

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program Technical Work Group Meeting August 8, 2024

Webinar

Start Time: 3:05 PM PDT

Conducting: Seth Shanahan, Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) and TWG Chair

Designated Federal Official: Daniel Picard (Bureau of Reclamation)

Meeting Recorder: Beccie Mendenhall, SeaJay Environmental LLC

Welcome and Administrative

- **Introductions and Determination of Quorum (16 members)** A quorum was reached.
- **Administrative:** Reminders for the webinar meeting format: audio conversation only, no video, use chat and hand raise for questions / comments, request all attendees to add their name and affiliation in the chat.

Note from Kurt Dongoske “The Pueblo of Zuni chose to not participate in this Technical Work Group virtual conference call as an *act of protest* to the unethical way the triennial work plan and budget was advanced to the Adaptive Management Work Group in spite of the Pueblo of Zuni’s expressed insufficient meaningful consultation and as an apparent self-serving effort by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center. I believe that this issue needs to be recorded in this historic documentation of the transactions of the Technical Work Group.”

Development of Budget Recommendation to the Adaptive Management Work Group:

Seth Shanahan (Chair) We have one item of business today. At the last meeting we wanted to delay the recommendation to the AMWG until the final draft of TWP was received. That went out as planned last night. There were already some questions sent to Andrew. It makes sense to start there, with Andrew providing response to those questions. **Andrew Schultz (GCMRC)** There was a slight increase in the overage from \$191K to \$196K. Those were changes that came up after we met on July 31st. The cause was that our actual overhead for facilities was higher than the estimate. There was also a slight increase in boat logistics. **Betsy Morgan (State of Utah)** Are those increases only for year one? **Andrew Schultz** Yes, we will not know the actual for years 2 and 3 until they happen. **Betsy Morgan** So we need to add that for the other 2 years as well? **Andrew Schultz** No, it may actually come down in subsequent years.

Andrew Schultz (GCMRC) We added an experimental fund project for measuring real time water temperature in Marble Canyon for about \$20K. This will help information from RM61 gauge to be accessible for SMB flow temperature management. It is included in the workplan but listed as “not funded” for transparency. **Bill Persons (TU)** You said you included the project, but it is unfunded? **Andrew Schultz** Yes, that is correct although we are working with Reclamation on that. **Bill Persons** That raises a concern I have about the entire TWP. It seems like each project takes about 4 pages to describe. You left the unfunded projects in that description. It would have made it easier for me to understand if you had put the unfunded projects in a separate document or appendix. I do not recall that

from the previous TWP. **Andrew Schultz** I appreciate that. People have commented that they do not understand how one element or project segues into another. We felt it was important to keep these details in the plan, so when funding becomes available the relationships are visible. We are open to suggestions on this format in the future. **Jeremy Hammen (BOR)** In the previous work plan there were unfunded and partially funded projects listed. It helps us when it comes to budgeting and interagency agreements to have visibility to that. The experimental funds allocations in the TWP are a nice to have, but these are estimates and not actual commitment as to how the funds will be used. **Seth Shanahan (Chair)** We also have a comment in the chat from Shana regarding the unfunded projects. **Bill Persons** In the previous workplan we had 3 or 4 unfunded projects included. This TWP there were 14 unfunded projects That takes up a lot of space and makes it more difficult to understand. **Seth Shanahan** I appreciate that. Already it is a 400 page document and that becomes unwieldy. This seems like an important point to fix. But I appreciate the points from Andrew and Jeremy that retaining the connections helps. There is already an action item related to improving the TWP process. Let's add to that a sub element to evaluate ways to improve handling of the unfunded projects.

Leslie James (CREDA) The proposal to use experimental fund money for the RM61 temperature gauge seems like a good use of those funds. But I am not as comfortable with some of the other uses I have seen for this fund. Is there something that you are proposing to use experimental fund money for that could swap with the RM61 gauge? We need to be diligent so that those funds are tied to unplanned experiments. **Andrew Schultz** We are working with Reclamation on how to apply experimental funds.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) Andrew, are there other items you want to touch on? **Andrew Schultz** I want to go back to the last question Betsy had around the Lake Powell Water Quality monitoring budget which is different than presented at the last meeting. The project lead had some corrections that were made to improve the accuracy of the budget. **Seth Shanahan** Thanks Andrew for describing those revisions. Let's open it up to general comments from the TWG about the final budget.

