

BAHG Update and FY27 Recommendation

GCDAMP

Technical Work Group Meeting

June 10, 2026

BAHG Update and Recommendation

- Background:
 - TWP process
 - GCDAMP funding and budget
- GCMRC Process:
 - Survey, results, determination of target reductions
 - Strategies to meet target reductions: tradeoffs of impacts of budget reductions
 - BAHG discussion
- Reclamation Process
- BAHG FY27 Recommendation

The BAHG TWP Process

- BAHG works with BOR and GCMRC to develop TWP and annual Budget recommendations for TWG
- Currently working within the FY25-27 TWP approved by AMWG Aug 2024
- Recommendation this year will be an update for FY27
- TWG FY27 recommendation due to AMWG before its Aug. 20-21 meeting
- AMWG FY27 recommendation due to Secretary of Interior before Sep. 30, 2026
- 2027: Develop FY28-30 TWP

Funding & Budget Background

GCDAMP Authorization:

- P.L. 106-377 (Oct 2000) - Section 204: Authorizes Reclamation to fund activities of the GCDAMP as authorized by Section 1807 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-575)
- No more than \$7.85 million per year (October 2000 price level), adjusted in subsequent years to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index
- No sunset clause

Funding & Budget Background

FY26 Colorado River Compliance Activities Budget

- Appropriations in Public Law 119-74
- Includes Initial Units, Water Quality & Consumptive Use Studies
- FY26 Initial Units: \$20.667 M

Colorado River Compliance Activities	
Consumptive Use Studies	\$ 880,000
Initial Units	\$ 20,667,000
Water Quality Studies	\$ 1,170,000
Total	\$ 22,717,000

- Initial Units includes GCDAMP & 2 Recovery Programs
 - Typically 51% to GCDAMP, 49% to 2 RIPs
 - Typically 80% to GCMRC and 20% to BOR
- GCDAMP received \$10.6 M (BOR: \$2.1M, USGS \$8.5M)
 - Roughly 15% reduction from FY25 to FY26

Funding & Budget Background

FY2027 Anticipated GCDAMP Budget

- For FY27, Reclamation directed the GCDAMP through the BAHG process to start with the FY26 \$10.6 M (BOR - \$2.1 M; USGS - \$8.5 M) and develop 5% and 10% walkdown reduction scenarios.
 - 5% Walkdown = \$10.07 M (BOR \$2.01 M; USGS \$8.06 M)
 - 10% Walkdown = \$9.54 M (BOR \$1.91 M; USGS \$7.63 M)
- President's Budget recently released
 - \$21.799 M total, Initial Units \$20.060 M
 - 51%: \$10.23 M GCDAMP (BOR \$ 2.046 M, USGS \$8.184 M)
- Congress determines annual appropriations through legislation; after FY27 budget has been determined, BOR and USGS will use FY27 recommendation as guidance and adjust as necessary

Survey for GCMRC Budget & Workplan Priorities

- TWG Members: Non-DOI & DOI
- Similar to FY26 survey, different format
- Questions:
 - Scale: Impact of budget reductions
 - Sufficient data for management decisions
 - Sufficient data for assessing LTEMP resources & goals
 - Short answer
 - Biggest Concern for FY27 Workplan
 - What information do you need to properly advise DOI?
 - Points allocation: most important to meet LTEMP goals
 - Agreement rank: necessary to meet LTEMP goals
 - Max Diff: importance for decision making

