

AD-HOC GROUPS JANUARY 1998

January 1998

Roles and Integration Report: Chris Harris distributed "Roles, Responsibilities, Schedules and Process Integration" information for the AMWG and TWG dated January 1998. Review for accuracy from your entity's perspective and determine if you concur with Chris Harris' interpretations. Submit revisions to Chris Harris. GCMRC will review the package with Chris and USBR and include the documents in its annual update of the TWG Briefing Booklet, which will be redistributed to TWG in March or April 1998.

Recommendation: After TWG receives the updated booklet, it should form an ad-hoc group to work on merging the schedules and budgets. The schedule will be updated annually. GCMRC will plan to make the information available on its web site after completion of the schedule

TWG is to develop action lists, schedule activities and form ad-hoc groups for the following assignments from the AMWG (listed in order of priority). TWG is to take action and report back at AMWG's July 21-22, 1998, meeting on items 1-5. Chair persons will give a brief status report at each TWG meeting until the work is completed and ad-hoc group is dissolved.

1. BHBf/Resource-based Criteria Ad-Hoc Group

Purpose: to work on research and budget associated with a planned spring 1998 BHBf. It will develop resource-based criteria for a BHBf with the first priority being TES. A resource design was given to AMWG but we are not sure how much research funding we will get. AMWG will work with TWG to strategize on it.

Volunteers: R. Winfree (Chairperson), T. Moody, B. Gold, B. Ralston, C. Barrett, B. Davis, W. Cook, G. Jencsok, M. Yeatts, C. Mayo, P. Hyde, D. Cohen, S. Lloyd, a FWS Rep.

Recommendation: Research design guidelines for the Center should include post-flow scenarios and resource prioritization. USBR, WAPA and GCMRC will determine funding availability. When budget is set, TWG will decide on which items (if any) will be cut.

2. BHBf Compliance Activities Schedule: Chairperson distributed General Planning Guidelines for BHBf (Attachment 5a dated 1/16/98). TWG reviewed and revised #7. TWG reviewed and made minor revisions to BHBf Compliance Timetable for Spring 1998 BHBf (Attachment 5b dated 1/16/98; Attachment 5c dated 1/21/98).

Recommendation: TWG to review for accuracy and submit concerns or differing interpretations to the Chairperson, Steve Lloyd or GCMRC Secretary. TWG to forward the Compliance Timetable to their AMWG representative. T. Morton will report at the next TWG meeting.

3. Science Advisory Board Ad-Hoc Group:

Purpose: Work with TWG to design and establish a board (as required in the GCDEIS) which will report to AMWG. Gene Jencsok provided comments on the white paper to Barry Gold.

Volunteers: B. Gold (Chairperson), B. Persons, K. Christensen, D. Cohen, B. Davis, K. Dongoske or A. Heuslein, G. Jencsok, USBR Rep.

4. Management Objectives/Out Year Budget Ad-Hoc Group

Purpose: Review and update management objectives and information needs. Establish relative priorities by study type, resource class and by research/monitoring question. Review GCMRC outyear budgets, including detail regarding overhead rates. Timeframe: Feb/Mar.

GCMRC's former Program Planning Group was dissolved at this time and the new ad-hoc group will take over its meeting rooms and times. Management Objectives need to be completed within three months of the AMWGI. They are not permanent and will be reviewed and updated annually. Some members felt the budget could be worked on before the objectives and information needs are updated. The science group needs to have the MO's and IN's first in order to do the budget. USBR needs the budget by March so discussions need to begin and a budget process structure established.

Volunteers: D. Garrett(Facilitator), C. Barrett, W. Davis, W. Cook, N. Henderson, K. Dongoske, B. Persons, C. Palmer, B. Moore, A. Heuslein, T. Moody, P. Hyde, D. Cohen, A. Potochnik, R. Winfree, G. Jencsok, M. Phillips, S. Lloyd, L. Stevens

5. **Out Year Budget Ad-Hoc Group:** An ad-hoc group was formed and combined with the MO/IN ad-hoc Group.

6. **Spillway Gate Extensions Ad-Hoc Group:**

Purpose: Review the ROD to install the gates permanently based upon new data on operations.