Leslie James (CREDA) On Project J, I am intrigued by what is described in J1 about the Value of Information (VOI) tool. Since it is described as new, I want to be sure there is a commitment from USGS that the TWG is involved from the outset with that project. **Seth Shanahan** Lucas is the PI for that project, Lucas would that work for you? **Lucas Bair (GCMRC)** Leslie has a good point, it is a new start, and I think it would be great early on to have a workshop or a specific session on this project. **Seth Shanahan** Can I assume we want to wait until at least January for that activity? **Lucas Bair** It depends on when we decide to hold the Hydropower workshop. It will probably be January since the Hydropower is targeted for late 2024. **Seth Shanahan** Let's take an action item to discuss the value of information tool and its use prior to implementation of project J1. **Jeremy Hammen (BOR)** Yes that works. We plan to leverage the SEAHG to plan the Hydropower workshop. **Seth Shanahan** We may be able to use the SEAHG to coordinate the J1 project workshop as well.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) Asking again, any questions, comments, anything else folks would like to say? If not, we will move towards making a motion for the recommendation. **Christina Nofsker (State of New Mexico)** Was Daniel Picard going to give a short discussion on the Pueblo of Zuni? **Seth Shanahan** Yes, we will get to that in a minute.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) I am sharing on the screen the draft motion everyone received a few days ago. It is largely the same as the motion amended during our meeting on July 31st. It has a few notable differences which I will point out.

- The first bullet about the use of the Experimental Fund has changed. Several folks worked together on that language since our last meeting.
- The second bullet did not change but I have some recommendations to propose there.
- One new bullet was offered by Kurt Dongoske (Pueblo of Zuni) but is not yet included in the recommendation. Daniel Picard is going to present the BOR position on that.

Daniel Picard (BOR) As you are aware I have participated and heard all of the interactions over the past month or so. The paragraph submitted by Kurt and the Pueblo of Zuni has a few points that are of concern to Reclamation and the Interior. The first point is there was verbiage that stated, “The Bureau of Reclamation shall”. All of you, as well as Kurt and the Pueblo of Zuni are aware that the AMWG, TWG and BAHG are a FACA committee that recommends things to the Secretary of the Interior who then takes those into consideration and makes the decision. They do not tell the Secretary things that they “shall” do, that is not appropriate. Secondly, there was language in this paragraph about a government-to-government consultation. I spoke out at the July TWG meeting where Kurt and other Zuni representatives were present explaining that term was probably not appropriate for their intent. If they want to have a government-to-government consultation, they can request that to the Bureau of Reclamation following the formal process defined for that. They should recognize that the formal process is different and separate from a FACA committee. The tribes have the right to request this but understand there is a lot involved in the process, including potential lawyers present for both sides. What I think they wanted was a face-to-face meeting to discuss their concerns. Government to government consultation is not the process to use for that. The acting director from the Navajo region backed up my position in the July TWG meeting. We treat the tribes in a FACA process the same way we would treat any other entity or organization in the FACA. These are the concerns with the language in that paragraph and the reason we request that it not be included. **Stewart Koyiyumptewa (Hopi Tribe)** At the last meeting I was really surprised at the Zuni’s actions because it is my understanding that we are elected to represent our tribe so we can make recommendations on behalf of the tribe. I already knew the “shall” and “government to government” language was not going to sit well with the group here. There are other means to move things forward. I felt that Kurt’s letter was not supportive of the other 4 tribal members in this group. I did not agree with the comment to remove the projects which other tribes valued. They had the opportunity to participate in our meeting when we worked through this. At the beginning of that meeting there was not agreement on any of the points. But we worked through that together and came to a proposal we all could agree on in order to present a unified position. **Erik Stanfield (Navajo Nation)** I just want to make a quick comment aligned with Stewart. I understand the frustration that is expressed through the paragraph Zuni submitted but I do not agree with the tactic. I would suggest maybe we add a bullet that acknowledges that there was disagreement on how things were prioritized. **Seth Shanahan** Thanks Erik. Kurt is not here today, but he did send a message to everyone in this group in advance of the meeting stating he would oppose any recommendation we come up with today. I say that because adding a bullet acknowledging their disagreement will not solve the problem. There is a process called a minority report, and this is the appropriate response for the Zuni as they object to this recommendation. I just want everyone to be aware as we work towards trying to make a motion today.

Kelly Burke (GCWC) Thinking back to the conversation that led to the Zuni paragraph, there was confusion at least for me as the language evolved into something that clearly was not appropriate. I wonder if there had been earlier engagement with the tribes in the TWP process in the form of a workshop if that would have prevented this. **Seth Shanahan** Your suggestion that we include them in a tribal specific format earlier in the process makes sense. Let’s add that to our actions for TWP process improvement. But I also want to point out what Stewart said that there was plenty of opportunity for Zuni to participate and share. And Erik Skie noted 16 meetings of the BAHG that were available for people to join. It may not be just a lack of opportunity. I think we can agree that this has been a frustrating experience for all of us and we would like to find a way to avoid it in the future.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) Any other comments before we get into a potential motion? (no response) I will mention that I have provided two edits for your consideration that are different than what Jeremy sent out on Tuesday, August 7th. The first is a factual correction on when we received the draft. The second is something identified by Kurt. He wanted us to remove the “tribal recommendation” and spell out the specific tribes that supported the bullet.

Are we ready to support this action? I am going to read through the motion to see if we have someone willing to make a motion to adopt the recommendation.

Helen Fairley (GCMRC) My recollection is that the second bullet items were not fully resolved at the last meeting. I believe there was discussion about including B4. **Seth Shanahan (Chair)** I am going to suggest something different. As part of Robert’s Rules of Order, the way we would work through this is to read off the potential motion and see if someone offers to support the recommendation, followed by a second. Then we have an actual motion for us to consider and act on. At that time, we would pause and ask the members who are able to vote on the motion to offer any revisions, questions or comments to the motion. If there are not, then we can move on and request a decision or action on the motion. I am going to follow that process here. When we get to a motion on the floor, I will let the voting body state if they fell changes are appropriate.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) Is there a member of the TWG that will make a motion to adopt the recommendation? **Sinjin Eberle (American Rivers)** I would move to do this if I was going to be on for more than 4 minutes. **Seth Shanahan** If you make a motion, can I ask if you will vote in favor or against? We can consider that you have made the motion. **Kelly Burke (GCWC)** I will second the motion.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) Are there any questions or changes folks want to offer about the motion? **Betsy Morgan (State of Utah)** Last meeting you crafted some language that noted the challenges we faced. I would feel more comfortable if we added that back, plus the point that we would have liked more time. Also, the three changes in the TWP presented today were not clearly highlighted when passing along the motion. If there are any future changes, we would like those spelled out to the AMWG. **Seth Shanahan** I will take a leap and copy that language back into the recommendation. We now need a new motion.

Kelly Burke (GCWC) I motion to accept this recommendation.

Seth Shanahan Betsy, since you made this request, would you be willing to second the motion?

Betsy Morgan (State of Utah) Yes, I will second the motion.

Ryan Mann (AZGFD) I think it is important to convey our struggles to AMWG. But I don’t believe it needs to be in the motion. I thought it could be part of the presentation instead of the motion itself. **Seth**

Shanahan (Chair) Yes, I can reflect that as well in the presentation to the AMWG. **Stewart**

Koyiyumptewa (Hopi Tribe) I don’t think the additional language should be in there and I don’t find it relevant to a motion. I would prefer that we remove that language. **Kelly Burke (GCWC)** After hearing these comments, if Betsy is OK with moving this to the presentation, I would support that. **Seth**

Shanahan Betsy, based on what you have heard, would you consider retracting that language. **Betsy**

