



PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
Memorandum

TO: Governance Committee (GC)
FROM: Executive Director's Office (EDO)
RE: Scope of Work for Lower Platte River Stage Change Study Peer Review
DATE: November 3, 2010

Recommendation

In June 2010, the Governance Committee (GC) approved a recommendation from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to conduct an independent peer review of the Lower Platte River Stage Change Study. This EDO memo provides details on areas of expertise necessary in the Peer Review Panel, the scope of work, and stipends for Peer Review Panel members. **The EDO requests GC approval** of this Peer Review Scope of Work.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended this Scope of Work to the GC for approval on November 3, 2010.

Peer Review Panel

This study will be one of the initial Program documents peer reviewed in 2011. Potential reviewers will be screened and recommended by PBS&J. The GC will ultimately approve the members of the Peer Review Panel, but certain areas of expertise are considered essential for representation on this panel:

- Pallid sturgeon ecology (prefer experience with fish habitat modeling)
- Riverine physical processes/geomorphology
- River engineering and hydraulic modeling
- Hydrology and hydrologic analysis
- Ecological statistics

Scope of Work

Each Peer Review Panel member will be tasked with reviewing the Stage Change Study from their particular area of expertise following the PRRIP Peer Review Guidelines for Reports & Studies. Peer reviewers will be asked to submit all comments, questions, and other communication in writing to ensure an appropriate record is built, and all communication with peer reviewers will be conducted via e-mail and conference calls (if necessary). Peer Review Panel members will be provided with a copy of the final Stage Change Study, all appendices and figures, a copy of the Stage Change Study RFP, and any other information requested during the review process.

Specifically, review of the Stage Change Study should include the following information:

What is the major contribution of this document?

What are its major strengths and weaknesses, and suitability for publication and/or use by the Program?

Are conclusions based on sound scientific methods and reasoning?

Are the major conclusions/findings concisely reported?

General Comments:

1. Scientific soundness
2. Organization and clarity



3. Conciseness
4. Degree to which conclusions are supported by the data
5. Cohesiveness of conclusions

Specific Comments:

Please support your general comments with specific evidence and literature. Specific topic areas and questions that should be addressed include:

1. Presentation: Is a tightly reasoned argument evident throughout? Does the manuscript wander from the central purpose?
2. Methods: Are they appropriate? Current? Described clearly and with sufficient detail so that someone else could repeat the work?
3. Data presentation: When results are stated in the text of the manuscript, can you easily verify them by examining tables and figures? Are any of the results counterintuitive? Are all tables and figures clearly labeled? Well planned? Too complex? Necessary?
4. Statistical design and analyses: Are they appropriate and correct? Can the reader readily discern which measurements or observations are independent of which other measurements or observations? Are replicates correctly identified? Are significance statements justified?
5. Conclusions: Has the author(s) drawn conclusions from insufficient evidence? Are the interpretations of the data logical, reasonable, and based on the application of relevant and generally accepted scientific principles? Has the author(s) overlooked alternative hypotheses?
6. Errors: Point out any errors in technique, fact, calculation, interpretation, or style.
7. Citations: Are all (and only) pertinent references cited? Are they provided for all assertions of fact not supported by the data in the manuscript?

Budget Implications

The EDO recommends that each Peer Review Panel member receive a stipend of **\$5,000** for a total of **\$25,000** (5 panel members X \$5,000/each). Stipends would be paid from approved funds in the PRRIP FY 2011 Budget Line Item PD-3: AMP & IMRP Peer Review.