

**DFC Ad Hoc Summary Report to TWG
Oct 2, 2007**

Ad Hoc Process Schedule:

By August 22, 2007, Review the draft DFC document and provide comments to ad hoc chair:

- The ad hoc is to review the attached draft document for format and accuracy; and
- Review the proposed NPS supplied DFC's and develop the short/long-term target actions to accomplish/satisfy the DFC (e.g. using the AMP goals (2003 AMWG priority goals), science questions, AMP Management Objectives (MOs) etc.);
- Respond back to ad hoc chair with acceptance as is, or offer modifications to, or submit alternative DFC's or actions that meet the BOR charge to the group.

COMPLETED

By August 30, 2007 - Review the GCMRC BHBF Science Plan for technical adequacy as an off-the-shelf plan by which a BHBF could be implemented if approved by AMWG;

- Provide a recommendation to ad hoc chair (e.g. move for TWG acceptance in October for the January AMWG meeting; Not recommend approval (with reasons why not); return to GCMRC for revisions before a TWG decision can be made.

COMPLETED

By September 14, 2007 – Ad hoc chair to consolidate group comments and recommendations on DFC's and BHBF Science Plan, and provide consolidated version and Science plan recommendation to the ad hoc group by the week of September 10.

COMPLETED

By September 28, 2007 – Ad hoc group to discuss comments and recommendations and come to consensus on each topic, or prepare list of needs and requirements on each topic (DFC's, targets, and BHBF science plan) and recommendation to TWG at October 2-3 TWG meeting.

COMPLETED

By September 28, 2007 – Prepare progress report and recommendations and submit to TWG Chair for use at October TWG meeting (as possible to accompany mailing of TWG meeting materials).

COMPLETED

October 2-3, 2007 - Present ad hoc progress to TWG members.

Week of November 6-7, 2007 – Conduct facilitated workshop on DFC's and targets for CRE resources (2-day workshop).

By December 21, 2007 – Provide TWG approved DFC list, CRE resource targets, and BHBF recommendation(s) to BOR for use at winter AMWG meeting (January?).

Brief Summary of Key Ad Hoc Comments on List of DFC's:

- I'm still very uncomfortable with this being an AMP product. From my perspective, DFCs are an NPS responsibility, not something open to being watered down in the AMP. It seems that NPS needs to insure that any DFCs are consistent with park resources and values.
- For this ad hoc, we simply don't have the information to quantify NPS DFCs in a legally and scientifically defensible way. I would be strongly opposed to developing "incremental" DFCs that a majority of the AMP could agree with, as they would not be legally and scientifically defensible, and they would become the NPS DFCs in the conventional wisdom of the AMP.
- My notes and recollection of the 8/15/07 call indicate that the ad hoc would initially only address the DFC's for sediment and HBC, not the whole package of DFC proposed by NPS.
- I don't recall there was any agreement on proceeding with the entire package of NPS draft DFCs.
- In particular we do not agree that the body of law under which the AMP was undertaken gives NPS the sole responsibility/authority to prepare DFC for the TWG, the AMWG nor the AMP program in total.
- Given the importance of science in the Antiquities Act, which underpins the 1916 Organic Act and subsequent enabling legislation for Grand Canyon National Park and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, I recommend that reference to the use of appropriate scientific methods be emphasized throughout the DFC's. Presumably, it will be at least in part that science will be used for interpretation of inventory and monitoring data, and that decision-making will have to be at least informed by scientific information.

Proposed DFC ad hoc Recommendation on the BHBF Science Plan:

The DFC ad hoc provides to TWG the following recommendation on the technical adequacy of the BHBF Science plan, and provides a means to correct the plan for use in the 2008 water year:

DFC AD Hoc Recommends: To not accept the plan as presented, but with slight modifications of the plan as listed below, the ad hoc recommends the plan to be technically sufficient for use in planning a BHBF test for 2008.

Recommended modifications to the plan include:

1. Limit the BHBF test studies to answer short-term **sediment focused** resource questions like:
 - With sediment conservation and use can enriched conditions successfully build target beach and near shore and backwater habitat?
 - Does the sediment trigger volume provide enough sediment into the river to create needed camping beach and habitat restoration, and meet longer-term maintenance requirements?
 - Does the BHBF successfully develop the near shore and backwater habitat?
2. What are the flows necessary to accomplish successful beach, shoreline, restoration, etc. to DFC levels?
3. What are the changes to the HBC population after the BHBF test (pre and post sampling efforts required);
4. A BHBF is a substantial perturbation to the system which may result in humpback chub mortality, changes in recruitment, and modification of habitat. What may be the impact of a BHBF test right before the implementation of the LTEP?

5. Assess the impacts of a BHBF test on other resources in the long term, identifying linkages to ongoing MRP and LTEP designed flows and studies (e.g. assess timing, scope and coordination, etc. with ongoing GCMRC efforts as necessary to accomplish longer-term studies); and
6. Refocus and reduce the overall BHBF science plan proposed budget to just the topic studies listed above, logistics, etc., and move longer term studies of other impacted topics to a separate section (the appendix?). This section should address LTEP linked research studies, changes to MRP efforts necessary to answer the BHBF questions, and applicable tasks necessary to address the need to conduct multiple BHBF tests that reflect the priority of resources as recommended by AMWG.