[Yesterday 1:05 PM] Kurt Dongoske (Guest)

Can you provide a list of who the science advisors are and their area of specialization. thanks

[Yesterday 1:07 PM] Hammen, Jeremy J

Hey Kurt, we are hoping to provide the names and resumes of the reviewers once the reviews are finished. We leave it as an option for the reviewers but in the past the reviewers have allowed for their names and resumes to be released.

[Yesterday 1:16 PM] Shana Rapoport (External)

Thank you Jacob. Can you specify which eDNA project we're discussing?

[Yesterday 1:16 PM] Shana Rapoport (External)

Thank you

[Yesterday 1:21 PM] Billerbeck, Rob P

Agree with Jakob about the importance of veg projects - particularly D1, D2 and D3 are important to fund well enough to follow through on the environmental commitments that were a priority in the LTEMP ROD. And with Ben that we have to make sure we don't cut the sediment project projects A and B aren't cut too deeply to provide the key LTEMP experimental and analytical understanding needed to manage sediment in the system. We know cuts have to be made to balance this budget and we have to look carefully but just wanted to express agreement with the general sentiments from Jakob and Ben.

[Yesterday 1:33 PM] Kurt Dongoske (Guest)

The Secretary's Acting Designee has expressed his desire to integrate Tribal traditional knowledge (as legitimate science systems) into the Adaptive Management Program. In addition, the White House Memorandum on indigenous traditional knowledge, as commensurate with knowledge produced by Western science, into federal agency compliance processes. It is not obvious from this triennial work plan if this integration is being facilitated and responsive to these above directions. Moreover, GCMRC has never exhibited, in my opinion, to work collaboratively or effectively with the participating Tribes. Project J.3 is of concern for Zuni, because, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no prior conversation between GCMRC and Zuni regarding this project.

[Yesterday 1:45 PM] Unknown User

NM would like to note that we would also support the funding of hydropower modeling being done by WAPA. We do not recommend GCMRC conduct the HP modeling. And a basic question - Are we supposed to propose more cuts today? I heard GCMRC mgt ask the stakeholders not to demand a balanced budget at this point and to wait until the Science Advisors made their recommendations.

[Yesterday 1:47 PM] Leslie James

We are not opposing screening tools, we want to ensure WAPA/BOR lead roles in developing the hydropower portion of such a tool. This is not dissimilar to water quality or other water models that are managed by State entities and produce data that is used in other models.

[Yesterday 1:49 PM] Danielle E. Greene (External)

CRCNV agrees with you Craig, we would like to see collaboration with data provided by WAPA

[Yesterday 1:51 PM] Ryan Mann, AZGFD

May be for a larger discussion, but what is the difference in the approaches to modelling between GCMRC and WAPA. There is always value in independent review of approaches. Should the inputs in question be discussed within the TWG? I am not aware that those discussions have been done.

[Yesterday 1:53 PM] Leslie James

Ryan, that topic has been proposed for presentation/discussion by SEAHG (at a minimum).

[Yesterday 1:53 PM] Ryan Mann, AZGFD

Thanks Leslie

[Yesterday 1:54 PM] Hammen, Jeremy J

Leslis is correct. I do believe the SEAHG is going to make this a priority once it gets fired up again.

[Yesterday 1:55 PM] Ryan Mann, AZGFD

My next question would be does the changing of the "lead" on this approach affect the budget in any meaningful way?

[Yesterday 1:57 PM] Ellsworth, Craig (External)

I don't believe it would.

[Yesterday 2:00 PM] Ryan Mann, AZGFD

Is it then pertinent to these BAHG discussions? Not trying to be critical, important conversations, but trying to focus on the budget at hand

[Yesterday 2:00 PM] Shana Rapoport (External)

Thank you Lucas. I'm still a bit confused. It looks to me like most of the increase from 2024 is in J1 rather than J2.