Survey Results & Discussion

Project	Points Rank	Agreement	MaxDiff	Average
I.1 System-wide native fishes and invasive aquatic species monitoring \$384,206.54	2	6	1	3.00
A.1 Stream gaging and hydrologic analyses \$444,751.67	5	1	5	3.67
G.1 Humpback chub population modeling \$256,032.93	7	4	3	4.67
G.5 Monitoring humpback chub aggregation relative abundance and distribution \$253,175.54	1	7	7	5.00
I.4 Modeling population dynamics and improving forecasting tools for smallmouth bass and other non-native fish \$264,091.29	3	9	6	6.00
G.2 Annual spring/fall HBC abundance estimates in the lower 13.6 km of the LCR \$597,957.81	4	16	2	7.33
M.2 Logistics staff \$495,960.81	9	2	13	8.00
A.3 Sediment transport and budgeting \$695,181.40	8	12	10	10.00
G.3 Juvenile chub monitoring near the LCR confluence (JCM-East) \$630,262.11	10	11	9	10.00
K.2 Data management and database administration \$347,489.36	23	3	4	10.00
A.2 Continuous water quality parameters \$241,647.17	18	8	8	11.33
M.1 Leadership, management, and support \$1,018,132.05	15	5	16	12.00
I.2 Estimating kinship and spawner abundance of warm-water non-natives \$18,499.98	16	14	15	15.00
G.4 Remote PIT-tag array monitoring in the LCR \$37,519.26	19	10	17	15.33
I.3 Identifying emerging threats to the Colorado River Ecosystem using environmental DNA \$112,772.17	12	24	12	16.00
C.1 Ground-based riparian vegetation monitoring \$304,290.57	11	18	24	17.67
G.6 Juvenile chub monitoring - Western Grand Canyon (JCM-West) \$0.00	13	15	25	17.67
K.1 Enterprise GIS, geospatial analysis, and processing \$220,027.51	22	13	20	18.33
B.1 Sandbar and campsite monitoring with topographic surveys and remote cameras \$393,378.07	17	20	22	19.67
K.3 Data telemetry and field engineering \$168,501.42	24	23	14	20.33
B.2 Bathymetric and topographic mapping for monitoring sediment storage and riverbed dynamics \$556,525.69	26	27	11	21.33
H.1 Rainbow trout fishery monitoring in Glen Canyon \$99,875.03	6	26	33	21.67
D.1 Monitoring the effects of dam operations on archaeological sites \$380,158.00	25	22	19	22.00
J.1 Integrated models for adaptive management \$165,355.30	28	28	18	24.67
L.1 Analysis and interpretation of overflight remote sensing data \$332,316.35	31	19	26	25.33
F.2 Aquatic invertebrate monitoring in Glen Canyon \$175,743.51	32	21	23	25.33
H.2 Experimental flow assessment of trout recruitment (TRGD) \$336,922.80	14	25	38	25.67
M.3 IT \$81,135.50	30	17	31	26.00
J.3 Tribal resources research \$0.00	20	35	28	27.67
E.2 Rates and composition of primary producers in the Colorado River \$102,525.71	33	31	21	28.33
F.3 Aquatic invertebrate monitoring of Grand Canyon tributaries \$115,323.53	29	33	29	30.33

Survey Results & Discussion

- Concerns:
 - Budgetary constraints and financial uncertainty
 - Understanding impacts of reductions
 - Preservation of long-term data and monitoring
 - Program alignment and process
 - Operational impacts
 - Importance of projects not included in 2027 Workplan
- DOI & non-DOI survey results were scored and the scores were used to generate target reduction amounts for GCMRC projects

Survey Results & Discussion

Survey Results

The tables below include the survey results as shared from the DOI (average collective score), the BAHG (each survey result and an average), and the Grand Average (DOI and BAHG average scores averaged) used to generate targets in this plan.

