

Response to Peer Review Comments for Chapter 9 – Adaptive Management

Please note that the peer review comments are in **red font** and the Study response is in *italic blue font*.

A. What is the best/most unique part of the analysis?

The report provides a very good presentation of the decision making analysis procedure. Supporting material is clearly presented.

B. What is the most critical aspect of the study/analysis? Why?

The report was somewhat difficult to follow because the phrases vulnerability assessment and adaptive management seemed to be used interchangeably. In the end, what was presented was more of a risk-based decision making process rather than an adaptive strategy. These are quite different.

***Response:** A distinction has been made between the process used for “risk assessment” which helped define our AMG workplan for the Study and the Adaptive Management strategy developed for post Study efforts towards understanding future risk, minimizing uncertainties and adjusting management actions as new information and knowledge becomes available or as conditions change. In particular section 9.1.2 was revised to more clearly distinguish between the two and to ensure consistency between the work plan items listed and the risk assessment process identified in figure 9.3.*

C. Which aspect of the analysis/modeling is weakest? Why? How can it be improved?

See comment B.

D. Are there any other suggestions that are related to how this analysis may be used more effectively or the results explicated in a more understandable manner?

- Section 9.1.2 is quite confusing and should be rewritten At the bottom of page two, eight items are listed, but the following discussion covers five items and figure 9.3 contains boxes that don't agree with the workplan items nor the other five.

***Response:** As noted above section 9.1.2 has been rewritten and the title for figure 9.3 revised. As well the items listed for the AM work plan now link to figure 9.3.*

- Section 9.2.3 the last sentence refers to a gateway under development. Wouldn't most reader find the word portal more understandable?

***Response:** Revised*

- On page 16, should this section contain a discussion of the results from perfect forecasts as a means of demonstrating the limits of operational flexibility? Also should the water

management implications of the water use priorities contained in the treaty be discussed?
Note typo paragraph three, line 10.

Response: This comment appeared to be somewhat unclear; however, a reference to the need for using perfect forecasting in considering future plan adjustments under extremes was added to the bullets on page 16 under 9.2.4, #3.

- *In 8.4, a call for a new advisory board may appear a bit of a damp squib to the public. Think it would be better to reverse the order of recommendations 2 and 1.*

Response: Revised as suggested

Also –

- *Added some references to the need to link water quantity and quality and revised the graphic for figure 9-6 to add this.*
- *Added text to Section 9.2.6 #2 The Role of the IJC that speaks to the past 1977 reference for a Great Lakes Levels Advisory Board and revised the last finding under section 9.3 Key Points to reflect this.*