Volunteers: B. Moore(Chairperson), W. Cook, N. Henderson, P. Hyde

Recommendation: W. Cook and USBR will develop a report for AMWG which includes more detail on compliance. Report back to TWG.

7. **Glen Canyon Dam Release Issues Ad-Hoc Group**

Purpose: To gather information on flows above 45,000cfs and daily fluctuations.

Volunteers: T. Moody(Chairperson), T. Melis, W. Cook, C. Barrett, C. Harris, R. Peterson, F. Worthley, M. Yeatts, C. Palmer, D. Cohen, A. Potochnik

8. **State of Resources Report Ad-Hoc Group**

Purpose: Review and recommend format for annual report for TWG and AMWG review.

Volunteers: T. Moody(Chairperson), L. Stevens

9. **BHBF Science Funding Ad-Hoc Group**

Purpose: Design research and investigate funding alternatives for a potential 1998 spring flood.

Volunteers: B. Moore(Chairperson), C. Barrett, D. Garrett, W. Cook, C. Palmer

10. **BHBF Compliance Issues Ad-Hoc Group**

Purpose: Investigate compliance activities and timetables for a spring 1998 BHBF.

Volunteers: T. Morton(Chairperson), D. Bills ,

11. **Formats for Electronic Transmission Ad-Hoc Group**

Purpose: Distribution electronically of documents. The GCMRC Secretary reported that the Acrobat software has been received and documents will soon be available in the .pdf format on the GCMRC web site.

Recommendation: Committee recommended to dissolve the Formats for Electronic Transmission Ad-Hoc Group. Large documents should be saved as compressed files to fit onto a diskette. Written feedback was received suggesting that members who distribute handouts should provide an electronic copy to the gcmrc Secretary so they may be posted on the web site along with the minutes for reference.

Obviously, one of the more successful Ad-Hocs.

- 7 12. Compliance/Process for a Seasonal Tributary Event
Details are unclear

13. Lake Powell Split Ad-Hoc Group

14. The "Tom Moody-This Will Be My Last Meeting" Ad-Hoc Group

Purpose: "JUST DO IT!"

15. The Operational Flows Issues Committee of One Ad-Hoc
The Monthly Clayton Palmer ROD Discussion

16. The KAS Expert Panel Ad-Hoc?

17. Strategic Plan and Annual Plan Ad-Hocs

It was determined that most members should be in attendance. Consequently, They became TWG functions rather than ad-hoc issues.

18. Experimental Flows Ad-Hoc

Bill Persons (Chairperson)

Issues currently being discussed

19. "Vision Statement" Ad-Hoc

Bill Persons, Rick Johnson (Co-Chairpersons)

Issues currently being discussed

Ad Hoc - Ad Hoc

Dave Cohen

From: Bill Persons [BPpersons@gf.state.az.us]
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 1999 8:59 AM
To: 'Dave Cohen'
Subject: Reports

Dave,

Some ideas I stole.

Reports from committees should minimally contain

1. A statement of the charge to the committee
2. A statement of the methods employed by the committee in accomplishing its charge.
3. A summary of information gathered or work done.
4. A statement of conclusions or findings.
5. A specific recommendation, together with a rationale for that recommendation.
6. The names of the members on the committee.
7. A summary (often called an "executive summary" at the beginning of the report is helpful for long reports.

The next section elaborates the nature and content of committee reports.
The Committee Report

By whom should the report be prepared? Usually a member of the committee (often the chair or a recorder, but it could be anyone) prepares a draft of the report. All members of the committee should be given opportunity to review and revise the draft before it is submitted. It is not the drafter's work product, but the product of the entire committee.

To whom should be made? In most cases the committee is addressed to the appointing or supervising authority. Occasionally, particularly at the direction of the authority, a report may go to other individuals or organizations.

