Agenda Item:  GCMRC’s BHBF Science Planning Update

Action Requested
√ Information item only; we will answer questions, but no action is requested.

Feedback requested from AMWG members.

Motion requested.  (The following motion is requested, and is provided as a courtesy to AMWG members as recommended by TWG. However, no motion is presumed to be made unless and until an AMWG member makes the motion in accordance with the AMWG Operating Procedures.)

Presenter(s):  John Hamill, Chief; Ted Melis, Deputy Chief; and Matthew Andersen, Biological Program Manager, GCMRC

Previous Action Taken
√ By AMWG: see below

By TWG:

By an Ad Hoc Group:

Other:

Relevant Science

There has been no relevant research or monitoring on this subject.

The following describes the relevant research or monitoring on this subject:

Background Information
√ See attached.
Addressing AMWG concerns about Future Beach/Habitat-Building Flow Testing and the Need for Science Plan Development (BHBF)

AMWG Recommendation

“AMWG recommends to the Secretary of the Interior to charge GMCRC to develop a science plan for a BHBF that addresses the concerns raised at the AMWG meeting on Dec. 6, 2006, and AMWG further charges the TWG to work with GMCRC to review the Draft Science Plan and make a recommendation to the AMWG.” AMWG Meeting, December 6, 2007

During late December 2006, through early February 2007, the GMCRC proceeded with development of a beach/habitat-building flow (BHBF) experimental science plan, as recommended by AMWG and directed by the DOI. Planning activities included several meetings among staff and cooperating scientists to define both single-discipline and integrated science activities that might be implemented before, during and following future BHBF testing. In addition, several appendices were added to the draft BHBF science plan by the GMCRC, including one specifically to provide cost estimates associated with research and monitoring tied to the physical/cultural, biological (mainly, fishery and aquatic research, but also terrestrial vegetation studies) resources, as well as quality-of-water related to Lake Powell and dam releases. Additional information in the appendices identified pros and cons associated with future BHBF tests of similar and shorter durations to the 2004 test. Another appendix was included specifically to respond to concerns about future BHBF testing expressed by the AMWG at their December 2006 meeting. The draft BHBF plan was delivered to the Science Advisors (SA) for external peer review in mid-February and the GMCRC further revised the draft plan on the basis of this peer review during March through mid-May.

During the BHBF draft science plan revision process, meetings also occurred between the GMCRC and other DOI agencies to discuss various elements of the proposed experimental research. Additional discussions about the GMCRC’s proposed BHBF testing strategy, as well as the potential influence of such tests on biological and cultural resources also occurred between GMCRC staff and other invited scientists during the April 2007 Science Workshop on Long Term Experimental Planning. The GMCRC’s strategy is to have an integrated BHBF science approved by AMWG during summer 2007, and seek additional guidance about whether the plan should be implemented during winter/spring 2008, if the proposed sediment trigger is reached during summer through early winter 2007-08. Regardless of whether the BHBF plan is implemented in 2008 or not, having an approved BHBF plan is desirable in that such a plan can eventually be integrated into any long term experimental plan that might be implemented in 2009 and beyond.

Next Steps

1. The draft BHBF science plan will be sent to the TWG in early May for a 30 day review and written comment period.
2. Following receipt of written comments from TWG in June, and a discussion at the June 25-26 TWG meeting, the GMCRC will make further revisions of the draft BHBF science plan.
3. GMCRC will send out the revised BHBF science plan for review and approval by the AMWG (Late July 2007).