

SA Review of HFT and Improving SA Information Transfer to the TWG

**Technical Work Group
Phoenix, AZ
April 8-9, 2008**

**L.D. Garrett
Executive Director
Science Advisors**



SA Review of 2007 Draft HFT Plan

SA COMMENTS

- 1996 and 2004 background info should be retained
- General design was acceptable but insufficient details on study methods
- Riparian vegetation survey has insufficient literature support; Revise Study
- Documentation of cultural resource program activities insufficient
- Expand proposed Lake Powell assessment
- Documentation of HBC related program activity insufficient

GCMRC Response

- Minor revision
- Significant improvements in requested detail
- Science literature support expanded. Proposed research revised
- Significant addition and revision of cultural resource activities
- Minor expansion in assessment
- Significant additions and revision of HBC Program

SA REVIEW OF 2008 DRAFT HFT PLAN

SA COMMENTS

- Clarify if sand is distributed through system
- Text and Table 1A need to provide greater detail on potential tests related to HBC use of backwaters
- Clarify those hypothesis appropriate to test in 2008 and those where more information is needed
- GCMRC should develop cost benefit analysis (CBA) models to assist assessment such as the HFT.
- Clarification needed of appropriate integration of cultural resource protection and science requirements.

GCMRC RESPONSE

- The distribution is to be fully validated in pre-assessment
- Clarification provided on food base and ongoing monitoring
- Clarification provided for selected science assessments
- Economic impacts are outside scope of HFT
- Clarification provided on multiple issues

Opportunities for Improving SA Information Transfer to the Technical Work Group

Assumptions

- Roles and Operating Protocols of TWG and SAs do not change
- Continued AMP support for SA and TWG programs
- Improved meeting schedules of SAs and TWG

Opportunities for Improving SA Information Transfer to the Technical Work Group

Proposals

1. All reviews will have developed executive summary and power point support documents.
2. All SA reviews will have developed response from AMP entity responsible for document/report.
3. SA Executive Director will schedule reviews, as possible, to provide collaborative presentation at TWG meetings
4. Conference call of TWG, the SA Executive Director and GCMRC Chief or other AMP entity on time constrained reviews