

Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG)

FINAL

**Minutes of October 21, 1999 Meeting
Phoenix, Arizona**

Presiding: Stephen Magnussen, USBR (Chairperson)

Recorder: Linda Whetton, BOR

10/21/99: Convened: 9:35 a.m. **Adjourned:** 3:40 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions

Stephen Magnussen introduced himself as the Secretary's Designee and Chairman for this committee. He welcomed the committee members, member alternates, and visitors to the meeting. This meeting will focus on the work that has been done on the goals associated with the mission and vision statement which was adopted at the last meeting.

Roll Call. There were 17 members initially present so a quorum was achieved.
(Attachment 1- Sign-In Sheet for AMWG Members/Alternates/Public)

Administrative Items:

- C Stephen welcomed Linda Whetton as a Management Analyst who will be working for Randy Peterson and will be the permanent recorder for both the AMWG and TWG meetings. If you need to contact her, her e-mail address is **lwhetton@uc.usbr.gov**.
- C Stephen provided an update on the status of the GCMRC director's position. Barry Gold has been recommended by the selecting official who is part of the USGS and it is presently working its way through the approval process in the Department of the Interior.
- C Stephen informed the members that the minutes for the last AMWG meeting are still in draft form and copies are available on the back table for review. They will be approved in the January 2000 meeting.
- C Stephen met with Mark Schaefer on the institutional home issue last week. He said Mark is anxious to get the issue resolved but no decision has been made. He asked Stephen to inform the AMWG that this is a high priority for him and hopefully will be resolved in the very near future.
- C Travel Authorizations are an annual process so those who need them. contact Linda.

her and the other members on the subcommittee: Andre Potochnik, Amy Heuslein, Rick Johnson, Wayne Cook, Clay Bravo, Ted Rampton, and Jerry Zimmerman. Based on the comments received, the AMWG will determine what the next step will be.

AMWG Ad Hoc Committee Report - Mary Orton

Mary stated that this was a group comprised of both AMWG and TWG members. In addition, Barry Gold and Randy Peterson assisted in providing technical expertise and support and guidance from the perspectives of the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center and Bureau of Reclamation.

The Vision and Mission Statement (Attachment 2) was developed on the river trip in May and was adopted at the July 1999 AMWG meeting.

The next steps were to define goals and then objectives. The AMWG gave a charge to a new strategic planning ad hoc group to look at the Vision Statement and develop goals (Attachment 3). The process the group followed fit well with recommendations from the NRC to adopt a vision with very clear goals (Attachment 4). The group tested the goals by arraying old management objectives under the goals to see how they would fit. Many of the goals are very similar to the old MOs so the group lifted the level of specificity up from a management objective to a goal which means that the management objectives now will need to be much more specific to tell us how we're going to achieve the goal.

The group developed some goals and suggested management objectives that probably couldn't be paid for out of power revenues so an additional task would define responsibilities for these goals. Each year the AMP would examine priorities and goals as input to the budget process. On a less frequent basis the goals will need to be re-addressed rather significantly as new information is learned about the Grand Canyon ecosystem. Some goals may be unrealistic or irrelevant while others might turn out to be key issues. The goal document will grow and change as more is learned through the adaptive management process.

AMP Strategic Plan Principles - Draft by AMWG Goals Ad Hoc Group (Attachment 5).

The Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Group developed guiding principles that hadn't been captured in the

possibly creating another goal. Stephen Magnussen said his recollection of the Charter of the Adaptive Management Program includes a recognition that there may be some things in there that aren't necessarily funded under power revenues so AMP isn't synonymous with being funded or not being funded by power revenues. The Charter recognizes that there might be other funding resources under the AMP other than power revenues.

Recommendation: Add "look for other funding sources" and alternatively address in goals and objectives.

- 2 Concern about the wording "much is unknown about the Colorado River ecosystem ...". Much is known and reference should be made to information that currently exists.

Recommendation: Consider revising the statement to read: "A good body of knowledge exists but much remains to be known." It needs to be tied into adaptive management.

- 3 Bruce Taubert recommended the following words be added after the word "dam," human disturbance, air pollution, noise pollution and possibly others.

Recommendation: Add "human disturbance, air pollution, noise pollution" as factors that have changed the ecosystem.

