

# Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program Technical Work Group (TWG) Meeting Summary

Dates: July 9–10, 2025

*Note: Meeting Summary was produced by AI and subject to errors.*

## Day 1 – July 9

### 1) Welcome and Administrative

On Day 1 of the July 9–10, 2025 TWG meeting, the "Welcome and Administrative" session was led by Chair Seth Shanahan. He opened the meeting by confirming quorum. Seth conducted a roll call of TWG members and alternates, confirming representation from nearly all stakeholder groups, including federal agencies, tribes, states, Non-Governmental Organizations, and power contractors. He also confirmed the presence of the Designated Federal Officer (DFO), Kathleen Callister (Reclamation), which is required for the meeting to proceed.

Administrative updates included a reminder that meeting materials had not yet been posted to the program website due to delays in public affairs processing, though all materials had been distributed via email. The next TWG meeting is scheduled for October 8–9, 2025, and Reclamation is making a concerted effort to hold it in person in Phoenix.

Seth also reviewed the status of ad hoc groups, encouraging members to update their participation via email to Reclamation. Updates were provided from several ad hoc groups, including the Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAG), the Steering Committee Ad Hoc Group (SCAHG), and the Trout Ad Hoc Group (TAHG). The TAHG, chaired by David Rogowski (AZGFD), presented a detailed update on their structured decision-making process to address recruitment issues in the Lees Ferry rainbow trout fishery.

Finally, the group reviewed action items from the previous meeting. Most had been completed, including scheduling a Lake Mead water quality presentation and distributing knowledge assessment materials. A few items, such as finalizing the monitoring metrics report, remained open. The session concluded with a review of upcoming monitoring trips and a discussion of personnel losses and funding uncertainties affecting federal agencies.

### 2) Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson Election

During the TWG Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson election on Day 1, Seth Shanahan and Michelle Garrison (State of Colorado) were both nominated and unanimously re-elected to continue serving in their respective roles as Chair and Vice-Chair for the upcoming fiscal year. The nomination was introduced by Larry Stevens (GCWC) and seconded by Jakob Maase (Hopi

Tribe). No other nominations were brought forward, and there were no objections or comments raised during the discussion. The motion passed without opposition, and both Seth and Michelle expressed their appreciation and willingness to continue serving the group. The election process was conducted efficiently and in accordance with TWG procedures.

### 3) Hydrology, Glen Canyon Dam Operations, and Water Quality Conditions

During the session on Hydrology, Glen Canyon Dam Operations, and Water Quality Conditions, Alex Pivarnik from Reclamation provided a detailed overview of current hydrologic conditions and operational forecasts. He reported that Lake Powell peaked at an elevation of 3,561.89 feet in June 2025 and was currently at 33% capacity. Dry conditions in April through June led to significant reductions in inflow forecasts, with the April–July unregulated inflow forecast dropping to 42% of average. The 2026 water year is also projected to be below average, with inflows forecasted at 83–84% of average. The system remains in the Mid-Elevation Release Tier, with a planned release of 7.48 million acre-feet (MAF) from Lake Powell, although risks of falling below critical elevations (3,500 ft and 3,525 ft) remain.

Jeremy Hammen (Reclamation) followed with a presentation on water quality conditions, focusing on temperature trends and predictions. He showed that release temperatures from Glen Canyon Dam were trending upward but remained below the 15.5°C threshold that would trigger the Cool Mix Flow experiment. Forecasts suggest that River Mile 30—the 2025 trigger location—may reach the threshold in mid-to-late July. Real-time temperature data from River Miles 0, 30, and 61, along with predictive modeling, are being used to guide implementation. It was noted that River Mile 61 had already reached the threshold, but the official trigger point remains at Mile 30. The group discussed the limitations of real-time monitoring at Mile 30 and the reliance on predictive models to initiate the experiment. Overall, the session emphasized the importance of close monitoring and adaptive planning in response to evolving hydrologic and thermal conditions.

### 4) Lake Mead Water Quality Monitoring and Modeling

During the Lake Mead Water Quality Monitoring and Modeling presentation, Carissa Wilkerson from the Southern Nevada Water Authority provided an update on current conditions and trends. She reported that despite lower lake elevations, water quality in Lake Mead remains good. Cold water is still available at both the Southern Nevada Water Authority’s drinking water intake and the lower Hoover Dam intake, which is critical for cooling equipment and maintaining effective water treatment processes. The deeper intake, which was activated in 2014, continues to provide access to high-quality, cooler water, while the original intake is now above the waterline.

