

**TWG Steering Committee (SCAHG)**  
**Agenda Related Topics & Budget Discussion Topics**  
**January, 2014**

**Discussion for TWG meeting**

1. TWG webinars vs in-person meetings
  - a. In responding for feedback about TWG face-to-face meeting vs webinars: In general I think there is value for TWG members to meet face to face two or three times per year. There is value in actually working with one another. I am not opposed to an occasional webinar when it is short. (UCRC)
  - b. Regarding the use of conference calls / webinar: We recognize the need for budget awareness, but really do think that the use of webinars instead of in person meetings for TWG greatly reduces the effectiveness of the TWG and recommend that webinar use be held to the absolute minimum. (UAMPS/CREDA)
  - c. I don't want to marginalize or diminish the work that comes out of the technical arena. When you take a car into the shop to get fixed, you hope that someone physically looks under the hood, and someone kicks the tires and gets dirty. I think the TWG plays this important role in the AMP and is needed to really flesh out understanding and get to the bottom of tough questions. Currently the TWG is taking a back seat to the LTEMP processes. Once the new ROD is set in place, I do hope that the TWG will ramp up its' efforts and importance again. \*Webinars are better than nothing, but significantly lack in comparison to the effectiveness of face-to-face. –Make it a priority to meet face-to-face. (Nevada)
  - d. Glen: discuss the costs associated with conducting an in-person meeting? Travel, room rental, salaries... \$25k/meeting. (SCAHG)
2. Glen LTEMP update: provide an HFE update at Jan TWG meeting. Give a more in depth presentation in April. Have Bureau of Reclamation report on compliance with the Memorandum of Agreement regarding the implementation of the 2012 and 2013 HFEs. How is Reclamation tracking the concerns raised by the Tribes regarding the HFEs? (CRAHG)

**CRAHG Request and Follow Up**

1. Bureau of Reclamation report on progress made toward revising the existing programmatic agreement for the operations of Glen Canyon Dam. In addition, Reclamation should report on their efforts/perspective of how they have remained in compliance with the existing programmatic agreement. (Barger at TWG)
2. Bureau of Reclamation report on compliance with the Memorandum of Agreement regarding the implementation of the 2012 and 2013 high flow events. How is Reclamation tracking the concerns raised by the Tribes regarding the HFEs. (Barger at TWG)

3. Grand Canyon National Park provide a report on their monitoring of archaeological sites (and other historic properties) that is part of their on-going Colorado River management plan. *(submitted to GCMRC)*
4. Grand Canyon National Park provide a update report on when the CRAHG may be provided an opportunity to review the data recovery report that details the excavations that the Museum of Northern Arizona and Grand Canyon National Park performed in 2010. *(submitted to GCMRC)*
5. Glen Canyon National Park Service report on the progress made at Minus 9 Mile terrace site. *(submitted to GCMRC)*
6. GCMRC report on their cultural resource monitoring program and progress they have made toward successful integration of Tribal values into that program. *(submitted to GCMRC)*
7. GCMRC report on the progress in expanding the sediment monitoring below Diamond Creek as requested by the Hualapai Tribe. *(submitted to GCMRC)*
8. GCMRC report on updates on what is happening with trout/chub numbers and the triggering criteria. *(submitted to GCMRC)*
9. What is the future of the cultural resources program (both GCMRC's cultural resources program and Reclamation's compliance under the programmatic agreement) within the GCDAMP? Recent events might suggest that the cultural resources are losing importance in this program which would be ironic given that the entire GCDAMP is a product of a cultural resource value. *(submitted to GCMRC)*

### **Future TWG Agenda Items:**

#### **April**

1. Would like to see more "BIG Picture" planning. Sometimes we get set in our ways, and we become comfortable doing what we have done before. The budget only looks 2 years out. Where do we want to be in 20 years? 50 years? Outside the box thinking... For example:
  - a. Would love to hear about other ideas like different ways of getting beaches and sandbars besides HFE's. [\(Nevada\)](#)
  - b. How do we restart our long-term planning efforts: Core Monitoring Plan, Strategic Science Plan, Monitoring and Research Plan? [\(SCAHG\)](#)
2. Temperature seems to be playing a more important role in the discussions. I would like to hear more about the WEARS impellers concept. [\(Nevada\)](#) How important is additional temperature modification to continued improvement of the humpback chub population? Can we reach recovery goals for humpback chub without additional temperature modification at Glen Canyon Dam? [\(SCAHG\)](#)
3. Have WAPA prepare a presentation on geographic scope of impacts for re-operating Glen Canyon Dam. How do changes in operation at Glen Canyon Dam affect operations and compliance at Flaming Gorge and the Aspinall units? [\(WAPA\)](#)

4. Teach us more about the upper basin humpback chub populations. What do we in the lower basin need to do to move the needle closer to getting humpback chub downlisted and delisted? Provide an update on “Threats Analysis.” What do we need to keep an eye on? (Nevada)

**List of future budget items, future research projects for discussion at TWG in January**

1. Would like to see more “BIG Picture” planning. Sometimes we get set in our ways, and we become comfortable doing what we have done before. The budget only looks 2 years out. Where do we want to be in 20 years? 50 years? Outside the box thinking... For example:
  - a. I would like to see a write up on the Paria Ponds concept. Not for the purpose of introducing extirpated species, but for running controlled experiments and really get to the root of answering strategic science questions. (Nevada) Assess, develop, and implement a plan for humpback chub and other native fish rearing ponds and experimental studies near the mouth of the Paria River. (GCWC) Larry: Have Extirpated Species AHG meet with GCMRC and FWS to build support for the Paria Ponds concept. Connect concept planning with what is provided in the NPS Fish Management Plan. (SCAHG)
2. Extirpated Species AHG: Develop and implement a plan to track observations of rare and sensitive species in the Canyon (leopard frog, muskrat, zebra-tailed lizard). (GCWC)
3. GCMRC paper/research topic: What are the ecological and economic trade-offs associated with a multi-day (weekly and monthly) flow fluctuation release patterns vs the current daily flow fluctuation release pattern. What should be the release plan for large spills (greater than 45,000 cfs) at Glen Canyon Dam if an inflow like what happened in 1983-84 occurs again? What are the ecological consequences of spills greater than 45,000 cfs and how does the preferred protocol for passing large volumes of water maximize geomorphic benefits and minimize ecological damage downstream of Glen Canyon Dam? (GCWC)
4. Conduct a sediment and fisheries analysis of Cataract Canyon as a control for management options in Glen and Grand Canyons. (GCWC)
5. Undertake a study of driftwood distribution and movement through the river corridor during various flow regimes, and provide recommendations on driftwood availability and management. (GCWC)
6. Develop a nutrient budget model for the Colorado River ecosystem. (GCWC)
7. Placeholder: wait for a recommendation from the ADAHG. Initiate development of the GCDAMP administrative history program by compiling biographical and interviews of high priority collaborators, and other project components as advised by the ad hoc committee. (GCWC)
8. Develop and implement a plan for translocation and reintroduction of razorback sucker or at least one other missing species into the upper and middle reaches of Marble and Grand Canyons. (GCWC)

9. Although direction has been developed for desired future resource conditions and structured decision processes, significant time has elapsed since the stakeholders and managers have pursued in-depth review and revision of long and short term goals and objectives for the program. This activity would best be planned for 2015 to benefit from the overall planning direction derived from the current EIS/LTEMP process. The activity will be critical to effective implementation of these important guidance documents, especially short and long term science projects. Planning how this activity would be accomplished could be an important outcome of the 2014 program. (Science Advisors)
10. In general the GCDAMP has pursued a consistent set of resource concerns over its existence, even though the emphasis on each has varied over the period. Knowledge gained has been extensive. An assessment of this current knowledge regarding critical resource concerns of stakeholders/managers and desired future resource conditions would be important in revisions of goals and objectives and designing short and long term science and management programs. How this assessment is structured would benefit from stakeholder/manager/scientist interaction and planning to assure appropriate emphasis to EIS/LTEMP direction, critical resources of concern, and key goals and objectives. (Science Advisors)
11. The GCDAMP is now approaching two decades of application. How adaptive management is applied in the program and how it could be modified to improve application might benefit from external review to assess the longer term benefit of “double-loop learning” in programs of this nature. (Science Advisors)
12. The GCDAMP is a unique example of how resource science and management programs can utilize and benefit from systems design and management processes to guide program development and help resolve multiple interacting resource issues. Generally the complexity of the systems and multiplicity of information sets necessary for longer term management solutions require support of systems science designs and models. Emphasis was placed on ongoing systems understanding and model development and use early in the program. The program might benefit from a review of these applications over the next decade especially as relates to development of long term monitoring programs that maximize integration of critical bio-physical program elements. (Science Advisors)
13. Large long term science/management programs such as GCDAMP can derive important guidance from assessments that evaluate alternative approaches and levels of science and management investments to gain desired future resource conditions and resolve short term issues. Benefit-Cost assessments are normally employed for the evaluations and can assist in defining critical alternative paths to pursue in science and management needs. (Science Advisors)