

ATTACHMENT

Specific Recommendations for ERPP Peer Review Process

Who will provide the peer review?

- The peer review should be conducted by nationally prominent, recognized experts with no stake in the outcome . Objectivity is essential for success.
- If a panel approach is to be used, we recommend it be thought of as one panel, rather than four. We believe this would be more effective, particularly given the interdisciplinary approach being advocated by CALFED and the stakeholders. However, subgroups to address specific topical areas are probably necessary.
- Reviewers should represent the various technical disciplines involved, including but not limited to fisheries, riparian and stream ecology, hydrology/geomorphology, hydrodynamics, and statistics.
- If a panel approach is used, we believe the panel should be sufficient to adequately cover the issues. Too small a panel will not provide sufficient depth. However, too large a panel may be difficult to manage and coordinate. We believe the effort will likely require more than 10 individuals, but should not exceed 20.
- The reviewers should be supported by technical experts knowledgeable of the local issues and data. These experts would be available for presentations and questions. This technical “support” should be balanced representing multiple points of view.
- We are currently working together to prepare a list of proposed individuals for the peer review.

How will the reviewers interact (with each other and with interested parties)

- A structured procedure for engaging with each other and the stakeholders should be developed/defined. We recommend that this procedure consist of four elements: (1) coordination time among the reviewers; (2) time for technical debate and discussion, including participation of technical experts and interested parties knowledgeable of local issues; (3) time to hear from the general public; and (4) time for reviewers to meet together to prepare a report of findings.
- A specific schedule for the process should be developed. Given the complexity of the technical issues, one 3-4 day workshop setting to meet with interested parties is probably not sufficient. We believe several 3-4 day workshops will be required.

What is the expected outcome of the review (i.e. what will be produced)?

- The outcome of the process should be a written report that documents the process and findings.
- Findings should focus on a set of well defined scientific questions.

What are the specific questions that will be asked of the reviewer?

- As stated above, the review should focus on specific, pre-established questions regarding key technical issues.
- These questions should be developed and agreed to by the stakeholders in advance of the review process.
- Representatives of ag, urban, and environmental interests are currently working on a list of technical questions we believe should be addressed.