

The Mary Orton Company

4701 East Valley View Drive
Phoenix, AZ 85044-5752

602.426-9866 voice
602.426-9867 facsimile
602.432-2469 cellular

mary@maryorton.com
www.maryorton.com

Memo

To: TWG Members
From: Mary Orton, in behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning
CC: Members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning
Date: February 20, 2002
Re: Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning on issues referred by AMWG

As you may recall, the AMWG referred several issues to the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning (AHCSP) at its January 2002 meeting. This memorandum will describe to you the recommendations from the AHCSP on those issues, which you will consider at your February 26-27 meeting.

Issue 1: Development of a process and timeline for prioritization, in order to complete the Strategic Plan.

The AHCSP agreed that the purpose of this exercise is to give direction to the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (GCMRC) in development of its Strategic Plan and annual workplan. Given that, the result should be a list of the Management Objectives in SEQUENCE order, so that GCMRC knows what the AMWG feels should be accomplished first.

In order to develop a list of MOs in sequence order, TWG members will consider several criteria. Some examples are: what the law requires, what has to be accomplished before another thing can be accomplished, or what is higher priority.

The AHCSP recommends the following process:

1. The TWG members are asked to determine individually which MOs are their highest priorities. This will aid them in thinking about the sequence order for the MOs.
 - a. Two or three weeks before the May 16-17 TWG meeting, TWG members are sent a list of Goals and MOs. They are given 24 "votes" that they can use to indicate their highest priority MOs.
 - i. They can array those votes in any way they wish, with one exception: **THEY MUST VOTE FOR AT LEAST ONE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE UNDER EACH GOAL**. Beyond that, they can give one MO several "votes," they can give each of several MOs one vote, or any combination.
 - ii. This is intended to give you an indication of the highest priority MOs for each goal, as well as for the MOs overall.

- b. The TWG members are also invited to note the major research questions that they feel are the top priority to answer.
 - c. I compile these votes and the questions, and the results are given back to the TWG.
 2. The next step is to determine the sequence order of the MOs. This is done by the TWG at the May meeting. We will use a “paired comparisons” exercise, where the group decides, two at a time, which MO should be accomplished first. There will be discussion before each of the decisions, so that the TWG members can educate each other about how and why they are making their decisions.
 - a. This exercise can take a long time, and the AHCSF recommends allowing several hours to complete it. The MOs that have been identified as high priority in the earlier exercise (described under #1, above) will be addressed first. In this way, if we run out of time, we will have put the highest priority MOs in sequence order. (Note that this adds importance to the first exercise.)
 - b. The result of the “paired comparisons” exercise is a list of MOs in sequence order. This result will be reviewed by the group as a whole for fatal flaws – does the result have any fatal flaws that need to be corrected? These might be violations of legal requirements, putting something early in the sequence that can’t be determined until later, etc.
 3. These results are sent to the AMWG for approval at its July meeting.
 4. After the AMWG acts, the GCMRC takes the approved list of MOs in sequence order and produces its Strategic Plan, which will include the Information Needs that will be addressed during the next 5-year period, and its annual workplan, which will include the Information Needs that will be addressed during the coming year. If, during the process of developing its Strategic Plan or annual workplan GCMRC believes that a lower priority MO and its associated INs need to be addressed first, they will bring this recommendation with the accompanying rationale to the TWG for review.
 5. The AMWG approves that Strategic Plan and annual workplan, after review by the TWG.

The AHCSF recommends that this process of putting MOs in sequence order as guidance for the GCMRC should occur periodically, because as conditions change, so will the desired sequence order.

Issue 2: Development of a process and timeline for completion of Information Needs and Management Actions, in order to complete the Strategic Plan.

Information Needs: The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning recommends that the TWG, at its February meeting, identify the Information Needs around which it does not have consensus, and approve the rest. Those INs that have not been approved are sent to the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning for discussion and a recommendation, which will come back to the TWG at its May meeting, and then to the AMWG for final approval in July.

Management Actions: The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning recommends that after the sequencing exercise is completed, the GCMRC and the TWG jointly develop the Management Actions for recommendation to the AMWG.

Issue 3: Development of a process and timeline for identification of which MOs are in and which are out of the AMP, in order to complete the Strategic Plan.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning recommends the following process for identification of which MOs are in and which are out of the AMP:

1. The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning develops a list of criteria that would place an MO outside the AMP.
2. The TWG, at its May meeting, considers and refines that list of criteria, and then uses it to develop a list of MOs that should be considered outside the AMP.

3. In both these cases, the AHCSF recommends using a simple process, similar to what we have used many times: give people time to think about the question, generate a list, then discuss each item and come to a consensus.
4. That list goes to the AMWG for approval in July.

Issue 4: Consideration of the addition of a new Management Objective 7.3. Maintain suitable water quality in GCD releases to meet downstream Management Objectives.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning was not able to come to a consensus on this item in the time it had before the February TWG meeting. The members anticipate that it will be identified during the TWG discussion in February as an item that needs further discussion, and that it will be referred back to the Ad Hoc Committee for further discussion.