- 4 Cliff Barrett asked about phrase, "to benefit native and non-native resources..." Did the group mean non-native species or just all the resources in the canyon like recreation, boating, etc.? Mary said that it doesn't mean all the resources in the canyon nor all non-native species. It means there are some natives and non-natives that we will be managing to benefit.

Recommendation: Change the word "resources" to "species"

- 7 Question: Are experiments going to be done within the provisions of the Law of the River? Goal #4 refers to that. Mary said the group didn't feel that it needed to be addressed in every goal since it was contained in the vision/mission statement.

Recommendation: Reword so that "additional experiments should be conducted within the Law of the River."

on the goals.

The following are the comments recorded on the “flip charts:” Note: Many of the comments were not delivered in sequential order so an attempt was made to consolidate by goal:

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Comments</u>
1	prioritization is a future step replace - “native” with “existing” protect existing foodbase
2	Frame broader goal that includes several more specific goals (#2-6, 7-8) - maintain endangered species - investigate reintroduction possibilities - Table 2-7 of EIS should be used to define species of concern (responsibility should also be defined) - “remove jeopardy” means from the operation of Glen Canyon Dam, rather than recovery of species.
7 & 8	could address the issue of predator control of non-native species.
8	reintroduction of the otter could be viewed as exotic → rewrite goal (endemic otter is extinct)
9	should not restrict hatchery augmentation Change “removal” to “avoidance” (avoidance of jeopardy higher priority than “wild reproducing”
10	change “species” to “fish”
11	Ecosystem goals should be defined Delete goal #11 / retain goal #11 Make goal #11 a management objective this is the only goal that deals with water characteristics Concern over “within the range of natural variability” is too broad

Category B: Riparian Ecosystem

- #14 why worry about “spring species” more than other endemic species?
- add to “unique areas/species”
- Suggested MO2 better placed under #14

Collapse 14-16 into one goal

- 15 Maintain native biodiversity - system
only break out listed species
17 isn't “SMART” goal (put in principles or mission)

Public Comment on Categories on A & B: None

Category C: Socio-cultural Resources

- 18 delete “native”
Prefer natural processes
What ecosystem is desired? (need to define)
Principles lead us to more like pre-dam ecosystem (though not completely)
- 19 not viewed as true statement. Substitute language from Guidance Document pg. 4
benefit all resources - benefit power as well - not in conflict w/pg. 4 of Guidance Document
- 20 funding is an issue
“recording knowledge” not compatible w/GCPA
for sites under jurisdiction of NPS, add NPS, Federal agencies and other entities after affiliated tribes - also P.A. signatories → involve these in developing goals/MOs
do no harm vs. protect?
add “as appropriate” after “cultural properties” and delete “or” - substitute “or” with “and/or”
tribes concerned about dispersing sacred knowledge
GCPA requires site protection

Action: Amy will confer with the tribes and provide comments back to the committee. Mindy Schlingen-Wilson mentioned that the PA people had done a lot of work in this area and suggested that Nancy Coulam provide that documentation to a member of the Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Group for further discussion.

21 should be a principle
recognizes consumptive use benefit of Lake Powell

22 delete "native"

Public Comment on Category C:

(Ruth Lambert)- Regarding #20, protection and mitigation are really two opposites. Suggest that the goal is really protection of cultural sites. You mitigate only if you can't protect and in some cases, mitigation is not possible. Archaeology sites are now called cultural resource sites.

(Pam Hyde) Would like to echo what was said about goal #21, think this is encompassed in Principle #4. While it might be beneficial to use as a legal term in the law of the river, I think out of context with some of the other aspects of the law, it could be completely misinterpreted.

(David Wyaco, Sr., Zuni Tribal Council) Regarding goal #20, Grand Canyon is considered very significant to our tribe. I think our people would appreciate that if we could keep those sacred sites as they are rather than even interpreting them. When you start interpreting such sites as what they are, then we excite the outsiders to become more interested and they start desecrating. These sites are very valuable to us and we would like to have them left as they are. With your help in putting this language together, we can work together to help us protect all our interests. Don't put in language as "will be protected or interpreting or record knowledge."

Category D: Administration

23 **EAMO** #1 (MO 39) and MO18 belong to another goal.
delete "adaptive ecosystem management"
MO # 17 - parity refers to GCMRC, AMWG, - SAB or I.R.P. (TWG is subgroup of AMWG) - use consistent terms

Canyon) were established as part of the National Park System - add GCPA statute
Omit federalism issues between the agencies and include language concerning far
reaching stakeholders in the state of Arizona and the Indian tribes - eliminate just the
Department of the Interior.

Public Comment on Category D:

(Pam Hyde) - Want to register my real pleasure with the inclusion of #24, outreach to the public.
As someone who has been a part of this process and now being part of the public, I want to just
relate that Glen Canyon Institute held a conference in Salt Lake City last week and one of the
things we did was bring a lot of environmentalists together. A lot of them didn't have any idea
what was going on in the Adaptive Management Process. There is no information going out of
these particular rooms if you don't make the effort to come here. That's a real disservice to the
Colorado River management as a whole.

(Barry Wirth) - have prepared a detailed report for Charley Calhoun to get involved in that
process. Working to get information disseminated on the web, videos, etc.

Mary advised that if there were any additional comments, they should be directed to members of
the committee: Andre Potochnik, Amy Heuslein, Rick Johnson, Wayne Cook, Clay Bravo, Ted
Rampton, and Jerry Zimmerman.

Action: Stephen asked that the group convene again and discuss the above and prepare a report
for the next AMWG meeting in January 2000.

Guidance Document - Scott Loveless

Scott passed out copies of page 5 of the revised guidance document (Attachment 6) and
addressed the issue of downramp rates. The third paragraph on page 5 discusses a downramp
rate of 1500 cfs per hour integrated across the hour as being a firm limit. There remains a
question as to what that firm limit is referring and a question on how to interpret the ROD,
whether that is a limit that should never be exceeded or if it is a target without the certainty of
actually being hit. The language in question in the circulated draft says, "these figures should be

Dave Sabo said that since there are a lot of people around the table that weren't involved in the Glen Canyon EIS process, it would be valuable to have a "hydropower 101" discussion. He said WAPA collects the schedules from the customers, transfer that information to their office in Montrose and then to the dam. The dam actually implements the schedule. Dave drew a diagram on the board to illustrate how the schedule is adjusted on an hourly basis. The problem that Scott discussed is that we don't know if we've achieved a 1500 cfs downramp change until the hour is ended.

There was discussion what would to do next, whether additional information was needed, or if the Secretary should provide further clarification on the language. Scott said there are two ways of reading the document and he tried to explain what he thought the Secretary meant when he signed the ROD. It is then up to the committee to say if they need to modify it. He has tried to make the best cut on the question but this was intended as guidance to the AMWG in their deliberations.

Dave Cohen said the catalyst for starting this discussion was to see if they could offer WAPA some additional flexibility in their operations while not impacting resources downstream. They made an effort over a year ago to start the dialogue and it had not progressed as quickly as they had hoped. They felt today's discussion was a first step in getting this done. He feels they are on their way to doing that and has trust in Dave to get this done and would prefer that no changes be made at this point in time.

Scott responded to Clay's concern about the issue of the AMP looking only at resources inside the National Park boundaries or looking at the Canyon as a whole, questioning if titles in acts such as the Grand Canyon Protection Act have legal effect. Scott replied that the courts have determined that titles in acts are only titles and that the actual language of the law are the substantive provisions of the act. He drafted the guidance document the way he did because the operative language in the act talks about the values for which the national parks were established. That does not mean, however, that resources on adjacent lands will also not be benefitted.

Action: Additional comments on the Guidance Document should be sent to Scott by November 19, 1999.

Kurt said there were several topics discussed:

- 1) There was general consensus to consider the Grand Canyon a traditional cultural property that is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. The eligibility boundaries would be from rim to rim and most of the PA signatories agreed that that was a good boundary to establish. A draft MOU was constructed identifying the boundaries for the traditional cultural property designation. This will be supported by documentation from the tribes.
- 2) It's unclear right now whether the TCP designation will actually go through a formal nomination process so that it is actually listed on the National Register for Historic Places or whether it will just be managed and dealt under the consideration that it is determined eligible for the National Register.
- 3) They also reviewed Tom King's assessment report. He is one of the authors of National Register Bulletin No. 38 which identifies traditional cultural properties and how they may be eligible to the National Register. He reviewed the entire PA program and offered some comments: He thought the program focused too much on archaeology and didn't focus sufficient attention on the other values that make the Grand Canyon significant, and also that we should pay attention to other resources that are contributing elements that make the property a register eligible property. Some of the values would be the tribal values and other values by other communities that place great value on the Grand Canyon (e.g., the river running community). He also suggested we continue development of the Historic Preservation Plan. There was unanimous agreement among the signatories to complete the HPP.
- 4) There was a discussion over reevaluating the area of potential effect. The area of potentially effect is defined within the NHPA as the area that any undertaking has the potential to impact adversely or not historic properties that are considered eligible to the National Register. We have a way to go before we can actually reevaluate the area of potential effect.
- 5) Another aspect that would need to be reevaluated and defined by the PA is what constitutes a direct effect on historic properties from the operations of a dam? What constitutes indirect effect? What would constitute a cumulative effect? The NHPA does