Wilkerson presented data from recent sampling events in May and June, showing that stratification is occurring in the lake, with warmer surface temperatures and colder water at depth. Dissolved oxygen levels are generally sufficient, though some pockets of lower oxygen were observed, which is typical for this time of year. Specific conductance data revealed the

influence of the Las Vegas Wash, which contributes higher conductivity water into Boulder Basin. Additionally, nitrogen concentrations and chlorophyll levels have been trending slightly higher, and Secchi depth readings indicate a modest decline in water clarity.

She also shared modeling results that project water temperatures near Hoover Dam under different flow scenarios. Under a 50% flow scenario, temperatures are expected to remain below 15°C, but under 25% and 10% scenarios, temperatures could exceed that threshold, potentially affecting dam operations. Finally, Wilkerson noted that the Pierce Ferry Rapid remains active, indicating that the upper and lower basins are still hydrologically separated. She concluded by highlighting ongoing efforts to investigate the impacts of quagga mussels on water quality and the potential for future modeling and monitoring enhancements.

## 5) -12 Mile Slough Modifications Progress Update

During the -12 Mile Slough Modifications Progress Update, Matt O'Neill from Reclamation provided a comprehensive overview of the project's completion and early outcomes. The construction phase concluded in early June 2025, with all heavy equipment demobilized and removed from the site. Temperature loggers placed by the National Park Service in the lower Slough5 showed that prior to the reconnection, water temperatures had reached approximately 16°C. Once the upstream channel was opened on May 2, temperatures dropped rapidly to match mainstem Colorado River conditions, indicating successful thermal integration.

O'Neill reported that water velocity measurements taken during flows of approximately 10,700 cfs confirmed model predictions that target velocities of 1 foot per second were not fully achieved at lower flows, particularly in the lower Slough. However, during higher flows around 15,000 cfs, velocities increased significantly, and visual observations suggested that the entire channel was flowing at or above the target rate. The project also included the strategic placement of boulders to enhance trout habitat without compromising flow objectives.

The cobble bar was found to be stable and is expected to withstand high flow events, including HFEs. Park Service staff indicated that a fall HFE could serve as a "finishing touch" to the project by naturally shaping the channel and preparing the area for revegetation efforts planned for 2026. The project is considered a success in eliminating a key warmwater fish spawning habitat and improving flow conditions, with ongoing monitoring planned to assess long-term stability and ecological outcomes.

## 6) Smallmouth Bass and Other Nonnative Fish Monitoring and Management

During the session on Smallmouth Bass and Other Nonnative Fish Monitoring and Management, Drew Eppehimer from Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC), along with representatives from the National Park Service, Reclamation, and other agencies, presented a comprehensive update on the status of nonnative fish in the Colorado River ecosystem. Since 2022, a total of 1,729 smallmouth bass have been captured and removed, with all detections occurring in the upper reaches of the system. In 2025, only 14 smallmouth bass had been

captured as of June, with no age-0 fish detected, suggesting no evidence of successful spawning or recruitment this year. The farthest downstream capture of a juvenile smallmouth bass occurred at River Mile 5.26, and most captures were concentrated in the Lees Ferry tailwater.

The presentation included detailed maps and timelines of monitoring efforts, highlighting the extensive interagency coordination and the variety of gear types used, including electrofishing, hoop netting, and seining. Monitoring efforts are more intensive upstream of Badger Rapid due to logistical constraints downstream. Green sunfish were the most abundant nonnative species captured in 2025, with 1,436 individuals removed, followed by bluegill, walleye, and striped bass. While smallmouth bass captures were lower than in previous years, this was attributed in part to cooler water temperatures, which reduce catchability.

The group also discussed the impacts of federal staffing and funding uncertainties on monitoring capacity. Park Service representatives noted that while current efforts are continuing, future monitoring may be affected by potential reductions in funding and personnel. Lab studies on turbidity and temperature effects on smallmouth bass are ongoing, and side-scan sonar and artificial spawning habitat monitoring are being scaled back due to staffing limitations. Hotspots such as Dam Slough and River Mile 3.21 Slough remain areas of concern, particularly for green sunfish activity.

The session concluded with a discussion about the need for continued monitoring, the importance of maintaining data collection to support decision-making, and the potential role of the SBAHG in reassessing priorities and strategies in light of changing conditions and resource constraints.