[Yesterday 2:02 PM] Leslie James

I think to answer Ryan's question, we'd need to have a further breakdown of what is in J.1.
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[Yesterday 2:03 PM] Ryan Mann, AZGFD

Thanks all, that makes sense. Just trying to be helpful

[Yesterday 2:07 PM] Leslie James

I wouldn't characterize what has occurred as "ignored and neglected". I would argue that the issue of prioritization and budget/scope has driven whether or not this program even had a socioeconomic component in the early days.

[Yesterday 2:09 PM] Ellsworth, Craig (External)

Those reviews and responses to the review of GTMax were uploaded to the wiki at: https://gcdamp.com/index.php/GCDAMP-\_GTMAX

GCDAMP- GTMAX - Glen Canyon Dam AMP

[Yesterday 2:10 PM] Bair, Lucas S

Hi Shana, correct, there is an increase in J.1. The increase is because I added GCMRC salary, specifically on the biology side, to help with the proposed integrated SMB model (Dzul, Yackulic, and Healy).

[Yesterday 2:10 PM] Shana Rapoport (External)

Lucas - thank you for the clarification

[Yesterday 2:16 PM] Ryan Mann, AZGFD

Can Jeremy give an update on progress on the slough modification which is happening outside the GCDAMP in response to Ben's comment?

[Yesterday 2:18 PM] Hammen, Jeremy J

Thank you Ryan!

[Yesterday 2:18 PM] Ben Reeder

Thank you for clarifying Ryan- missed that in the budget-

[Yesterday 2:19 PM] Topping, David

To inform dam operations, it seems like the eDNA data need to be processed quickly.

[Yesterday 2:24 PM] Ben Reeder

Put the guides to work! Let’s do that-

[Yesterday 2:25 PM] Ben Reeder

What project is that again?

[Yesterday 2:25 PM] Dzul, Maria C

G.9

[Yesterday 2:26 PM] Ben Reeder

👍

[Yesterday 2:26 PM] Topping, David

Buy all the gear in FY 2024.

[Yesterday 2:26 PM] Shana Rapoport (External)

Well said Dan. Thank you.
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[Yesterday 2:37 PM] Dzul, Maria C

it's G.5

[Yesterday 2:37 PM] Shana Rapoport (External)

It would also be very helpful, time permitting, to have a roadmap of which projects are ongoing monitoring and which are short term projects that should yield answers and be completed during the TWP.
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[Yesterday 2:40 PM] Kurt Dongoske (Guest)

There is a false dichotomy when you separate cultural from natural.

[Yesterday 2:42 PM] Danielle E. Greene (External)

would the information taken from repeat photography in D.2 still be beneficial if it occurred less often? this way it isn't completely cut

[Yesterday 2:45 PM] Ben Reeder

C4 seems critical

[Yesterday 2:46 PM] Topping, David

C4 is absolutely critical. There is a serious risk of the river narrowing as lower releases cause vegetation expansion lower in the channel and then sediment deposition anchors the plants before the next spike flow can remove the new plants.

[Yesterday 2:48 PM] Topping, David

Every other major regulated river I work on in the west has a project like C.4 except this one.

[Yesterday 2:50 PM] Topping, David

We need to know the dam releases required to prevent dense vegetation from moving lower and lower in the channel. How often does aa higher flow and how long does that flow need to be to prevent this from happening? This question is critical as we see lower sustained releases in the future. This question was only anecdotally treated during the 2000 LSSF

[Yesterday 2:57 PM] Ellsworth, Craig (External)

3 mintues....

[Yesterday 2:58 PM] Healy, Brian D

Its even sadder now that its been cut by 98%

[Yesterday 2:59 PM] Shana Rapoport (External)

Thank you to GCMRC to the responsiveness to questions throughout this process. The spreadsheet answering the questions submitted is very helpful.

[Yesterday 2:59 PM] Ellsworth, Craig (External)

Please come up with a project with the acronym DADBOD
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[Yesterday 3:02 PM] Unknown User

Thank you for taking time to review the project budget with us. Thanks GCMRC and Erik!