Morgan I agree that this can be explained in the presentation, but I feel uncomfortable adopting a budget I have had less than 8 hours to review. I still feel it would be really helpful to include the language but if the majority of the people on this call think it is not necessary, I will see. **Stewart Koyiyumptewa** I don’t see where adding this language adds anything to the recommendation. **Mel Fegler (State of Wyoming)**

Wyoming actually supports the language that Betsy added given the time constraints and late changes. **Emily Young (State of Arizona)** I also support this language. I want to ensure we are sending something we fully understand to the AMWG. But if others feel it is not necessary for the motion, as long as it is highlighted at the AMWG presentation and in the postmortem action item it will suffice. **Shana Rapoport (State of California)** California is also in favor of keeping the language. The process has not met the needs of the GCDAMP, or the representatives being asked to vote. California is going to vote to support this recommendation today so we can meet deadlines and keep the program viable. But we have concerns about the budget and the process and are looking forward to the BAHG postmortem review.

Kelly Burke (GCWC) It feels a little like we are throwing GCMRC under the bus for all the work that has been done. I am wondering if we can change the language a little, removing inadequate and some of the other negative connotations. **Seth Shanahan** Betsy offered a change in the chat replacing inadequate with limited. **Bill Persons (TU)** I wanted to make a comment that my support for the TWP is somewhat qualified. I am not going to oppose it, but I am not fully in support of it either. Also, I don't want to throw anyone under the bus, but I thought the time provided for the review was inadequate and I don't mind just spelling that out. **Seth Shanahan** I will keep limited for now. **Andrew Schultz (GCMRC)** It is accurate that it was inadequate time. It was a 400 page document. But the due date was August 7th, and we made that date. Someone not aware of that could read this as stating it came in late. **Seth Shanahan** In prior years the final work plan was provided to TWG before the July meeting. Where we got stuck is there were still substantial points in the July meeting that people did not agree on. **Andrew Schultz** Bottom line is there was a late request for an addition (the fall trip) which took a lot of rework.

Ryan Mann (AZGFD) The language just added says the adoption of this motion has not been fully evaluated. How can we put forward a motion that we make that statement about? I agree with Stewart, the changes made since last week are not significant. I do understand the need to acknowledge the frustrations. **Seth Shanahan (Chair)** I just want to make sure I understand, the issue you have is saying we have not had time to evaluate? **Ryan Mann** Yes, with that language I don't see how we can put forth a motion on consensus. **Seth Shanahan** Betsy, do you have a solution for that? **Betsy Morgan (State of Utah)** What you said makes sense, that where we got hung up was the changes made since July TWP which would normally have been the final draft. It is all those changes after July TWP that we did not have adequate time to review. **Ryan Mann** I am sensitive to all those concerns but still struggle with the language. **Mel Fegler (State of Wyoming)** Would it be fair to say the resources were not evaluated? **Seth Shanahan** I am not sure that would resolve this concern. The dilemma is we are asking people to recommend the motion when we have not looked at it. **Bill Persons (TU)** Should we change adoption of this motion in this language to the Aug 8th TWG meeting? **Seth Shanahan** Good idea, I just did that. That definitely clarifies the timeline of concern but does not resolve Ryan's problem of contradictory language.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) I will just say this out loud. We are not going to get consensus. Zuni has already said they will not support the recommendation. So, we are going to have to vote. Betsy, does your motion still stand? **Betsy Morgan (State of Utah)** My motion still stands with the added language. **Seth Shanahan** Kelly, do you still support the motion? **Kelly Burke (GCWC)** I am struggling. I hear Ryan's point, and I agree there was not adequate time. I don't think there are major changes we have problems with. If we can incorporate that, then maybe I would still support this. But I do have an issue with this being contradictory. **Seth Shanahan** I will take that as you are not ready to second the motion. Let's take this language and put it into a bullet on its own. Maybe that helps distinguish we are making a recommendation but there are these qualified considerations. **Kelly Burke** I think that makes sense.

Bill Persons (TU) It makes a lot of sense **Seth Shanahan** Betsy, what do you think of that? **Betsy Morgan** Yes, I think it works great.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) Let's revisit the motion and reaffirm.