## 7) Cool Mix Experiment and Risk Tolerances

During the session on the Cool Mix Experiment and Risk Tolerances, Bill Stewart from Reclamation and Charles Yackulic from GCMRC presented the planning and decision-making process for the 2025 Cool Mix Flow experiment. The Planning and Implementation (P&I) Team, composed of Department of Interior (DOI) agencies, basin states, and other stakeholders, met regularly in spring 2025 to evaluate options for managing warmwater nonnative fish threats, particularly smallmouth bass. The team reviewed technical materials, including a draft summary report of the 2024 Cool Mix experiment, risk assessments from fisheries experts, and modeling outputs.

The 2025 Cool Mix Flow was approved to target River Mile 30, with a hard off-ramp date of October 20. The experiment will be triggered when the three-day average water temperature at that location exceeds 15.5°C. The implementation will avoid bypass flows during peak hydropower demand hours (2–10 PM), similar to the 2024 approach. The decision was informed by a screening tool developed by GCMRC and Argonne National Laboratory, which modeled hydrology, temperature, fish recruitment risk, and economic costs under various scenarios. The

tool allowed stakeholders to evaluate trade-offs and apply their own risk tolerances to different outcomes.

A broader discussion followed about how different stakeholders perceive and manage ecological risk, particularly regarding humpback chub conservation. Brian Healy (GCMRC) noted that natural resource managers often have low risk tolerance and suggested incorporating formal risk functions into decision-making frameworks. Leslie James (CREDA) raised concerns about the need for complete monitoring to justify such impactful experiments and emphasized the importance of understanding how Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) assesses risk under the Endangered Species Act. Deb Williams (FWS) from the Service explained that decisions are based on the best available science and that more structured discussions on risk could be helpful.

The group also discussed the potential role of turbidity as a natural deterrent to smallmouth bass reproduction. While some participants suggested turbidity might reduce the need for Cool Mix flows, others, including Charles Yackulic and David Topping (GCMRC), emphasized that the science is still evolving and that turbidity alone is not a reliable control mechanism. The conversation highlighted the need for continued research, better integration of risk tolerance into planning, and the importance of maintaining flexibility in experimental design and implementation.

## 8) Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) Report and FY2026 Budget Planning

During the session on the Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) Report and FY2026 Budget Planning, BAHG Chair Erik Skeie (State of Colorado) provided an overview of the group's activities and the challenges faced in developing a recommendation due to ongoing federal budget uncertainties. The BAHG had two main tasks in 2025: evaluating the Triennial Work Plan (TWP) process and reviewing the FY2026 budget. While the TWP process evaluation began using a 2016 draft budget process document as a framework, it was paused due to the lack of clarity around federal funding and staffing. The BAHG intends to resume this work in the fall, pending more stability.

For the FY2026 budget, the BAHG was unable to make a formal recommendation because no definitive budget numbers were available from Reclamation or GCMRC. In response, the BAHG conducted a stakeholder prioritization survey to gather input on which projects were most critical to achieving Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan (LTEMP) goals and which could tolerate reduced precision. The survey received 11 responses initially, later increasing to 17 of 21 voting members after additional outreach. The results were not intended to be definitive but to serve as guidance for future planning.

The DOI also conducted a separate prioritization exercise, ranking projects based on compliance needs and alignment with LTEMP experiments. These two sets of priorities—BAHG stakeholder input and DOI agency rankings—were presented side by side for comparison. Some members

expressed concern about the potential for misinterpretation of the survey results and emphasized the need for more discussion and transparency.

Ultimately, the BAHG did not reach consensus on a formal recommendation. Instead, they proposed draft motion language for TWG consideration, suggesting that GCMRC develop three budget scenarios (5%, 10%, and 15% reductions) and use the BAHG and DOI prioritizations as guidance. The TWG agreed to continue discussions and potentially reconvene before the August 2025 Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG) meeting to finalize a recommendation. The session highlighted the importance of flexibility, collaboration, and clear communication in navigating the current fiscal challenges.

## Day 2 – July 10

### 9) Welcome and Administrative

On Day 2 of the July 2025 TWG meeting, Chair Seth Shanahan reconvened the group, confirmed quorum, and welcomed participants. He acknowledged that the meeting was originally intended to be in person and reiterated his earlier apology for the extended hours caused by the unchanged agenda following the shift to a virtual format. Attendees were again asked to enter their names and affiliations in the chat window to assist with attendance tracking.