PROJECT	DOI Total (Higher Score Higher Priority)	BAHG Points Rank	BAHG Agreement	BAHG MaxDiff	BAHG Average	GRAND ave RANK
A.1 Stream	62	5	1	5	3.666667	3.17
A.2 Contin	56	18	8	8	11.333333	8.67
A.3 Sedim	50	8	12	10	10	9.33
B.1 Sandb	53	17	20	22	19.666667	14.00
B.2 Bathyr	24	26	27	11	21.333333	30.50
B.3 Contro	32	52	55	43	50	43.50
B.4 Stream	17	34	41	45	40	43.00
C.1 Groun	50	11	18	24	17.666667	15.17
C.2 Deterri	30	48	43	42	44.333333	42.67
C.3 Predic	22	47	42	36	41.666667	39.50
C.4 Biogeo	37	38	36	34	36	35.67
C.5 Vegeta	4	56	39	54	49.666667	47.50
D.1 Monit	53	25	22	19	22	16.33
D.2 Monit	20	49	54	40	47.666667	38.67
D.3 Evalua	37	46	29	37	37.333333	33.00
D.4 Pilot s	11	45	56	56	52.333333	44.00
D.5 Monit	7	44	53	55	50.666667	46.83

GCMRC FY27 Budget and Workplan

REDUCTION SUMMARY TABLES

PROJECT ELEMENTS IN ORDER

ELEMENT	GRAND AVE RANK	15%	19.25%	23.50%
A.1	3.166667	M	M	M
A.2	8.666667	M	M	M
A.3	9.333333	M	M	M
B.1	14	M	M	M
B.2	30.5	T-	T--	T--
B.3	43.5	NF	NF	NF
B.4	43	NF	NF	NF
C.1	15.16667	M	M	T
C.2	42.66667	P	P	P
C.3	39.5	T	P	P
C.4	35.66667	T	P	P
C.5	47.5	NF	NF	NF
D.1	16.33333	M	M	T
D.2	38.66667	T	P	P
D.3	33	T	P	P
D.4	44	NF	NF	NF
D.5	46.83333	NF	NF	NF
E.1	33.66667	T	P	P
E.2	33.33333	T	P	P
E.3	44.33333	NF	NF	NF
E.4	34.83333	T	P	P
F.1	36.66667	T-	T	P
F.2	30.5	P	P	P
F.3	34.5	P	P	P
F.4	38.83333	T	P	P
G.1	4.833333	M	M	M
G.2	6	M	M	M
G.3	7.5	M	M	M
G.4	20.5	T	T+	T+
G.5	7.666667	M	M	M
G.6	24.33333	NF	NF	NF
G.7	41.66667	NF	NF	NF
G.8	38.16667	NF	NF	NF
G.9	36.5	NF	NF	NF

PROJECT ELEMENTS IN PRIORITY ORDER

ELEMENT	GRAND AVE RANK	15%	19.25%	23.50%
A.1	3.166667	M	M	M
I.1	3.166667	M	M	M
G.1	4.833333	M	M	M
I.4	5.666667	M	M	M
G.2	6	M	M	M
G.3	7.5	M	M	M
G.5	7.666667	M	M	M
A.2	8.666667	M	M	M
A.3	9.333333	M	M	M
M.2	12.66667	T+	T+	T+
B.1	14	M	M	M
K.2	14.66667	T+	T+	T+
C.1	15.16667	M	M	T
D.1	16.33333	M	M	T
I.2	16.5	M	M	M
I.3	17	T	T-	T-
H.1	18.16667	M	M	M
J.1	19.33333	M+++	M++	M+
G.4	20.5	T	T+	T+
K.3	20.83333	T+	T+	T+
H.2	24.16667	M	M-	M--
G.6	24.33333	NF	NF	NF
M.1	27	T+	T+	T+
K.1	30.16667	T+	T+	T+
B.2	30.5	T-	T--	T--
F.2	30.5	P	P	P
J.2	31.66667	P	P	P
H.3	32.33333	M	M	M-
D.3	33	T	P	P
E.2	33.33333	T	P	P
E.1	33.66667	T	P	P
L.1	34.33333	T-	T-	T-
F.3	34.5	T	P	P
J.3	34.5	NF	NF	NF

These tables summarize the disposition of each Project Element in the reduction plan. To the left, Project Elements are presented in order. The right the same information is presented with Project Elements in their ranked order.

