

I. Project Title: Peer Review of Geomorphology Related Work

II. Principal Investigator:
George Smith
P.O. Box 25486, DFC, Denver, CO 80225-0486
Phone: (303) 236-5322, ext. 235
Fax: (303) 236-4224
E-mail: george_smith@fws.gov

III. Project Summary:

The refinement of flow recommendations and channel monitoring are becoming increasingly important as the Recovery Program moves from a research-oriented program to implementation of flow enhancement projects such as coordinated reservoir operations, re-operation of dams, instream flow protection, and levee removal. The Recovery Program's Channel Monitoring Program is expanding, into a habitat monitoring program and additional projects expected in the future. To ensure that future geomorphology and channel monitoring projects are designed properly, a peer review process has been implemented by the Recovery Program. A three-person peer review panel was established in 1998 and continued to operate in 2004.

IV. Study Schedule: Initial Year - 1998, Final Year - Ongoing

V. Relationship to RIPRAP: General Recovery Program Support Action Plan
I. Provide and Protect Instream Flows
II. Restore Habitat

VI. Accomplishments of FY 2004 Tasks and Deliverables:

During 2004 two reports were reviewed by the geomorphology peer review group. The first report was the Miller Mussetter Report "Ecological and Physical Processes during spring Peak flow and Summer Base Flows in the Colorado River." The second report was the Anderson Stewart report "Riverine Fish Flow Investigations Federal Aid Project F-289-R6." The only payed peer reviewer in 2004 was Jimmy O'Brien who was paid \$ 750 to review the Miller Mussetter Report.

VII. Recommendations: The problems with the panel are timely review which is difficult to overcome because everyone is busy. Paying peer review helps but many reviewers are government people that we cannot pay for reviews. My suggestion is for everyone to realize peer reviews are an important part of Recovery Program work and if ask to provide a peer review; give your best efforts to conduct a thorough and timely review.

VIII. Project Status: Ongoing and not without problems, which have been addressed.

IX. FY 2004 Budget Status:

A. Funds Provided: up to \$10,000 Section 7 funds (on an as-needed basis)

B. Funds Expended: $\frac{750}{\$ 9,250}$

X. Status of Submissions: Not Applicable

XI. Signed: George Smith November 16, 2004
Principal Investigator Date: