

Consensus Building Workshop

March 9, 2011

Final Results

Compliance with law and policy

Compliance (Fed/state/tribal)
Compliance – ESA, NHPA, Law of River, EO13007
Consistency with park values and no impairment
Degree of linkage to dam operations
Related to GC Dam Operations
Meets mandates of GCPA
Comply with laws and regulations
Meets compliance needs (LOR, NEDA, etc...)
Meets legal goals/objectives
Related to “dam operations and other actions” (GCPA)

Data Quality

Geospatially and temporarily related datasets
Objectivity and replication of methods, measurements, and assessments
Appropriate scientific methods (controls, sample, bstudy decision)
Use of best science/technology and TEK
Data provides a measure of confidence/reliability
Result in measurable outcomes
Adequacy of existing knowledge
Robust metric for determining effects

Utility of Data

Data are useful and timely
Timeliness of information
Risk analysis ... does it contribute?
Ability to detect threats (contingency/risk assessment)
Flexibility in periodicty of monitoring
Relevance of measured indicators to dam operations
Dual role of data and use in model generation
Relevance to rigorous, defensible predictive model
Adaptable/flexibility of timing and frequency
Continuation of Legacy Data sets
Ability to detect trends
Continues long-term dataset
Metrics and indicators appropriate to CMINs

Minimize adverse impacts

Impact to visitor experience
Geographic and demographic extent of effects
Potential impact on resource being monitored
Minimal impacts to CRE
Impacts to Tribal Trust resources
Considers negative impacts on other resources

Integration of Cultural and social values

Considers environmental and cultural values

Zuni is happy
Considers economic values
Sensitive to tribal concerns
Stakeholder interest (i.e., AMG, TWG, public)
Satisfies tribal and public trust responsibilities
Considers social values
Tribal monitoring results can be meaningfully integrated
Culturally relevant and sensitive to cultural concerns

Addresses goals and priorities

Meets hierarchy of priorities
Does it relate to AMP goal?
AMP strategic plan
Meets program priorities
AMWG /sec of Interior priorities
Does it lead to DFC?
Addresses AMP goals 1-12
Contribute to management actions/decisions
Is there a defined goal
Meets SOTI goals
Appropriate to resource goals and CMINs
Are data linked to ends/objectives
DOI priorities vs. AMG priorities

Information Management

Adequacy of information management

Larry's Ecosystem Approach

Is it directed to keystone resources
Prioritized by trophic structure
Tie-in to ecosystem model
Integration into BIG picture (ecosystem)
Provides for multiple needs

Cost effectiveness and affordability

Good benefit/cost
Cost can be accommodated by program
Affordability and budget implications (cost)
Integration with other management programs
No duplication of effort
Cost/Benefit
Collaborative funding sources

Parking Lot

SA Review of Plan(s) (Process)

Next Steps

- Complete Appendix B
 - Integrate SA comments
 - Include criteria
- CMP AAG
 - Larry
 - Pam

- Jan
- Norm
- Bill
- Helen
- Paul
- Shane
- Process – SA review of plans – to be discussed

What are the benefits to working in a group?

- Collective wisdom – education, ideas, experience – differences
- Personal growth
- Sustainable decisions
- Better than alternative
- Accountability
- Commitment to implement

Meeting Evaluation

The meeting concluded with Mary asking TWG members to write down one thing they liked about the meeting and one thing they would change for next time. The results are below.

+	Δ
+ Great job on facilitation	Δ Linkages ignored or unclear.
+ Complexity of program well reflected	Δ Resolution and linkage not identified
+ Encouraging to see the support for the integration and importance of tribal and cultural values in the core monitoring	Δ Realistically this support for integration of tribal values has risen to the top in past TWG/AMWG exercises like this one, but it never gets the subsequent attention and work to integrate it in the program that it needs.
+ Clear statements of criteria	Δ Drill down into specifics
+ I felt this was a good integration of “teaching” a more open way of communicating and crunching out some needed work on CMP	Δ No downside
+ I liked that everyone’s ideas were heard and discussed	Δ A bit more time in the small groups would be helpful
+ Good ability to reach end point, intended goal	Δ At the point of breaking into small groups, work to produce integrated groups so there can be <u>more</u> cross fertilization of ideas. What was done was good and could be made even better!
+ Good integration of stakeholders into small groups – not done enough	Δ Constraints of instrument due to law suits and representing agency rather than personal priorities
+ Engaged the entire group/everyone was participating	Δ Maybe more reminders of the task to keep the group focused
+ Inclusiveness of process	Δ Better overview of CMP status/process/history
+ We accomplished something with everyone’s input	Δ Need to link the criteria rather than separate into categories
+ Small groups good approach for discussions/exercise	Δ It took quite a long time to get into the heart of useful discussion – but have to be sure you have laid enough groundwork for a positive outcome
+ You kept it interesting – no one went to sleep	Δ More time and maybe starting on a simpler “problem” to better see how the process works
+ The formal step of categorizing how decision will be made is very helpful in understanding each others’ perspectives better	Δ Don’t clearly see the transition from cards on the wall to formal written criteria document
+ Facilitator guided discussion and criteria setting	Δ A little more time for process – 1-2 hours
+ Facilitator brought together many varied individuals through experience.	Δ Left Blank
+ Ensuring collaborative approach	Δ Wasn’t sure why we had to pick 3 “clearest” criteria
+ Review of guidelines for productive group interaction (wish we could do it <u>before</u> every meeting!)	
+ Mary shows excellent patience with team members	

+

- who aren't excited about participating.
- + Good process to use group to get good cross section of ideas
- + The method of accomplishing the task together

Δ

- and then again. This seemed to take a long time. Easier for groups to just share criteria one at a time...kind of a round robin approach?
- Δ Discussion of relationship between CMP and individual CMPs and what this step means to that process could have had more clear clarification
- Δ Less intro. Not needed with the sophistication of this group