

Peer Review Plan

Independent Scientific Peer Review of the Methow River Subbasin Effectiveness Monitoring Program Report

Date: May 22, 2017

Originating office: Bureau of Reclamation, Pacific Northwest Region, 1150 N. Curtis Rd,
Boise. Idaho 83706

Reclamation roles:

Director or delegated manager: Lorri Gray, Regional Director, Pacific Northwest
Region, Bureau of Reclamation

Peer Review Lead: Mitch Mumma, Natural Resource Specialist, Pacific Northwest
Region, Bureau of Reclamation

Subject and Purpose

This report summarizes the US Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and collaborating agencies' efforts performed as part of the Methow River Subbasin Effectiveness Monitoring Program Report. This is an update to Reclamation's 2012 Methow IMW Annual Report, and describes the current status and findings of the monitoring programs effort. The report aims to evaluate the effectiveness of salmon and steelhead habitat enhancement actions and to identify future adaptive management actions. In combination with other research and monitoring efforts, this report contributes to evaluations and predictions of fish population response to habitat enhancement actions at the reach- and project-scales.

Impact of Dissemination:

This report is not considered influential or highly influential scientific information as defined by Office of Management and Budget Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (70 FR 2664-2677) and the Reclamation Manual Policy CMP P14 Peer Review of Scientific Information and Assessments. The nexus of this determination is that this document may provide a clearer understanding of the effects of tributary habitat enhancement actions in the Methow watershed; however, there is no known decision or policy that will be affected by its dissemination. This peer review is considered discretionary based upon Reclamation Manual Policy CMP P14.

Peer Review Scope:

This review will evaluate the science used to develop the report, analytical methods and assumptions, results, and conclusions reached by the report as well as the supporting documents.

Peer reviewers will be asked to provide responses to the following questions:

Question 1. How well does the report accomplish its stated goals?

Question 2. How well does the report target the intended audience?

Question 3. How technically sound are the assessments and conclusions?

Question 4. Is there anything that appears missing, including habitat enhancement programs and projects or RM&E data or studies?

Question 5. How effectively does the writing style and formatting convey the information?

Reviewers are to provide comment solely on the scientific information being reviewed, and not on any agency decision or policy.

Manner of Review, Selection of Reviewers:

The review of this study will use individuals who (a) have not worked on the report being reviewed and (b) are knowledgeable in the scientific disciplines contained within the body of the report. The reviewers will review the study to address the questions listed above.

Number of Peer Reviewers:

Six reviewers will be used.

Reviewer Qualification and Selection Process:

The peer reviewers will have at least 10 years' experience with expertise in hydrology, fisheries science, aquatic ecology, and/or conservation biology and water management. Peer reviewers will have education, professional experience, and peer recognition in their field, and will have contributed to their field.

Opportunity for Public Review:

No opportunity for public review will be provided.

Timing of Review:

The peer review period will be from May 30 thru June 16, 2017. The Peer Review Report will be published on the peer review website at the conclusion of receiving peer review comments. The final Peer Review Report is expected to be available on the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Peer Review public website by September 30, 2017.

Methodology of Review:

Review will be conducted by individuals. The identities of the reviewers will be disclosed in the final Peer Review Report. Review findings/comments will be attributed to the individual reviewer. No public comments will be provided or collected as part of this review.

Oversight of the Peer Review Team:

Oversight will be limited to Reclamation with this statement serving as the reviewer's scope of work.

Delivery of findings:

The peer review team members will each submit a report of their findings to the Peer Review Lead by the end of the review period. At a minimum, their report will include a brief description of their findings and recommendations in a comment matrix. The report will be provided digitally to the Peer Review Lead.

Response to Peer Review:

At the conclusion of receiving peer review comments, the Peer Review Lead will submit a final Peer Review Report to Reclamation's peer review website (below), which will summarize the findings of the peer review and list the comments provided by the reviewers.

www.usbr.gov/main/goi/peeragenda.html

Applicability of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA):

This peer review is not subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) because reviewers are being asked to provide individual reviews on the subject matter. Reclamation is not seeking consensus advice from the reviewers as a group.

Agency contact:

Mitch Mumma, 208-378-5347, mmumma@usbr.gov, Bureau of Reclamation