archaeological approach but more an anthropological approach.

- 7) The final thing discussed was tribal participation and funding for tribal participation in the AMP. Right now in FY2000 and 2001, funding for that participation is coming out of the monies that were slated for the compliance and programmatic agreement program. At that meeting they stated that they didn't think it was appropriate for the PA program to fund solely tribal participation. Tribal participation should be funded out of the greater AMP and that it should be planned for in the future more effectively than it has been up to this time. They also suggested to the USBR that they become involved in greater dialogue with the tribes to identify what funding levels each individual tribe felt they needed to adequately participate.

PA Budget - Nancy Coulam

The PA group discussed three general goals for FY 2000 and 2001 in terms of PA activities. First, the top goal was to complete the protocol evaluation of the overall programs, the socio-cultural program at the GCMRC as well as Reclamation's compliance programs. It will be an integrated protocol evaluation and all of the PA signatories and the GCMRC are working to get that organized. Second, they also agreed to complete the HPP, which will serve as their strategic plan in guiding compliance and other cultural resource activities over the next 5 years. One of their goals is to get better integration with the other programs as a whole, whether it is the GCMRC, the TWG, strategic plans, etc. Third, they also articulated a goal of increasing opportunities for the tribes and those goals are reflected in some of the PA budget decisions.

For FY 2000, they have \$973,000 which includes money for tribal participation in the overall programs of the AMWG and TWG, the programmatic agreement, and cultural resource monitoring and compliance. With these tasks in mind, the specific PA line items were developed (see Attachment 7)

Because traditional cultural properties are a relatively new category of property eligible to the Register and because of the importance of them in the Grand Canyon in particular, they don't know how to mitigate for those tribal values right now.

Rob Arnberger was concerned that there was an HPP that was almost finished two years ago and questioned why we're spending \$180,000 on something that was in a final draft two years ago. It has major implications relative to the funding in the other categories in terms of total availability of money. Nancy said that the structure of the plan done two years ago was good at the time but is lacking at this time, noting Tom King's comments. Nancy said that in recognition of the fact that we should have TCP's as eligible resources, we need to revisit how specific sites are managed in the canyon. That is not in the current plan. The draft plan does not contain site specific management information, nor does it contain any method or mechanism for providing a tradeoff between the values which made the resources eligible for the Register and trying to mitigate the effects. They will build on the existing plan.

Rob was concerned that as shown in the 2001 budget, the monitoring of sites in the Grand Canyon has been cut from almost \$260,000 down to \$130,000 and that has been with little or no agreement between the two agencies. Randy replied that the HPP and PEP review would determine the allocation of funds for monitoring and treatment of sites. For FY 2000, the issue was conflicting pressures for funding both participation and monitoring so it was a cut that Reclamation made to try and balance all the demands. The Bureau and the Park Service have taken a 25% cut in the FY 2000 budget in order to balance the budget. Rob said he felt it was a very strategic change of direction, potentially to move away from a monitoring protocol of those sites to something less than that and that is a very fundamental change of course that he didn't feel should be ascribed to the difficulties of trying to find a way to fund the tribes involvement.

Clay said that tribal participation is different from cultural resources in the PA. That component should come from a different account. Stephen said that Reclamation is currently involved in ongoing conversations with the Budget Office as part of the Department of the Interior to determine if there other ways or mechanisms of which funding can be made available. Tribal participation is a line item and there was concern that dollars that should be going to towards cultural resources, historic preservation plans, or monitoring are actually going to the tribes to participate in the AMWG. Clay asked what the tribes can do to assist in the process that is ongoing and also what other agencies in the AMWG can do to facilitate the tribes getting more money.

