



# Socioeconomic PEP review

Helen Fairley, Sociocultural Program Manager

Presentation to the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program  
Technical Work Group  
Phoenix, Arizona October 2, 2007

# Review

- Funding for a socioeconomic PEP recommended and approved in FY05
- PEP was deferred with AMWG approval due to science planning priorities
- Information needs workshop conducted in April 2007
- Socioeconomic PEP now planned for spring (April?) 2008

# Goal 9 MO and CMIN

- **MO #Objective 9.1**

Maintain or improve the quality and range of recreational opportunities in Glen and Grand Canyons within the capacity of the Colorado River ecosystem to absorb visitor impacts consistent with the NPS and tribal river corridor Management Plans.

- **CMIN # Information Need 9.1.4**

Determine and track the economic benefits of river related recreational opportunities.

# Goal 10 CMINs

- IN 10.1 Determine and track the impacts to power users from implementation of Record of Decision dam operations and segregate those effects from other causes such as changes in the power market.
- SPG CMIN 10.1.1 Determine and track the marketable capacity and energy produced through dam operations in relation to the various release scenarios (daily fluctuation limit, upramp and downramp limits, list components, maximum flow limit of 25,000 cfs, minimum flow limit of 5,000 cfs.)

# AMP Management Objective

MO #	Objective
12.1	Maintain or attain socio-economic data for adequate decision-making.

# Research Information Needs Related to Management Objective 12.1

- 12.1.1 What is the economic value of the recreation use of the Colorado River ecosystem downstream from Glen Canyon Dam?
- 12.1.2 What are the use (e.g., hydropower, trout fishing, rafting) and non-use (e.g., option, vicarious, quasi-option, bequest, and existence) values of the Colorado River ecosystem?
- 12.1.3 How do use (e.g., hydropower, trout fishing, rafting) and non-use (e.g., option, vicarious, quasi-option, bequest, and existence) values change in response to an experiment performed under the Record of Decision, unanticipated event, or other management action?

# IN Workshop Discussions

- All agreed that CMIN 9.4.1 is an appropriate CMIN to consider for recreation, but they recommended that socioeconomic aspects of additional resource areas needed to be considered (e.g., trout angling)
- Participants agreed to rank Goal 10 CMINs, but did not want to mix CMINs from different goals
- Workshop participants recommended changing wording of SPG CMIN to “dam operations” rather than “ROD operations” to reflect Long-term experimental planning
- Workshop participants agreed to focus on this revised SPG CMIN and IN 10.1 for ranking purposes

# Prioritization of Goal 10 CMINs

- **CMIN 10.1 vs. 10.1.1:** discussion ensued about each CMIN and why one CMIN might be ranked higher than another.
- 10.1.1 looks forward and considers all operational scenarios whereas 10.1 only looks backward.
- 10.1.1 provides the methods by which you monitor 10.1.
- **Ranking resulted in 10.1.1 being ranked higher than 10.1 at a ratio of 10:1.**



# Follow Up to IN Workshop

- Report on IN Workshop prepared and shared with participants for comment
- Workshop participants' comments were incorporated into report and proposed PEP guidance that was sent to TWG on 4/20/07
- Comments on report and PEP guidance were requested from TWG by 5/7/07
- Comments were received from GCT and CREDA – did not require revision to socioeconomic PEP guidance

# Next Steps

- Socioeconomic PEP to be convened in spring 2007 (potential presenters and panelists have been contacted; final dates to be determined this month)
- PEP will address both core monitoring and research information needs for developing and implementing a future socioeconomic monitoring program

# The End

