

## Proposed Independent Social Economic Technical Review (ISETR) Discussion Questions

Below are a number of general organizing questions for ISETR to think through when preparing for interaction with MRRIC during HC Ad Hoc Group calls, MRRIC webinars, and/or MRRIC plenary meetings. Additional questions and related materials will be added to this document as needed.

### Discuss and Provide Feedback Topics

1. Review the Adaptive Management (AM) governance process (e.g., who makes what decisions, how would MRRIC engage moving forward) to ensure that MRRIC's interests are being maintained through the AM process.

#### **Background**

The draft AM plan's purpose is to establish a process by which the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE or Corps), with engagement of MRRIC, meets its fundamental objective of avoiding/precluding jeopardy of the species while maintaining the authorized purposes for the river. Governance, as defined in the draft AM Governance Appendix, refers to the process of negotiation, coordination, and collaboration between agencies, private actors, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), etc. to the joint realization and implementation of a plan addressing an environmental problem (Jessop 1998).

In the current Management Plan Critical Engagement Points (CEP) document, there are placeholders for both the Independent Science Advisory Panel (ISAP) and the ISETR to discuss and provide feedback about the AM governance plan and for MRRIC to make a recommendation regarding the governance plan. The MRRIC leadership and facilitation team and the third party science neutral (TPSN) will work with the planning groups for the MRRIC Human Considerations (HC) Ad Hoc Group and the Strategic Programmatic Assessment (SPA) Task Group to ensure clear roles and responsibilities regarding the feedback from each independent panel and to coordinate any overlap as appropriate. We anticipate the ISETR discussions and feedback will focus on the governance associated with the assessment of the effects of potential management actions on the human objectives of MRRIC/basin stakeholders, and the use of appropriate modeling, monitoring, and assessment tools. In contrast, we anticipate the ISAP discussion and feedback will focus on the scientific decision-making processes related to the AM monitoring, research and adjustment of alternative hypotheses/management actions using appropriate modeling, monitoring, and assessment tools aimed at meeting the species objectives.

#### **Specific Questions**

- a. Is the purpose for this governance structure clear? Does the definition of governance on page 1 make sense? Is it clear what the definition of governance is trying to convey?
- b. Is it clear what decisions are to be made, how they will be made (by whom and based on what criteria)?
- c. Are the types of information and analyses to be provided to each level of governance sufficient in order to make effective decisions?
- d. Have processes been designed to ensure decision makers have access to the best available data (data of the required quality) for use in analyses?
- e. Is the timing for analysis and decision making clear and adequate?

- f. Is it clear when and how MRRIC will engage in the AM process?
- g. Is it clear when and how the ISETR will engage in the AM process?
- h. Will this governance process provide the lead agencies and MRRIC a foundation on which to achieve the species and human considerations objectives?
- i. Are there other aspects of the governance structure/process that should be considered?

**Materials to Review**

- The draft AM Plan: “Draft\_AM\_Plan\_20141208\_ISAP\_SPA\_review”
- Draft AM Plan Governance Appendix: “Governance Appendix A\_120814\_ISAP\_SPA\_review”
- USACE Summary of Interviews and Lessons Learned about AM Governance: “AM Lessons Learned Summary Table for Governance and Stakeholder Involvement...”

2. Observe the ProACT process with the proxy metrics, the initial results of the test alternatives, and the Round 1 consequences and tradeoffs and provide feedback on what could be done better in Round 2 (e.g., discussing social and economic information, alternative selection/evaluation process). Respond to MRRIC’s questions about proxy calculations.

