

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group  
December 5-6, 2006

**Public Comments presented on December 5, 2006**

Lynn Hamilton (Grand Canyon River Guides):

My initial thought is to talk on the ranking motion. At the TWG meeting motion #1 which was basically this initial motion before we amended it today was in my view kind of pre-empts and makes moot the motion #2 which was the ranking motion because we did not also include the MLFF which it was my understanding from John Hamill at the TWG meeting that the MLFF which obviously is the no action alternative should be included in its own right. If you're only ranking the four that came up, well three came up through the SPG and one from the TWG, and not including the MLFF, then you really haven't ranked the full range of what's going to be out there. In my view it's pre-decisional anyway. Also, as far as these five options are concerned what I would really like to bring home is sort of a broad philosophical point in regards to the Grand Canyon Protection Act and in my view the GCPA really indicated a societal shift that ecosystem management was a major, major concern. It was enacted because there was a problem to fix and that's why you guys have been sitting here for over ten years. I'm sure it seems like that today too, but in general terms, that's why you're here doing what you do and so I'm hoping that the options that come out of this will really be viewed in a very focused light as far as the GCPA is concerned. Thank you.

Roxane George (Sierra Club, Grand Canyon Chapter)

I haven't been very involved with this process but we certainly have been involved with this issue and so I would like to just say that a lot of what Lynn said about the GCPA and ecosystem resource protection is also I would say about our concerns and when I hear the talk about balance at this table, I'd just like to state for the record that the Sierra Club would like to see a priority as opposed to balance or equality of concerns and obviously there is a restoration problem here that has to be addressed. It's why you're going through this EIS process so we hope that you will prioritize and that this process will prioritize ecosystem restoration. Thank you.

Pamela Hyde, member of the public

I'm here today as member of the public, not representing anybody except myself. First of all, I'll commend Reclamation for putting this into a NEPA process because I think there is a tendency here to move along politicized lines and that essentially that takes it back out of the politicization of the AMWG process and I certainly know a little bit about that. What Randy was saying was that the purpose and need is to increase scientific knowledge and to protect downstream resources. And so I think that's where we need to start and that's where the Secretary and Reclamation need to start from this. We need to go from what the best available data that we have on this ecosystem. We have to use the best known available scientific processes for developing hypotheses based on the available data, figuring out what it is we want to test that gives us the best set of potential experiments over a long period of time. I haven't followed how these options really have been developed very carefully but it seems to me, like Randy says, they're just individual interests, Christmas trees that have been developed and that's not really how we should do the work for Grand Canyon. We all kind of know that but we all kind of get entrenched in our own positions on this. I'm going to suggest to Reclamation and I was going to suggest in the context of what the AMWG decides to recommend to the Secretary, that we consider going back to how do we go back to use the best available data, the best scientific processes to develop a scientific experimental plan that actually works for Grand Canyon. Thank you.