Seth conducted a roll call of TWG members and alternates, confirming broad representation across federal agencies, tribes, states, NGOs, and hydropower contractors. He also confirmed the presence of the DFO, which is required for the meeting to proceed. No unresolved issues from Day 1 were raised beyond the ongoing discussion about the FY2026 budget.

Jeremy Hammen confirmed there were no additional administrative updates. Seth noted that the main focus of Day 2 would be to continue the budget discussion, particularly reviewing the Department of the Interior's prioritization list and the updated TWG stakeholder survey results. He emphasized the importance of open dialogue and collaboration in working toward a potential recommendation to the AMWG.

### 10) Development of Budget Recommendation for AMWG

During the session on the Development of a Budget Recommendation for the AMWG, the TWG focused on reviewing and discussing two key sources of input: the DOI project prioritization list and the TWG stakeholder prioritization survey. Chair Seth Shanahan emphasized the importance of open dialogue and collaboration in working toward a potential recommendation, while acknowledging the challenges posed by ongoing federal budget uncertainties.

Jeremy Hammen and other DOI representatives explained the methodology behind their prioritization, which was based on compliance with legal mandates (such as the Endangered Species Act and Grand Canyon Protection Act) and alignment with LTEMP experimental goals. Projects were ranked from 1 to 40, with lower numbers indicating higher priority. High-priority

projects included those related to humpback chub monitoring, streamflow and sediment transport, and riparian vegetation monitoring. Some members, including Helen Fairley (GCMRC), raised concerns that certain rankings may have been based on misunderstandings of project scope or purpose—for example, the distinction between ground-based vegetation monitoring and vegetation treatment experiment monitoring.

The Technical Work Group also reviewed the updated results of the stakeholder survey, which had increased to 17 of 21 voting members after additional outreach. The survey asked members to rate each project's importance to LTEMP goals and the impact of reducing precision. While the results were not intended to be definitive, they were meant to provide guidance for future planning. Some members, including Bill Persons (TU) and Brian Healy, expressed concern about the potential for misinterpretation of the survey data and emphasized the need for further discussion to understand differing stakeholder values and priorities.

Ultimately, TWG did not adopt a formal budget recommendation during the meeting. Instead, members discussed the possibility of recommending that GCMRC develop three budget scenarios (5%, 10%, and 15% reductions) using both the DOI and TWG prioritizations as guidance. There was general agreement that more time was needed to review the data, understand the implications, and potentially reconvene before the August 2025 AMWG meeting to finalize a recommendation. The session underscored the importance of transparency, flexibility, and continued collaboration in navigating the current fiscal challenges.

## 11) Stakeholder Input for Hydropower Workshop

During the session on Stakeholder Input for the Forthcoming Hydropower Workshop, TWG did not engage in a detailed discussion, as this agenda item was not covered in depth due to time constraints and the extended focus on budget planning. However, the topic was acknowledged as important, and it was noted that the Reclamation had been working with the Udall Foundation to help organize the workshop. The workshop is intended to gather input from a broad range of stakeholders on hydropower-related issues within the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (GCDAMP). While no formal input was collected during the meeting, TWG expressed interest in continuing to support the planning process and anticipated receiving updates at future meetings.

## 12) Threatened and Endangered Fish Species Planning Updates

During the session on Threatened and Endangered Fish Species Planning Updates, Deb Williams from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provided an overview of the agency's evolving approach to recovery planning and implementation for Colorado River endangered fish species. She explained that the Service has been revisiting its strategies for recovery planning, species status assessments, five-year reviews, and recovery implementation strategies. While the discussion did not delve deeply into specific species updates, Deb noted that her presentation the following day

would provide more detail on the current status and planning efforts for all Colorado River fish species under the Service's jurisdiction.

Leslie James expressed interest in understanding how the Fish and Wildlife Service assesses risk in its decision-making processes, particularly in the context of endangered species management. Deb responded that the Service bases its decisions on the best available science, and she acknowledged that the upcoming presentation would help clarify how risk is evaluated and incorporated into recovery planning. The conversation highlighted stakeholder interest in better understanding the Service's methodologies and the importance of aligning program actions with regulatory and conservation priorities.