Rob stated that as an advisory group to the Secretary of the Interior, if this group feels it is important to give advice to the Secretary of the Interior to take some action to fund the tribal

Stephen would like to see this discussed at the next AMWG meeting in January.

Status Report on Budget Ad Hoc Group - Bruce Taubert

(Attachment 9) - The Budget Ad Hoc Group was formed to make a recommendation to the GCMRC on how they could formulate their budget proposal for the January meeting so that all could better understand what dollars were associated with what tasks. The group also suggested that the Bureau also develop similar budget papers for line items I-IV for the January meeting. Present at the meeting were: Randy Peterson, Barry Gold, Vicki Kieffer, Don Bay, Dave Cohen, Renn Loefherner, Bill Persons, Mary Orton, and Bruce Taubert. Barry asked the group to think about how they would like to have these documents modified. GCMRC would like comments on Tables 1-3, 2.1, and 2.2 so they can revise the format and bring to the TWG on Dec. 7-8 for further discussion. Comments should be sent to Bruce Taubert by November 19, 1999.

Public Comment:

(Pam Hyde) - would like to request that Reclamation put the minutes of meetings on their website in a timely manner.

Next Meeting Date and Location: The next meeting will be January 20-21, 2000 at the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Phoenix, Arizona.

Possible Agenda Items for the Next Meeting:

Updated reports on:

- C Budget Report
- C Goals & Management Objectives
- C TCD briefing
- C Tribal participation issue - appropriated dollars

Dave Cohen said he would like an agenda item on federal trust responsibilities. A copy of Rebecca Tsosie's paper will be provided to him and also placed on the BOR website (Attachment 10).

Adjourn: There being no further business, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m. on October 21, 1999.

General Key to Adaptive Management Program Acronyms

ADWR - Arizona Department of Water Resources	IN - Information Need (stakeholder)
AF - Acre Feet	IT - Information Technology (GCMRC program)
AGFD - Arizona Game & Fish Department	KAS - Kanab ambersnail (endangered native snail)
AGU - American Geophysical Union	KAWG - Kanab Ambersnail Work Group
AM - Adaptive Management	LCR - Little Colorado River
AMP - Adaptive Management Program	LCRMCP: Little Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program
AMWG - Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Work Group (a FACA committee)	MAF - Million Acre Feet
AOP - Annual Operating Plan	MA - Management Action
BA - Biological Assessment	MO - Management Objective
BE - Biological Evaluation	NAAO - Native American Affairs Office
BHBF - Beach/Habitat-Building Flow	NAU - Northern Arizona University (Flagstaff, AZ)
BHMF - Beach/Habitat Maintenance Flow	NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act
BHTF - Beach/Habitat Test Flow	NGS - National Geodetic Survey
BIA - Bureau of Indian Affairs	NHPA - National Historical Preservation Act
BO - Biological Opinion	NPS - National Park Service
BOR - Bureau of Reclamation	NRC - National Research Council
CAPA - Central Arizona Project Assn.	NWS - National Weather Service
cfs - cubic feet per second	O&M - Operations & Maintenance (USBR funding)
CRBC - Colorado River Board of California	PA - Programmatic Agreement
CRCN - Colorado River Commission of Nevada	PEP - Protocol Evaluation Panel
CREDA - Colorado River Energy Distributors Assn.	Powerplant Capacity - 31,000 cfs
CRSP - Colorado River Storage Project	Reclamation - United States Bureau of Reclamation
CWCB - Colorado Water Conservation Board	RFP - Request For Proposals
DBMS - Data Base Management System	RPA - Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
DOI - Department of the Interior	SAB - Science Advisory Board
EA - Environmental Assessment	Secretary(^s) - Secretary of the Interior
EIS - Final Environmental Impact Statement	SWCA - Steven W. Carothers Associates
ESA - Endangered Species Act	TCD - Temperature Control Device (for Glen Canyon Dam water releases)
FACA - Federal Advisory Committee Act	TCP - Traditional Cultural Property
FEIS - Final Environmental Impact Statement	TES - Threatened and Endangered Species
FRN - Federal Register Notice	TWG - Glen Canyon Technical Work Group (a subcommittee of the AMWG)
FWS - United States Fish & Wildlife Service	UCR - Upper Colorado Region (of the USBR)
FY - Fiscal Year (Oct 1 to Sept 30 each year)	UCRC - Upper Colorado River Commission
GCD - Glen Canyon Dam	
GCMRC - Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research	