**Specific Questions**

- a. Are the USACE planning principles adequately integrated into the ProACT process (as explained in the USACE’s ProACT & USACE Planning Process Alignment document)?
- b. Is ProACT adequately integrated into the overall Management Plan development and EIS process (as explained in the ADM/DAA document)?
- c. Is the ProACT process adequately meeting the evaluation criteria established by the USACE?
- d. Does the USACE approach to assessing test alternatives meet the evaluation criteria established by the USACE?
- e. Does the USACE approach to assessing proxy metrics meet the evaluation criteria established by the USACE?
- f. Does the ProACT process provide adequate opportunities to address members’ questions/concerns about the USACE’s response to MRRIC’s recommendation on HC Objectives and Metrics (such as issues related to stranded assets, net farm income impacts, water-compelled rates, and the impacts of alternatives outside the sideboards)? If so, at what point in the process should these questions/concerns be addressed? If not, what approach do you recommend?
- g. Does the ProACT process provide adequate opportunities to address members’ questions/concerns about impacts of alternatives outside the sideboards? At what point in the process should these questions/concerns be addressed?

**Materials to Review**

- Alternatives Development Methodology and Decision Analysis Approach: “MRRMP ADM DAA v12,” (most of document is for background and context) which will include the following for review:
- USACE’s document detailing the ProACT & USACE Planning Process Alignment: “2015-02-20\_ProACTPlanning Integration”
  - USACE’s clarification regarding the Missouri River Recovery Program’s status as a NED and/or NER program and the evaluation criteria that apply (in development)

- Memo from the USACE to MRRIC in 2014 regarding the Proxy Metrics: “Summary\_HCProxies\_Dec2014 v4”
  - A set of Proxy Information Sheets, with the proxies the USACE used to for initial calculations:
    - Commercial Dredging: “Proxy Info\_Commercial Dredging\_Dec2014”
    - Cultural Resources: “Proxy Info\_Cultural\_Resources\_Dec2014”
    - Fish and Wildlife: “Proxy Info\_FishWildlife\_Dec2014”
    - Flood Risk and Agriculture: “Proxy Info\_Flood Risk and Agriculture\_Dec2014”
    - Hydropower: “Proxy Info\_Hydropower\_Dec2014”
    - Irrigation: “Proxy Info\_Irrigation\_Dec2014”
    - Navigation: “Proxy Info\_Navigation\_Dec2014”
    - Property Tax Base (Local Government): “Proxy Info\_Property Tax Base\_Dec2014”
    - Recreation: “Proxy Info\_Recreation\_Dec2014”
    - Thermal Power: “Proxy Info\_Thermal\_Dec2014”
    - Water Supply: “Proxy Info\_Water Supply\_Dec2014”
    - Wastewater: “Proxy\_Info\_Wastewater\_Dec2014”
  - Test alternatives and related webinar presentations and summaries
    - Development of the Bird Test Alternatives: “11.1 Development of Bird Test Alternatives 2-10-15 v1”
    - February 2015 plenary presentation about the bird test alternatives: “Harberg\_MRRIC Feb 24”
  - Results of proxy calculations for test alternatives and Round 1 Consequences and Tradeoffs (Information not yet available)
3. Review, discuss, and provide feedback about HC model inputs (e.g., data used, how data gaps were filled, etc.), assumptions (e.g., future growth predictions and human behavioral response predictions), and outputs for validity back to the original objective and its intent as requested by MRRIC.
  4. After Round 1 of Consequences and Tradeoffs, review the OSE objectives, provide feedback about which are still sensitive to the alternatives under consideration, and for those that are sensitive, determine what will become of them in Round 2.
  5. Discuss and give feedback on potential impacts to human considerations objectives if alternatives outside of sideboards are under serious consideration after Round 1 (e.g., discuss the process for addressing these impacts).
  6. Observe, review, and provide feedback on Round 2 consequences and tradeoff process (including economic modeling and OSE objectives).

## Appendix A: Working List of Documents for ISETR to Review

### Procedural:

1. USACE MRRIC ISAP Approach Structure Ground Rules doc: "USACE MRRIC ISAP Approach Structure Ground Rules - FINAL MODIFIED"

