

Memo

May 16, 2001

From: TWG Budget Ad-hoc Group

To: Technical Work Group

Subj: Studies that could be deferred in FY 2002 if there is a budget shortfall

The Technical Work Group's Ad-hoc Budget Group held conference calls on May 3, 9 and 14, 2001 to develop a set of principles that should be used in developing a list of FY 2002 activities that could be deferred until FY 2003 should there be a budget shortfall in FY 2002. However, these deferrals may delay full implementation of a scientifically sound long-term monitoring and research program and are inconsistent with recommendations received from the NRC and various PEP reviews.

The Ad-hoc Budget Group believes that in order to make reasoned decisions about budget deferrals in years when there are budget shortfalls, it recommends establishment of the following hierarchy of activities for the Adaptive Management Program.

The principles developed by the Ad-hoc Budget Group are:

PRINCIPLES FOR PRIORITIZATION

High Priority

- Long-term (multiple-year) monitoring programs that have undergone a Protocol Evaluation Program review and are intended to determine the effects of Record of Decision operating criteria, principally on downstream resources and that represent integrated monitoring projects and address management objectives and information needs.
- Research necessary to respond to a Protocol Evaluation Program recommendation and / or that is needed to ensure that the long-term monitoring program is collecting the appropriate data to determine the "effects of the Secretary's actions" principally on downstream resources.
- Compliance (e.g., ESA or NHPA) related activities, particularly those required by a Biological Opinion.
- Personnel required to provide scientific support to the long-term monitoring and research program and to administer the program.
- Tribal funding to support participation in the AMP.
- Funding for Independent Review Panels (e.g., external peer-review and the Science Advisors).

Medium Priority

- Research that is necessary to respond to a specific IN or other Protocol Evaluation Panel recommendation but is not necessarily related to monitoring.

Low Priority

- Research activities resulting from unsolicited proposals intended to draw from the expertise of the broader scientific community.
- Funding targeted for AMWG / TWG support.

Guidelines for Deferral

- Compliance activities that may be extended over a number of years as compared to being accomplished in a single year should be considered for deferral.
- Capital expenditures that may be deferred without compromising the safety of the program or the ability to support high priority activities should be considered for deferral.
- Funding for specific tasks assigned to the Independent Review Panels that may be deferred to subsequent years without compromising the integrity of the program should be considered for deferral.
- Work that is needed in the area of remote sensing but that has not been accomplished yet should be considered for deferral.

Based on these principles, Barry Gold and Randy Peterson in consultation with the Ad-hoc Budget Group have developed the following recommendations for deferral of specific AMP activities from FY 2002 - 2003:

<u>Project / Activity</u>	<u>Budgeted Amount</u>	<u>Recommended Amount</u>	<u>FY 2002 Savings</u>
G. AMWG / TWG ¹	\$ 61,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 36,000
E. Unsolicited Proposals ²	\$123,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 48,000
J. Independent Review Panels ³	\$229,000	\$150,000	\$ 79,000
K. Administration ⁴	\$591,000	\$491,000	\$100,000
D. Remote Sensing ⁵	\$400,000	\$200,000	\$200,000

¹ Will reduce the ability of GCMRC to obtain contractual support to respond to an AMWG / TWG request.

² Will severely limit the ability of GCMRC to fund innovative ideas, submitted by outside scientists that may be directly related to an important IN for which no RFP has been let.

³ Given that FY2001 is the first year of working with the Science Advisors, this level of funding may severely constrain their ability to respond to GCMRC and AMWG/TWG requests. This level of funding also assumes that GCMRC will have limited external peer-review of new RFPs in FY 2002 due to the multi-year nature of the awards made in FY 2001.

⁴ Will defer the upgrading of some equipment and assumes that personnel and administrative demands will be reduced after FY 2001 which was the transition year from the Bureau of Reclamation to the USGS.

C-4 a&b. Modeling Sand ⁶	\$205,000	\$ -0-	\$205,000
A3. New Terrestrial Research ⁷	\$ 93,000	\$ -0-	\$ 93,000
USBR. Unexpended AMP Admin ⁸	\$1,399,000	\$ 1,359,000	\$ <u>40,000</u>
		TOTAL	\$801,000

⁵ Assumes that funds intended for LIDAR in FY 2001 will be carried over into FY 2002 and that the cost of obtaining LIDAR in FY 2002 will not increase substantially over FY 2001. Defers evaluation of some technologies into FY 2003.

⁶ The RFP for this work has been reissued, given the potential FY 2002 shortfall this solicitation is being slowed down and the award will not be made until late summer FY 2001. The contract will be written so that the work doesn't begin until FY 2002. FY 2001 funds will be used to support this work in FY 2002.

⁷ This work is proposed to be deferred until FY 2003 to allow a more deliberate and thorough analysis of FY 2001 data, as well as the development of INs. Both of these will help to develop a more specific research need than that contained in the FY 2001 annual plan.

⁸ This reduction results from potentially not needing to support the Science Advisory Board and from a lack of AMP compliance documents.