What form should the report take? There is no universally mandatory form, but some principles help guide us. Reports should go forward with a written and an oral report; both should be planned carefully to be effective. Exactly what goes into each depends on a large number of factors: the audience, the nature of the problem and the solution, time available, how much information is needed by the higher authority for decision making, and so forth. The report should be prepared and organized to accomplish two ends: (1) to persuade the higher authority to adopt the report & its recommendations and (2) to facilitate the decision-making of the higher authority. A reports need not necessarily be long (being too long may discourage anyone from reading it), but needs to be long enough to competently and persuasively present the plan and justify it to the higher authority. Whatever format is decided upon, the report should meet high professional standards: typed, spell and grammar checked, etc.; a computer and printer makes this easier.

What content should the reports contain? The report should be written to have an impact on those who read it. After reading the content, the reader must be convinced the conditions the proposal seeks to remedy are serious enough to justify action, understand the details of the proposal and how it will remedy the problem conditions, and be assured that the proposal is practical, reasonable, and will bring no undesirable side outcomes. The reader must also believe the proposal is the best alternative. Although the content and organization of the content is flexible and should be adapted to each situation, several content elements are usually "necessary" to fulfill the functions of a report:

Executive Summary. Especially in longer reports (probably over 8 pages), it is a good idea to have an Executive Summary in which the whole report (including purpose, problem, solution, rationale, and recommendations) is summarized in a few paragraphs, not to exceed one page in length. Explain the purposes of the report. Is it an interim or final

report? Is it to outline factual findings, conclusions, or recommendations? Is it to summarize actions of the committee or does it propose a project or program in solution to a problem?

Preamble. A preamble or introduction contains boilerplate information (such as the name of the committee and the names of the members), a statement of the charge or mission given to the committee (making the organizational context of the report clear), and a review of the procedures used in the problem solving process.

Background. The report should give needed background on the nature of the problem indicating a need for a solution. Succinctly and objectively, the committee's factual findings and conclusions about the nature of the problem, its causes, its effects, and related matters should be presented. Appropriate documentation should be given. If there is a large amount of material as a result of the committee's work, often this material is best summarized briefly in the report with supporting documents placed in an appendix.

Proposed solution. The report should give a detailed presentation of the solution to the problem, including an implementation plan, organizational chart, and budget. An implementation plan can include such things as

1. Goals and objectives. Goals point to the qualitative ideals or values the solution supports; they inspire motive and enable unity of action. Objectives are the statement of particular activities which, if achieved, result in the accomplishment of the goals.

2. Statement of personnel. From goals and objectives, we derive particular tasks that can be done by particular individuals. Often an organization chart makes clear the various task roles and their interrelationships. Reports should make clear what people will be assigned to which tasks and task roles.

3. Space, materials, and logistics. The proposal must make clear what resources are needed, including facilities, communications, computers, telephone, mailing, etc.

4. Finances and budget. Linked to the above, the costs of the program (personnel, materials, mailing, gasoline, etc.) should be clearly and accurately projected. If possible, the plan should also indicate the source of funds.

5. Time. The report should project a timetable for the accomplishment of the various objectives and tasks to facilitate the operation of the plan. Who is to do what by when?

6. Evaluation and impact. Proposals are more likely to be approved if the higher authority has a clear idea of how to tell if the investment of time and money was worth it. Explain how to evaluate the success of the program. Specify who will be affected or inconvenienced by the new program.

Rationale. The report should make an argued defense of the proposed solution, generally including (1) how the plan will meet the need; (2) why the plan is desirable in light of relevant absolute and/or relative criteria; and (3) why the plan has advantages and fewer disadvantages compared to alternative responses to the problem, including doing nothing.

Recommendation. The report should clearly present a request for the higher authority to take some action on the work of the committee; sometimes this function is done in the Preamble. For example, if the committee's function is largely advisory, then the report should request that the committee be informed of actions or decisions on the matters covered in the report. If the committee's role was to provide information, then the request might be that the receipt of the information be acknowledged. If the committee's role was decision-making or action-taking, then the request should be for feedback to guide future work.

From:

Parliamentary Procedure:
Toward the Good Order of the University
Advice from Dr. John A. Cagle,
Parliamentarian of the Academic Senate

and Professor of Speech Communication
at California State University, Fresno

Bill Persons
Arizona Game and Fish Department
2221 West Greenway Road
Phoenix AZ 85023
(602) 789-3375
bpersons@gf.state.az.us