

Questions Regarding Human Considerations (HC) and Adaptive Management Plan (AMP) v5 for Evaluation by the Independent Social and Economic Technical Review (ISETR) Panel

MRRIC requests the ISETR panel to provide an evaluation of the existing AMP v5 chapters 2, 5, and 6 that incorporates an academic-style review of the HC-related materials in chapters 2, 5, and 6, and strives to answer to the questions noted below to the extent that they can be answered given the current state of the AMP document development.

1. The fundamental objective of the MRRMP is to meet species objectives while minimizing impacts on human considerations. Does the AM Plan v5 identify and describe mechanisms for adjusting management actions to minimize HC impacts while meeting the species objectives? Does AMP v5 adequately address scientific uncertainty when assessing species response and HC impacts resulting from management actions?
2. Does AMP v5 adequately describe how MRRIC will participate in the analysis and interpretation of the results of HC metrics monitoring?
3. Does AMP v5 describe how its governance structure/process and HC monitoring and assessment approach will provide and use information in the timeframes needed to implement AMP effectively?
4. *PREAMBLE: Management actions and assessment procedures will change in time as new information derived from research, monitoring, and modeling emerges, and with changed social and economic circumstances. Breadth of program attributes also must adapt with adaptive management: program governance, expertise of technicians and managers, management implementation strategies, decision criteria, information-transfer pathways, data collection and archiving capabilities (and more), all will need to be revisited and some amended under an adaptive management framework.*

QUESTION: Does AMP version 5 identify and adequately explain how and through what mechanisms the full complement of program attributes and technical expertise will be amended and adjusted with new information and emerging opportunities and constraints under the proposed adaptive management regime?

5. Does AMP v5 adequately integrate HC effects monitoring, define HC decision thresholds, and identify specific actions that will be triggered when thresholds are crossed?
6. Does AMP v5 describe in sufficient detail, a programmatic HC monitoring and assessment approach that is sufficiently rigorous to detect potential impacts to HCs and subsequently provide actionable information to guide adaptive management?
7. Does AMP v5 adequately describe the process for collecting HC impact data from external sources, evaluating its reliability, and safeguarding any confidentiality? Does AMP v5 adequately describe how validated estimates from stakeholder input will be included? Is it clear whether/how an online system, complete with validation means, will be created and used for members to report effects on them? Is it clear whether/how members will be able to access

monitoring results (real time flow/stage) and review assessment/interpretation of monitoring results?

8. From your perspective, have HC monitoring metrics and decision processes been sufficiently described such that MRRIC members would be able to understand the monitoring results and how they will be used?
9. Have protocols been identified for the archiving, retrieval, reporting, communicating, and updating of data regarding HC effects?
10. Does the proposed HC Indicator Dashboard mentioned in AMP v5 Chapter 5 include the appropriate kinds of information, and does it appear MRRIC members will have adequate access to relevant data and the opportunity for feedback about data displayed in the Dashboard?
11. Is it clear from AMP v5 how and with what other programs on the Missouri River (e.g., programs of the USACE, other federal agencies, states, tribes) the MRRP AMP will integrate (i.e., how the AMP will synergize and avoid conflicts with these other programs)?