M = Maintained at TWP funding level,
 + = maintained at increased funding
 - = maintained with decreased funding

T = Reduced by target amount,
 + = reductions exceeded target,
 - = reductions below targets

P = Project Element paused for FY26

GCMRC FY27 Budget and Workplan

Reductions and budgets for all Project Elements at 15%, 19.25%, and 23.5% levels. FY26 budget reductions (yellow highlighted column titles) are included for comparison.

PROJECT	FY27TWP	GRAND AVE RANK	FY26 15 cut	FY26 15 %cut	FY26 15 Budget	FY27 15 cut	FY27 15 %cut	FY27 15 Budget	FY27 19.25 cut	FY27 19.25 %cut	FY27 19.25 Budg.	FY27 23.5 cut	FY27 23.5 %cut	FY27 23.5 Budget
A.1 Stream ga	\$444,752	3.166666667	\$0	0.00%	\$426,309	\$0.00	0.00%	\$444,751.67	\$0.00	0.00%	\$444,751.67	\$0.00	0.00%	\$444,751.67
A.2 Continuo	\$241,647	8.666666667	\$0	0.00%	\$226,260	\$0.00	0.00%	\$241,647.17	\$0.00	0.00%	\$241,647.17	\$0.00	0.00%	\$241,647.17
A.3 Sediment	\$695,181	9.333333333	\$0	0.00%	\$662,747	\$0.00	0.00%	\$695,181.40	\$0.00	0.00%	\$695,181.40	\$0.00	0.00%	\$695,181.40
B.1 Sandbar a	\$393,378	14	\$0	0.00%	\$380,824	\$0.00	0.00%	\$393,378.07	\$0.00	0.00%	\$393,378.07	\$0.00	0.00%	\$393,378.07
B.2 Bathymet	\$556,526	30.5	\$208,815	33.48%	\$434,804	\$94,990.38	17.07%	\$461,535.31	\$142,485.56	25.60%	\$414,040.13	\$142,485.56	25.60%	\$414,040.13
B.3 Control ne	\$0	43.5				\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
B.4 Streamflo	\$0	43				\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
C.1 Ground-b	\$304,291	15.166666667	-\$11,829	-4.29%	\$299,402	\$0.00	0.00%	\$304,290.57	\$0.00	0.00%	\$304,290.57	\$79,559.32	26.15%	\$224,731.25
C.2 Determin	\$64,348	42.666666667	\$68,083	100.00%	\$0	\$64,348.13	100.00%	\$0.00	\$64,348.13	100.00%	\$0.00	\$64,348.13	100.00%	\$0.00
C.3 Predictive	\$39,304	39.5	\$37,829	100.00%	\$0	\$13,021.02	33.13%	\$26,283.18	\$39,304.21	100.00%	\$0.00	\$39,304.21	100.00%	\$0.00
C.4 Biogeomc	\$53,682	35.666666667	\$0	0.00%	\$50,794	\$21,932.78	40.86%	\$31,749.46	\$53,682.23	100.00%	\$0.00	\$53,682.23	100.00%	\$0.00
C.5 Vegetatio	\$0	47.5				\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
