

# Independent Science Review Process



# GCDAMP Science Advisors Program

---

## **f. The GCDAMP Science Advisors Program**

The Science Advisors Program (SAP) will continue as part of GCDAMP to provide independent scientific review and recommendations regarding monitoring and research, integration, and management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources affected by Glen Canyon Dam operations. The SAP will be composed of qualified individuals not otherwise participating in the long-term monitoring and research studies. The SAP will establish review panels as directed by DOI and in consultation with GCDAMP, including the Tribes and AMWG to conduct periodic reviews. The SAP and review panels convened thereunder are advisory and not decision-making bodies.

# Purpose

---

- Review GCDAMP resource-specific monitoring and research programs, and carry out other advisory tasks per AMWG request to...
  - *Ensure that the monitoring and research findings used by the AMWG and the Secretary in implementing the GCDAMP meet AMP needs*
  - *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
- June 14-15, 2016, Technical Work Group Meeting: Updated the Science Advisory Charter  
“[https://www.usbr.gov/uc/progact/amp/twg/2016-06-14-twg-meeting/Attach\\_03.pdf](https://www.usbr.gov/uc/progact/amp/twg/2016-06-14-twg-meeting/Attach_03.pdf)”

# Process

---

- Sound Science – Contractor
  - Generate a list of potential reviewers (Recommendations from GCMRC, Reclamation, and TWG included)
  - Prepare reviewer guidance package
    - Background documents, presentations, links, recordings
    - Generate guidelines/questions for reviewers

# Guidelines/Questions

---

1. The clarity and scientific quality of the proposal consistent with the goals established by the 2016 LTEMP Record of Decision and the need to assess resource status and trends, the effects of experimental and management actions, and potential other drivers and constraints.
2. The feasibility of accomplishing the stated three-year goals and elements of each project.
3. The relative priorities and funding levels proposed for the different project elements included under each project and opportunities to improve the cost effectiveness of each project given the need to reduce expenditures.
4. Contributions to the adaptive management of the resources and the experimental and management actions prioritized in the 2016 LTEMP Record of Decision (as subsequently expanded to include other methods for controlling invasive species).
5. The likely readiness of the project to undergo a comprehensive review of its accomplishments and design after the completion of the FY 2025–2027 work cycle.
6. Technical Merit: Any new technologies/ideas that could be incorporated.

# Process

---

- Sound Science – Contractor (Part of GCDAMP since 2015)
  - Generate a list of potential reviewers (Recommendations from GCMRC, Reclamation, and TWG included)
  - Prepare reviewer guidance package
    - Background documents, presentations, links, recordings
    - Generate guidelines/questions for reviewers
    - Conflict of Interest Certification Form
  - Reviewers based on expertise in the fields we are asking them to review
    - **Reclamation signs off on reviewers**
    - Submit signed forms from Guidance Package
    - Submit an updated CV/Resume
  - Reviews begin **May 28** when 2<sup>nd</sup> draft is submitted
  - Reviews due **June 12** to Sound Science
  - Independent Science Panel Review Report due June 17
  - Virtual Presentation of reviews on June 17