### Background and Contextual Documents:

1. Structured Decision Making 101 Webinar Information (June 28, 2013)
  - a. Presentation: "Components of Structured Decision Making MRRIC Final"
  - b. Summary: "SDM101 Webinar Summary 6-28-13 FINAL"
  - c. Recording agenda (which includes a link to the recording): "SDM 101 Webinar RECORDING Agenda 06-28-13 v1"
2. Structured Decision-Making Workshop Comprehensive Debrief Webinar (July 16, 2013)
  - a. Presentation: "MRRP SDM ProACT MRRIC overview June 16 2013 Final v4"
  - b. Summary: "SDM Debrief Webinar Summary 07-16-13 v2"
  - c. Recording agenda (which includes a link to the recording): "SDM 101 Webinar RECORDING Agenda 06-28-13 v1"
3. Compilation of ProACT Questions from Webinars (August 2013): "SDM-ProACT Questions from Webinars"
4. MRRIC Human Considerations charge : "AM Ad Hoc Group Charge - February 26 2015 - APPROVED"
5. P&G 1983: "P&G\_1983"
6. Planning Guidance Notebook – ER-1105-2-100: "Planning Guidance Notebook - ER\_1105-2-100--Apr00"
7. Critical Engagement Points document: "2014-11-06\_MRRIC and ISAP CEP v15"
8. Sideboards Document: "2014-01-10\_USACE Action Item 4 HC Sideboards v5"
9. ISETR Evaluation of Human Considerations Objectives, Metrics, Methods, and Models for the Missouri River Recovery Management Plan: "Final ISETR Evaluation of HC Objectives, Metrics, Methods, Models 091214"
10. MRRIC Recommendation on HC Objectives and Metrics: "MRRIC HC Obj Metrics Recs Incl Prologue - Final Consensus"
11. USACE response to MRRIC's Recommendation on HC Objectives and Metrics: "USACE Resp HC Obj & Metr incl Cover Letter 05Nov2014"

### For Substantive Review:

1. The draft AM Plan: "Draft\_AM\_Plan\_20141208\_ISAP\_SPA\_review"
2. Draft AM Plan Governance Appendix: "Governance Appendix A\_120814\_ISAP\_SPA\_review"
3. USACE Summary of Interviews and Lessons Learned about AM Governance: "AM Lessons Learned Summary Table for Governance and Stakeholder Involvem..."
4. Alternatives Development Methodology and Decision Analysis Approach: "MRRMP ADM DAA v12"
5. USACE's document detailing the ProACT & USACE Planning Process Alignment: "2015-02-20\_ProACTPlanning Integration"
6. Memo from the USACE to MRRIC in 2014 regarding the Proxy Metrics: "Summary\_HCProxies\_Dec2014 v4"
7. A set of Proxy Information Sheets, with the proxies the USACE used to for initial calculations:
  - a. Commercial Dredging: "Proxy Info\_Commercial Dredging\_Dec2014"
  - b. Cultural Resources: "Proxy Info\_Cultural\_Resources\_Dec2014"

- c. Fish and Wildlife: "Proxy Info\_FishWildlife\_Dec2014"
  - d. Flood Risk and Agriculture: "Proxy Info\_Flood Risk and Agriculture\_Dec2014"
  - e. Hydropower: "Proxy Info\_Hydropower\_Dec2014"
  - f. Irrigation: "Proxy Info\_Irrigation\_Dec2014"
  - g. Navigation: "Proxy Info\_Navigation\_Dec2014"
  - h. Property Tax Base (Local Government): "Proxy Info\_Property Tax Base\_Dec2014"
  - i. Recreation: "Proxy Info\_Recreation\_Dec2014"
  - j. Thermal Power: "Proxy Info\_Thermal\_Dec2014"
  - k. Water Supply: "Proxy Info\_Water Supply\_Dec2014"
  - l. Wastewater: "Proxy\_Info\_Wastewater\_Dec2014" Test alternatives and related webinar presentations and summaries (Anticipated documents, not yet produced)
8. Test alternatives and related webinar presentations and summaries
    - a. Development of the Bird Test Alternatives: "11.1 Development of Bird Test Alternatives 2-10-15 v1"
    - b. February 2015 plenary presentation about the bird test alternatives: "Harberg\_MRRIC Feb 24"
9. Results of proxy calculations for test alternatives and Round 1 Consequences and Tradeoffs (Anticipated document, not yet produced)