D.1 Monitorir	\$380,158	16.333333333	\$67,399	18.88%	\$294,444	\$0.00	0.00%	\$380,158.00	\$0.00	0.00%	\$380,158.00	\$133,729.44	35.18%	\$246,428.56
D.2 Monitorir	\$79,941	38.666666667	\$22,028	28.59%	\$55,014	\$52,728.51	65.96%	\$27,212.46	\$79,940.97	100.00%	\$0.00	\$79,940.97	100.00%	\$0.00
D.3 Evaluatin	\$113,326	33	\$36,540	30.18%	\$87,456	\$90,437.09	79.80%	\$22,889.37	\$113,326.46	100.00%	\$0.00	\$113,326.46	100.00%	\$0.00
D.4 Pilot stud	\$0	44				\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
D.5 Monitorir	\$0	46.833333333				\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
E.1 Phosphor	\$59,395	33.666666667	\$9,016	30.11%	\$21,093	\$25,344.08	42.67%	\$34,051.38	\$59,395.46	100.00%	\$0.00	\$59,395.46	100.00%	\$0.00
E.2 Rates and	\$102,526	33.333333333	\$37,528	22.68%	\$128,189	\$74,767.75	72.93%	\$27,757.96	\$102,525.71	100.00%	\$0.00	\$102,525.71	100.00%	\$0.00
E.3 Understar	\$0	44.333333333				\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
E.4 Productiv	\$66,001	34.833333333	\$23,014	25.88%	\$65,901	\$32,379.20	49.06%	\$33,621.81	\$66,001.00	100.00%	\$0.00	\$66,001.00	100.00%	\$0.00
F.1 Invertebr	\$233,663	36.666666667	\$74,222	23.95%	\$235,701	\$24,815.00	10.62%	\$208,848.02	\$102,992.05	44.08%	\$130,670.97	\$233,663.02	100.00%	\$0.00
F.2 Aquatic in	\$175,744	30.5	\$39,218	25.40%	\$115,317	\$175,743.51	100.00%	\$0.00	\$175,743.51	100.00%	\$0.00	\$175,743.51	100.00%	\$0.00
F.3 Aquatic in	\$115,324	34.5	\$105,843	32.55%	\$0	\$97,909.52	84.90%	\$17,414.01	\$115,323.53	100.00%	\$0.00	\$115,323.53	100.00%	\$0.00
F.4 Invertebr	\$108,527	38.833333333	\$38,678	31.66%	\$84,708	\$97,600.70	89.93%	\$10,926.64	\$108,527.34	100.00%	\$0.00	\$108,527.34	100.00%	\$0.00
G.1 Humpbac	\$256,033	4.833333333	\$0	0.00%	\$243,019	\$0.00	0.00%	\$256,032.93	\$0.00	0.00%	\$256,032.93	\$0.00	0.00%	\$256,032.93
G.2 Annual sp	\$597,958	6	\$0	0.00%	\$582,435	\$0.00	0.00%	\$597,957.81	\$0.00	0.00%	\$597,957.81	\$0.00	0.00%	\$597,957.81
G.3 Juvenile c	\$630,262	7.5	\$0	0.00%	\$611,172	\$0.00	0.00%	\$630,262.11	\$0.00	0.00%	\$630,262.11	\$0.00	0.00%	\$630,262.11
G.4 Remote D	\$37,519	20.5	\$0	0.00%	\$35,851	\$6,157.90	16.41%	\$31,361.36	\$6,157.90	16.41%	\$31,361.36	\$6,157.90	16.41%	\$31,361.36

