

Table 1. Approximate timelines for a streamlined process for development of a biennial workplan and budget (BWP), plus consideration of changes to the second year of the budget. Dates shown are estimated targets.

Month	Year-1 (FY11) (development of biennial workplan & budget)	Year-2 (FY12) (consideration of year-2 of biennial workplan & budget)
November	USGS produces GCMRC annual project reports document	USGS produces GCMRC annual project reports document
January	Annual reports meeting (2 days) followed by 1-day TWG meeting to review budget and provide guidance to GCMRC and BOR. TWG reviews progress in addressing Information Needs and research accomplishments.	Annual reports meeting (2 days) followed by 1-day TWG meeting to review GCMRC budget and provide guidance to USGS and BOR on any potential changes to consider for year-2 of the budget. TWG reviews progress in addressing Information Needs and research accomplishments.
February-	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Based on a revised SSP/MRP, DOI establishes/updates general work plan priorities/hydrograph assumptions and communicates those to AMWG USGS and BOR will meet will meet with the DOI family to solicit their input on DOI priorities and major issues to be reconciled. Any disagreements will be resolved by DOI in consultation with the DOI Family 	USGS initiates internal review of BWP in relation to ASWS priorities and funding constraints. Identifies proposed revisions and analyzes scenarios/implications.
March	GCMRC and BOR will develop an initial biennial budget spreadsheet based on DOI priorities and input from (a) scientist and TWG provide at the AR meeting and (b) the DOI family.	USGS provides initial draft BWP spreadsheet for ASWS consideration.
April	TWG meets to consider and provide input on the initial GCMRC/BOR budget recommendation. Unresolved issues or conflicting priorities will be resolved by DOI in consultation with the DOI family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USGS meets with the DOI family to solicit input on draft BWP. USGS provides revised draft BWP and briefing to ASWS.
May	GCMRC and BOR provide a draft BWP to the TWG and SA for their review and comment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USGS provides draft BWP to the BAHG and SA for review. BAHG meets to consider and provide input on the draft BWP.
June	TWG meets to provide input on the initial GCMRC and BOR budget recommendation and provide a recommendation to the AMWG.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USGS provides a final draft BWP to the TWG and SA for review. TWG meets to provide input on the final draft BWP.
July	GCMRC and BOR provides a final draft BWP to the AMWG for their review	USGS revises and provides final draft BWP to the AMWG for their review.
August	AMWG meets to provide input on the GCMRC and BOR draft BWPs and provide a recommendation to the SOI	AMWG meets to provide input on the final draft BWP and provide a recommendation to the SOI
September	SOI reviews the budget and work plan recommendation from AMWG.	SOI reviews the budget and work plan recommendation from AMWG.

Criteria for Review and Revisions of the Year-two Budget

In order for BWP development process to be successful in reducing the administrative burden on the GCMRC, BOR and the GCDAMP it must have clear criteria for making changes to the year-two budget. The burden of an appropriate rationale for proposing a change falls upon the proposer to make a persuasive argument. The following criteria will be used by GCMRC, Reclamation, and TWG in making recommendations to AMWG on changes to the year-two budget:

- **Scientific requirement or merit:** New information gained during the implementation of monitoring and research projects may result in a need to alter methods, scope, or timelines in the work plan or substantially alter or eliminate a project. This is a science-based need based on the experience of implementing an already approved project. This does not represent a shifting priority, but a scientific learning process which results in needed modifications to carry out the goals.
- **Administrative needs:** Administrative or programmatic changes may occur within the time-frame of an approved budget. Examples include the mitigation of an impact as a result of ESA consultation or tribal consultation, a change in the “overhead” charges of a federal or state agency, a significant reduction of the balance of the Colorado River Basin Fund or a failure to secure NPS permits for work in the Grand Canyon. As soon as an administrative event occurs that affects the budget, GCMRC (or relevant agency – such as DOI) will notify the TWG.
- **New initiatives:** New initiatives or modifications to projects that may or may not be based on a scientific merit must be vetted through DOI. DOI will consider whether to direct GCMRC/BOR to work on these new initiatives or whether to consider them during the next full budget cycle. Given that the budget will likely be fully accounted for, direction on where to locate the funds within the current budget will be requested from DOI.