Betsy Morgan (State of Utah) My recommendation still stands

Kelly Burke (GCWC) Yes, my motion to adopt still stands

Seth Shanahan OK, so we have a revised motion on the floor.

Erik Stanfield (Navajo Nation) I don't want to derail things, but I think it is important to adjust the tribal prioritization. B4 needs to be moved to the end. It is a large project, it was added late, and it would take up all the funding from everything behind it. **Andrew Schultz (GCMRC)** Thank you Erik for that comment. I was thinking about that earlier. If these are in order by priority, maybe the one project that was adopted by all 5 tribes should be higher. **Kelly Burke (GCWC)** We have been very interested in seeing B4 funding restored due to its relationship to C4. We prefer that it stay where it is. I don't want to insert GCWC in the middle of the tribal prioritization, but we are advocating for this to be funded. **Seth Shanahan (Chair)** I think the nuance that this is a tribal prioritization is important here. Let's get input from the other tribal representatives on Erik's suggestions. **Stewart Koyiyumptewa (Hopi Tribe)** I was surprised that B4 got added. It was not one of the items discussed at the tribal workshop. **Seth Shanahan** This came up at the end of our meeting last week. **Erik Stanfield** I am sorry about changing this around. But it is not about the value of B4, it is a practical consideration of where we might get more projects funded. **Seth Shanahan** Good point. Let's hear from Daniel. **Daniel Bullets (Southern Paiute Consortium)** I recall this being mentioned, for the sake of the vote I would say leave it where it is, and we can hash it out at a future time. **Seth Shanahan** Erik, if we put it back to third on the list would that be OK with you? **Erik Stanfield** Like I said, it is not a deal breaker. **Seth Shanahan** Stewart, you were not even aware it was added to the list. I would like to hear from you again about where it is positioned. **Stewart Koyiyumptewa** The Hopi tribes support for D5 will get pushed down further, so I have a concern. But as Daniel says, for voting purposes we can leave it and work things out at a later date. **Seth Shanahan** Adding more qualification, not all tribes are present to give input on this change. Given that, maybe moving it to the bottom of the list is the right solution for now. Erik, Daniel, Stewart – any objection to leaving it as currently written? (No objections)

Seth Shanahan (Chair) Considering these amendments, Betsy and Kelly can you reaffirm your motion?

Betsy Morgan (State of Utah) Yes, I support the motion with amendments.

Kelly Burke (GCWC) I second the amended motion.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) We have a motion on the floor. Are there any questions or additional amendments to the motion? **Bill Persons (TU)** This list represents just the tribal projects to be prioritized for funding. There are other projects on the floor that are not funded. Will these also be considered if money becomes available? **Seth Shanahan** As money becomes available, we would have the opportunity as a TWG to weigh in and vote on funding.

Seth Shanahan (Chair) We are not going to have consensus so, let's work through the vote. A motion has been made by Betsy and seconded by Kelly Do you vote Yay, Nay or Abstain? (voting followed with each TWG member present providing their vote when the Chairman called their name)

Seth Shanahan The motion passes at 94%, with one member abstaining, 15 yes votes and one nay.

Public Comment:

None

Seth Shanahan (Chair) I just have a few closing items:

- We received word from Reclamation that the October meeting is going to be a webinar
- The next step for this recommendation is to send it to AMWG tomorrow.
- Please keep your AMWG members in the loop on the recommendation, final TWP and any concerns so they are prepared for the August meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:24 PM PDT

Participants

TWG Members, Alternates, and Leadership

Betsy Morgan (State of Utah)	Erik Stanfield (Navajo Nation)
Bill Persons (TU)	Jeremy Hammen (BOR)
Christina Noftsker (State of New Mexico)	Kelly Burke (GCWC)
Cliff Barrett (UMPA)	Leslie James (CREDA)
Craig Ellsworth (WAPA)	Mel Fegler (State of Wyoming)
Dan Leavitt (USFWS)	Michelle Garrison (State of Colorado)
Dani Greene (State of Nevada)	Rob Billerbeck (NPS-GLCA)
Daniel Bulletts (Southern Paiute Consortium)	Rudy Keedah (BIA)
David Rogowski (AZGFD)	Ryan Mann (AZGFD)
David Ward (USFWS)	Seth Shanahan (State of Nevada)
Emily Omana Smith (NPS-GRCA)	Shana Rapoport (State of California)
Emily Young (State of Arizona)	Sinjin Eberle (American Rivers)
Erik Skeie (State of Colorado)	Stewart Koyiyumptewa (Hopi Tribe)
	Ted Rampton (CREDA)