GCMRC Budget and Workplan Strategies

1. Prioritize fieldwork, maintain data collection/monitoring for all projects
2. Prioritize ESA compliance
3. Prioritize maintaining staff expertise

Reclamation Budget

Proposed Reductions to Reclamation side of Budget:

	Reclamation Adaptive Management Program Budget Summary FY25-27	2027 Budget	Budget at 95%	Budget 90%
3.A	Administrative Support for NPS Permitting	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$122,000

Impact: Travel for NPS permitting staff to attend GCDAMP meetings would be reduced or eliminated. Reductions in NPS permitting may put a higher burden on National Park Service to support the permitting staff for access to the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. This could result in prioritization and delays in river permitting GCDAMP projects to be completed.

	Reclamation Adaptive Management Program Budget Summary FY25-27	2027 Budget	Budget at 95%	Budget 90%
3.B	Contract Administration	\$130,000	\$129,050	\$115,000

Impact: Reductions in the contract administration may lead to limited ability to get all contracts in place for the fiscal year. It may lead Reclamation having to prioritize which projects are finished and which may have to be delayed. Additionally, with contracting services being consolidated under DOI, it is unknown how this may impact administrative funding for processing the dozens of agreements associated with the GDAMP.

	Reclamation Adaptive Management Program Budget Summary FY25-27	2027 Budget	Budget at 95%	Budget 90%
4.B	Science Advisors Program	\$75,000	\$64,000	\$14,000

Reclamation Budget

Table 1: Reclamation budget proposal for FY2027 at a 5% reduction and a 10% Reduction.

Reclamation Adaptive Management Program Budget Summary FY25-27		2027	95%	90%
	GCDAMP Total	\$10,625,000		
	Reclamation Total (20%)	\$2,125,000	\$2,018,750	\$1,912,500
	GCMRC Total (80%)	\$8,500,000	\$8,075,000	\$7,650,000
1	Adaptive Management Work Group	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$140,000
	<i>percent of BOR budget</i>	7%		
1.A	AMWG Direct Costs and Administration	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$140,000
1.B	AMWG Member Travel Reimbursement	\$-		
1.C	AMWG Facilitation and Notetaking	\$-		
1.D	Public Outreach - Reclamation public affairs, POAG	\$-		
2	Technical Work Group	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
	<i>percent of BOR budget</i>	9%		
2.A	Technical Work Group Costs (BOR)	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
2.B	TWG Member Travel Reimbursement	\$-		
2.C	TWG Facilitation	\$-		
3	Program Management and Contract Administration	\$450,000	\$449,050	\$422,000
	<i>percent of BOR budget</i>	21%		
3.A	Administrative Support for NPS Permitting	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$122,000
3.B	Contract Administration	\$130,000	\$129,050	\$115,000
3.C	Program Management	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$135,000
3.D	Program Evaluation	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000

BAHG Recommendation - Background

Budget Ad Hoc Group Report and Background:

The Budget Ad Hoc Group (BAHG) was tasked to work with the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC) and the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) on developing the Fiscal Year 2027 (FY27) Budget. GCMRC and BOR were asked to consider three budget scenarios: FY26 (which was a reduction of 15% from FY25), and reductions of 5% and 10% from FY26.

The BAHG recognizes uncertainty regarding current Federal Budgets and acknowledges the potential for limited available funding for the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program (GCDAMP) in FY27. Should reductions be necessary, then the lowest possible reductions should be applied to meet the available funding and continue to achieve the GCDAMP agreed upon work plan goals.

The BAHG met with GCMRC and BOR on April 28, May 8, May 26, June 5 and June 8, 2026 to receive and provide feedback on these scenarios.

On June 5 and 8, 2026 GCMRC presented three budget strategies to address tradeoffs from budget reductions (Strategy 1: preservation of field work, Strategy 2: ESA prioritization, Strategy 3: preservation of staff expertise). Strategy 3 was not finalized for review by the BAHG prior to the TWG meeting.

BOR provided a budget strategy to the BAHG on May 26, 2026. BAHG members provided written comments to BOR.

BAHG Recommendation: GCMRC

For GCMRC's FY27 Budget Scenarios:

- The BAHG recommends that GCMRC continue to modify the draft FY27 budget and workplan utilizing Strategies 2 and 3 and incorporating the comments below. The BAHG recommends additional discussion upon receipt of the revised draft.
 - Given unprecedented low reservoir storage levels and elevated water temperatures in 2026, the BAHG recommends prioritizing capturing data related to the unique and rapidly changing resource conditions expected to be present for informed LTEMP management decision-making. Examples include water temperature, water quality, entrainment, invasive species, sediment, and food base.

BAHG Recommendation: Reclamation

For BOR's FY27 Budget Scenarios:

- The BAHG recommends that BOR consider its feedback and is available for further discussion of the draft FY27 BOR budget and workplan.
- The BAHG recommends prioritizing funds from the Experimental Management Fund (4.C) in FY27 for monitoring, analysis of impacts and analysis of risks to humpback chub and other native fishes from the entrainment and establishment of smallmouth bass and other nonnative fishes. The BAHG recommends this prioritization regardless of whether experimental flows are implemented in FY27.



Questions?

michelle.garrison@state.co.us