### 13) Structured Decision Analysis Approaches

During the session on Structured Decision Analysis Approaches, Brian Healy introduced the concept of incorporating formal risk tolerance into decision-making processes within the GCDAMP. He explained that natural resource managers often exhibit low risk tolerance and that structured decision-making (SDM) tools can help clarify and quantify those preferences. One method involves eliciting stakeholder responses to a series of questions to develop individual or group risk curves, which can then be integrated into decision models. These curves help distinguish between risk-averse, risk-neutral, and risk-seeking attitudes, allowing for more transparent and informed trade-off evaluations.

Brian emphasized that incorporating risk tolerance into SDM could improve how the program navigates complex decisions, such as those involving endangered species or experimental flow actions. He also noted that while the program has used SDM in the past, there is room to expand its application, particularly in areas where stakeholder values and risk perceptions diverge. The discussion highlighted interest in exploring these tools further, with several participants acknowledging the potential benefits of better understanding and integrating risk tolerance into program planning and evaluation.

### 14) Monitoring Metrics and Knowledge Assessments

During the session on Monitoring Metrics and Knowledge Assessments, the TWG received a brief update on the status of ongoing work related to evaluating program effectiveness and identifying knowledge gaps. It was noted that while a final report on monitoring metrics was not yet available, a short update would be provided by Helen Fairley in a subsequent agenda item. The group acknowledged that this work remains a priority, particularly as it relates to assessing the performance of LTEMP experiments and informing future decision-making. There was also recognition that the topic would need to remain on the action item list until the final report is completed and distributed. The discussion underscored the importance of having robust metrics and assessments in place to evaluate progress toward program goals and to support adaptive management.



### 15) Avian Monitoring (SWFL, Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle)

During the session on Avian Monitoring, the TWG received updates on efforts to monitor the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (SWFL), Bald Eagle, and Golden Eagle populations within Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Grand Canyon National Park. The presentation, which was scheduled in response to a previous action item, was provided by the National Park Service. It highlighted ongoing monitoring activities and the importance of these efforts in understanding the status and trends of these protected bird species. The discussion acknowledged that avian monitoring plays a key role in meeting compliance requirements and informing adaptive management decisions, particularly in relation to habitat changes influenced by dam operations and vegetation management. TWG expressed appreciation for the update and recognized the value of continuing these monitoring efforts as part of the broader ecological assessment framework.

### 16) October Field Trip Planning

During the discussion on October Field Trip Planning, the TWG confirmed that the next meeting is scheduled for October 8–9, 2025, and there is a strong effort underway to hold it in person. Reclamation staff, including Jeremy Hammen, emphasized that they are fully committed to making the in-person meeting happen and are actively working through logistical challenges. Tara Ashby (Reclamation) noted that while the meeting is not yet officially confirmed, the team is putting in an “all-in effort” to secure the necessary arrangements. The group acknowledged that holding in-person meetings has been difficult in recent years, but there is broad support for returning to that format. The potential for a field trip component during the October meeting was also mentioned, though specific details were not discussed. The conversation reflected optimism and determination to reestablish in-person engagement among TWG members.

### 17) Emerging Issues and Next Agenda Items

During the discussion on Emerging Issues and Next Agenda Items, the TWG addressed several forward-looking topics and logistical considerations. One of the key points was the importance of maintaining momentum on high-flow experiments (HFEs), particularly in the spring. Lynn Hamilton, speaking during the public comment period, emphasized the need for proactive planning to ensure that opportunities for spring HFEs are not missed due to administrative or logistical delays. She also expressed appreciation for the efforts of federal partners and stakeholders in navigating the current challenges.

Additionally, the group acknowledged that several agenda items from the July meetings such as stakeholder input for the hydropower workshop, structured decision analysis, and monitoring metrics—would benefit from further discussion at future meetings. The October 2025 TWG meeting, which is being planned as an in-person event in Phoenix, was identified as the next opportunity to revisit these topics. There was also interest in including a field trip component during that meeting, though specific plans were still under development. Overall, the session

underscored the need for continued collaboration, flexibility, and strategic planning to address emerging issues and ensure the program remains responsive to evolving conditions.

## 18) Public Comment

During the Public Comment portion of the meeting, Lynn Hamilton from Grand Canyon River Guides expressed appreciation for the efforts of federal partners and stakeholders in managing the GCDAMP under challenging circumstances. She emphasized the importance of maintaining momentum on HFEs, particularly in the spring, and urged the group to ensure that planning and logistical preparations are not delayed, which could result in missed opportunities. Lynn also highlighted the need for proactive coordination to avoid administrative barriers that might prevent timely implementation of HFEs. She closed by thanking everyone for their continued dedication and collaboration.

Additionally, Bill Persons shared a comment referencing an email he received from a member of the public expressing concern over the perceived exclusion of rainbow trout monitoring from the budget. He noted that this perception may reflect a broader misunderstanding among the public and emphasized the importance of clear communication about program priorities and decisions. This comment underscored the need to ensure that stakeholder and public concerns are acknowledged and addressed transparently.

## Participants

### TWG Members, Alternates, and Leadership

Ben Reeder (Grand Canyon River Guides)	Jeremy Hammen (Reclamation)
Betsy Morgan (State of Utah)	Jerry Wilhite (WAPA)
Bill Persons (TU)	Joe Duncan (State of Wyoming)
Brent Powers (Navajo Nation)	Ka-Voka Jackson (Hualapai Tribe)
Buddy Fazio (NPS-GLCA)	Kurt Dongoske (Pueblo of Zuni)
Hannah Chambless (NPS-GRCA)	Larry Stevens (GCWC)
Colleen Cunningham (State of New Mexico)	Leslie James (CREDA)
Daniel Bulletts SPC (Unverified)	Marc Wicke (SRP)
Danielle Collins (State of Nevada)	Mel Fegler (State of Wyoming)
David Rogowski (AZGFD)	Michelle Garrison (State of Colorado)
David Ward (USFWS)	Noftsker, Christina (State of New Mexico)
Deb Williams (USFWS)	Richard M. Begay (Navajo Nation)
Emily Omana (NPS-GRCA)	Rob Billerbeck (NPS-GLCA)
Emily Young (State of Arizona)	Rudy Keedah (BIA)
Erik Skeie (State of Colorado)	Seth Shanahan (TWG Chair)
Erik Stanfield (Navajo Nation)	Shana Rapoport (State of California)
Jakob Maase (Hopi Tribe)	Ted Rampton (UMPA)

## Other GCDAMP Members and Interested Persons

Alex Pivarnik (RECLAMATION)	Kathy Callister (DFO-BOR)
Colleen Allen	Katrina Grantz (RECLAMATION)
Alyxandra Richards	Kevin Bullets (BARA/SPC)
Becki Bryant (RECLAMATION)	Rebecca Koller (NPS-GRCA)
Bill Stewart (RECLAMATION)	Kurt Shollenberger (NPS-GRCA)
Matthew Boggie (FWS)	Lynn Hamilton (GCRG)
Brandon Loomis	Mariah Giardina (GCMRC)
Brian Healy (GCMRC)	Mark Anderson (GCMRC)
Ann-Marie Bringhurst, (GCMRC)	Sabrina Martz
Carissa Wilkerson	Matt Kaplinski (GCMRC)
Cassandra Reed (NPS)	Matt O'Neill (RECLAMATION)
Craig Dengel	Michael Squires
Dale Stahlecker	Nicki Gibney (NPS)
David Rheinheimer (External)	Noe Santos (RECLAMATION)
David Topping (GCMRC)	Paul Grams (GCMRC)
David Dean (GCMRC)	Katrina Piersel
Bridget Deemer (GCMRC)	Pilar Rinker (FWS)
Drew Eppehimer (GCMRC)	Alexandria Popores (NPS)
Ernest Rheume (RECLAMATION)	Taryn Preston (NPS-GLCA)
Thomas Gushue (GCMRC)	Ronda Newton (NPS-GRCA)
Meredith Hartwell (GCMRC)	Sarah Haas (NPS)
Brian Healy (GCMRC)	Andrew Schultz (GCMRC)
Heather Whitlaw (USFWS)	Seth Cohen (Udall)
Betsy Hedden (RECLAMATION)	Sheri Farag (SRP)
Shaula Hedwall (FWS)	Kurtis Shollenberger (NPS-GRCA)
Helen Fairley (GCMRC)	Tara Ashby (RECLAMATION)
Gregory Holm (NPS-GRCA)	Laura Tennant (NPS-GRCA)
Jeffrey J. Woner	Kathryn Thomas (GCMRC)
Jim Strogon (TU)	Warren Turkett (State of Wyoming)
John Barry	Abigail Winrich (NPS-GRCA)
Julie Carter (AZGFD)	Susan Wood (NPS-GRCA)
Katherine Behn (GCMRC)	Charles Yackulic (GCMRC)