Other GCDAMP Members and Interested Persons

Andrew Schultz (GCMRC)	Noe Santos (BOR)
Helen Fairley (GCMRC)	Teo Melis (BOR)
Joel Sankey (GCMRC)	Alyx Richards (UCRC Commission)
Lucas Bair (GCMRC)	Beccie Mendenhall (SeaJay Env)
Paul Grams (GCMRC)	Craig Dengel (WAPA)
Ted Kennedy (GCMRC)	Lynne Westerfield (GCWC)
Bill Stewart (BOR)	Pilar Wolters-Rinker (USFWS)
Daniel Picard (BOR)	Tara Ashby (BOR)
Jamescita Peshlakai (BOR)	Ronda Newton (NPS-GRCA SRM)
Kathy Callister (BOR)	

Acronyms

ACHP - Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	MAF - Million Acre Feet
ADWR – Arizona Department of Water Resources	mm – millimeter
AHAHG – Administrative History Ad Hoc Group	MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
AHG - Ad Hoc Group	NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
AMWG – Adaptive Management Work Group	NMISC – NM Interstate Stream Commission
AZGFD – Arizona Game and Fish Department	NPS – National Park Service
BAHG – Budget Ad Hoc Group	NPS-GLCA – NPS Glen Canyon National Recreation Area
BIA – Bureau of Indian Affairs	NPS-GRCA – NPS Grand Canyon National Recreation Area
BO - Biological Opinion	P&I Team – Planning and Implementation Team
BOR – Bureau of Reclamation	PDT – Pacific Daylight Time
C° – degrees Celsius	Reclamation – Bureau of Reclamation
CBRFC - Colorado Basin River Forecast Center	RM - River Mile
CFS – Cubic Feet per Second	ROD - Record of Decision
CRBC – Colorado River Board of California	SEAHG – Socioeconomic Ad Hoc Group
CRCNV – Colorado River Commission of Nevada	SEIS – supplemental environmental impact statement
CREDA – Colorado River Energy Distributors Association	SHPO - State Historic Preservation Office
CRSP – Colorado River Storage Project	SMB – smallmouth bass
CWCB – Colorado Water Conservation Board	SNARRC – Southwestern Native Aquatic Resources and Recovery Center
D.O. – dissolved oxygen	SNWA – Southern Nevada Water Authority
DOI – Department of the Interior	SWE - Snow Water Equivalent
DROA – Drought Response Operations Agreement	TRGD – Trout Recruitment and Growth Dynamics
DSA - Deliverable Sales Amount	TU – Trout Unlimited
DWR – Department of Water Resources	TWG – GCDAMP Technical Work Group
EA – environmental assessment	TWP - Triennial Work Plan
EIS – environmental impact statement	UCRC – Upper Colorado River Commission
FLAHG – Flow Ad Hoc Group	UMPA – Utah Municipal Power Agency
FY – Fiscal Year	USFWS – United States Fish & Wildlife
GCD - Glen Canyon Dam	USGS – United States Geological Survey
GCDAMP – Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program	USU – Utah State University
GCMRC – Grand Canyon Monitoring & Research Center	WAPA – Western Area Power Administration
GCPA – Grand Canyon Protection Act	WY - Water Year
GCRG – Grand Canyon River Guides	YoY – Young-of-Year
GCROA - Grand Canyon River Outfitters Association	
GCWC—Grand Canyon Wildlands Council	
HFE – High Flow Experiment	
KAF - Thousand Acre Feet	
LCR - Little Colorado River	
LTEMP – Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan	