues:

1. The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning will develop a list of criteria that make power revenue funding inappropriate for an MO.
2. The TWG, at its May meeting, will consider and refine that list of criteria, and then use it to develop a list of MOs that should be funded by other revenues.
3. In both these cases, the AHCSPP recommends using a simple process, similar to what we have used many times: give people time to think about the question, generate a list, then discuss each item and come to a consensus.
4. That list of MOs, with the criteria used to generate it, will go to the AMWG for approval in July.

**Issue 4: Consideration of the addition of a new Management Objective 7.3. Maintain suitable water quality in GCD releases to meet downstream Management Objectives.**

The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning was not able to come to a consensus on this item in the time it had before the February TWG meeting. The members anticipate that it will be identified during the TWG discussion in February as an item that needs further discussion.



United States Department of the Interior  
U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY  
GRAND CANYON MONITORING AND RESEARCH CENTER  
2255 NORTH GEMINI DRIVE, MS-5000  
FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA 86001  
928 556-7094 Telephone  
928 556-7092 Fax  
www.gcmrc.gov

FEB 15 2001

MEMORANDUM

**To:** Technical Work Group  
**From:** Barry D. Gold, Chief *B. D. Gold*  
**Subject:** GCMRC Materials for TWG Meeting (February 26-27, 2002)

Enclosed are materials prepared by GCMRC for the February 26-27 Technical Work Group meeting.

The first document is a memo from Ruth Lambert regarding the recommendations of the Cultural PEP panel (the document goes under the Cultural PEP tab in your TWG packet).

The second document is Version 1.2 of the Draft Scenarios and Rationale for Experimental Flow Design in WY 2002-2003 (dated 2-15-02) and the attached Q&A's (insert under the Experimental Flows tab).

The third document is a memo regarding aerial photography for this year and subsequent years (insert under the Aerial Photography tab).

The last document is the FY2004 initial AMP Budget and associated project blurbs (insert under the FY2004 AMP Budget tab).

I look forward to seeing you at the upcoming meeting.