



2.1 Purposes of SA program

- Review GCDAMP resource-specific monitoring and research programs, and carry out other advisory tasks per AMWG request to...
 1. *Ensure that the monitoring and research findings used by the AMWG and the Secretary in implementing the GCDAMP meet AMP needs*
 2. *Ensure that the information on which the AMWG and the Secretary base adaptive management decisions is timely, comprehensive, efficient, unbiased, objective, and scientifically sound*
- Does not review, interpret, or otherwise evaluate public policy decisions or assess legal compliance associated with the GCDAMP and activities of the AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, or individual member agencies and organizations



A broad mandate

- Natural, cultural, and recreational resources affected by Glen Canyon Dam operations and the effects of those operations
- Results of ongoing and completed monitoring and research activities, and syntheses and assessments of these results
- Protocols followed in monitoring and research activities
- GCMRC long-term monitoring plans, annual monitoring and research plans, and annual budget proposals
- *Any other topics* per AMWG request concerning:
 - Resources affected by Glen Canyon Dam operations, effects of those operations, options for managing these effects
 - Coordination and balancing among resource programs
 - Combined effectiveness of resource programs in advancing understanding of the Colorado River ecosystem and ensuring progress in defining and conducting adaptive management experiments



2.2 Executive Coordinator

- Leads Science Advisors program
- Liaison for SA program to AMWG, TWG, GCMRC
- Contracted by and reports administratively to Reclamation but substantively to AMWG
 - *All EC and SA program activities require authorization by Reclamation task orders*
- Prepares SA program work plans, budgets, task order proposals
- Oversees all SA program activities
 - *Design and implementation of all review and advisory services*
 - *Recruitment of review/advisory panel members*
 - *Completion of SA task orders and delivery of reports*



2.3 Work plans

- AMWG Action Items
- Recommendations for additional tasks for consideration
 - *Input from AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, and Secretary's Designee*
 - *EC may propose additional tasks*
 - *Work plans also cover routine tasks*
- List of potential new tasks ranked in consultation with AMWG, TWG, GCMRC, Reclamation (*see next slide*)
- Ranked task list and costs reviewed by Reclamation and TWG in normal cycle of planning and budgeting
 - *Work plan and budget included with Reclamation*
- AMWG approval



Criteria for ranking potential tasks

- Synthesize multiple knowledge inputs, data, methods, models, and assumptions used by AMWG and Secretary in GCDAMP
- Clarify uncertainties in available information that affect (or could affect) adaptive management decision making, or suggest ways to reduce such uncertainties
- Ensure that information on which AMWG and Secretary base adaptive management decisions is timely, comprehensive, efficient, unbiased, objective, and scientifically sound
- Improve transparency of decision making within GCDAMP
- Improve stakeholder or public perceptions of credibility of information on which the GCDAMP makes decisions
- Financially and logistically feasible



2.4 Task orders

- SA work plans & budgets included in Reclamation work plans and budgets
- EC general duties and specific SA tasks require task orders from Reclamation; follow Reclamation procurement procedures
- Reclamation administers task orders for SA program activities approved by AMWG



2.5 Science Advisor selection

- SA panel size and selection specific to each review/advisory task
- EC steps for selecting SA panel members:
 1. Review potential selection criteria (*see next slide*)
 2. Consult AMWG, GCMRC, TWG, professional networks, literature
 3. Tabulate selection criteria, names, credentials of potential SAs
 4. Solicit GCMRC, TWG review of resulting tables
 5. Prepare final ranked list of potential SAs
 6. Reclamation COTR administrative review
 7. Extend invitations; work down ranked list until panel filled
 8. Notify AMWG, GCMRC, TWG of result



SA core selection criteria

- Expertise
 - Advisors must have well-established scientific or technical expertise in disciplines central to the task at hand as indicated by their records of publications in the peer-reviewed literature or other demonstrable scientific or technical achievements
- Balance
 - Advisors must represent the existing diversity of scientific and/or technical perspectives and spectrum of knowledge relevant to the task at hand
- Independence
 - No advisor may have a conflicting interest in the outcome of the task at hand
- Collaborativeness
 - Advisors must have a demonstrated ability to work effectively and collaboratively with other experts in an interdisciplinary setting



2.6 Reporting

- Progress reports on SA tasks to AMP meetings:
 - TWG, January
 - AMWG, February
 - AMWG, May
 - TWG, June
- Annual report to AMWG, August
- Annual report to Reclamation at end of FY



Three possible modifications

1. Allow option for establishing year-long or multi-year “standing panel” for ongoing/recurring needs?
2. Include a step/process for approval of potential SAs after EC identification and ranking?
3. Include description of a procedure for amending charter & protocols in the future?

Other suggestions?



Panel duration

- Proposed new paragraph to insert after present first paragraph in Section 2.1:

“Science Advisors work in panels sized for efficient completion of each review or advisory task (typically 5-6 panel members). The Executive Coordinator establishes a separate Science Advisor panel for each review or advisory service approved by the AMWG. However, the Executive Coordinator may propose and the AMWG may approve establishing panels that operate over a whole- or multi-year timespan to address ongoing or recurring review/advisor needs.”



SA panel member approval

- Formerly:
 - GCMRC Chief approved new appointments, with input from the standing SAs, TWG, and AMWG
 - Maintaining standing panel meant new appointments not time-sensitive
- Currently:
 - GCMRC Chief no longer responsible for SA program
 - Task-order structure means appointments always time-sensitive
 - GCMRC and TWG input on proposed ranked list of names: advisory, not same as approval
 - Reclamation COTR approval: administrative only?
 - EC (Sound Science) therefore makes final decisions on SA panel members for each task order

SA panel member approval *(cont.)*

- Should charter/protocols include a final step for SA panel member approval?
 - *Approvals may be time-sensitive*
- Option: **change** item “(6)” in Section 2.5 to:
*“(6) Rank the resulting **draft** final list of potential reviewers/advisors on their appropriateness and potential value for the Science Advisory task at hand **and submit the ranked list to the GCMRC and TWG for final review and approval. Requests for approval may be time-sensitive. The Executive Coordinator will resolve any differences in responses between the GCMRC and TWG.***”



Process for amending document

- Proposed addition of a final Section 2.7:

“2.7 Amending the Charter and Protocols

Changes to this charter or its protocols may be proposed to the TWG, which will then review each proposal and convey to the AMWG any recommendations for changes. The Executive Coordinator must provide recommendations to the TWG on each proposal for its consideration during its review. Reclamation must review all proposed changes to ensure that they are consistent with Reclamation requirements as administrator of the Science Advisors program, and convey its findings to the AMWG. All amendments require approval by the AMWG, which may request further information from the TWG, GCMRC, or Executive Coordinator for its deliberations.”

Questions & Discussion