



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Independent Science Advisory Committee (ISAC)

2013 Report on the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program (PRRIP)



Islands in Platte River near Elm Creek during high flows, Oct 2, 2013.

Submitted to

PRRIP Governance Committee

c/o Dr. Jerry Kenny, Executive Director,
Platte River Recovery Implementation Program
Headwaters Corporation,
3710 Central Avenue, Suite E
Kearney, Nebraska 68847

Prepared by

ISAC

Mr. David Marmorek, ESSA Technologies Ltd. (Chair)
Dr. Brian Bledsoe, Colorado State University
Dr. Philip Dixon, Iowa State University
Dr. Adrian Farmer, Wild Ecological Solutions, Fort Collins, CO
Dr. David Galat, University of Missouri (Retired)
Dr. Robert Jacobson, U.S. Geological Survey, Columbia, Missouri

October 30, 2013.

30 **Introduction**

31

32 Prior to and during the ISAC meeting in Kearney on October 1-3, 2013, the PRRIP requested written input from
33 the ISAC on the following 7 questions (listed with letters so as not to be confused with the Program's 11 Big
34 Questions):

35

36 **A)** Are the 2013 Big Question assessments logical based on your understanding of Program data and
37 consistent with what you have learned during your involvement with the Program?

38 **B)** Based on your understanding of the Flow-Sediment-Mechanical (FSM) management strategy, should
39 Program data, collected during natural high flow events in areas in sediment balance (i.e., below
40 Kearney), be used to provide insight into whether management actions such as Short-Duration High
41 Flows (SDHF) will result in the creation of suitable in-channel tern and plover nesting habitat as
42 defined by the Program?

43 **C)** Can the Program still learn important information relevant to decision-making from the results of
44 the FSM "Proof of Concept" experiments at the Elm Creek and Shoemaker Island habitat complexes?

45 **D)** Does the technical information provided to the Governance Committee in the 2012 State of the
46 Platte Report and subsequent annual State of the Platte Reports seem useful for making policy
47 decisions on program management actions?

48 **E)** Do all reports, documents, or other reference materials need to be published in refereed journals in
49 order to be considered useful for making policy decisions on program management actions?

50 **F)** Does the ISAC recommend any improvements to the Program's peer review process?

51 **G)** Should the Program pursue publication of PRRIP-related manuscripts in refereed journals either as a
52 special issue compendium or as individual manuscripts? If 'yes', what would be the purpose of
53 publishing?

54 Our responses to these questions are below.

55

56 **A) Are the 2013 Big Question assessments logical based on your understanding of Program data and
57 consistent with what you have learned during your involvement with the Program?**

58 *Reference Documents* – 2012 State of the Platte Report (including Appendix A, ISAC commentary on 2012 Big
59 Question assessments); September 2013 Big Questions table; 2013 Big Questions presentation on 1 October
60 2013; 2013 Big Questions issues table (in development); 2013 State of the Platte Report (in development).

61

62 We begin with some general comments, and then move into specific comments on each of the 11 Big Questions.

63

- 64 • The 2013 State of the Platte Report only has a detailed written response to Big Question 6, which we
65 discuss below together with each of the Big Questions. Our responses also reflect results conveyed in the
66 2013 Big Questions presentation, and further pondering of our previous comments in 2012.
- 67 • The 2013 SPR includes a section on 2013 Assessment Statements, Counterpoints, and Clarifications Table
68 (pg. 12-18). This is a useful format, and when condensed will help the Program to crystallize differences
69 of opinion on key issues, which is helpful to structure dialogue.
- 70 • Over the years, the ISAC has been very impressed with the responsiveness of the Program to our
71 suggestions. As the Program moves towards completion of the 2013 State of the Platte Report we would
72 like to emphasize the importance of ensuring that the Program responds to our recommendations in
73 Appendix A (pages 36-37) of the 2012 State of the Platte Report, either implementing the ISAC's
74 recommendations, providing their rationale for not doing so, or requesting further clarification and
75 discussion.

76

BQ 1: Will implementation of SDHF produce suitable tern and plover riverine nesting habitat on an annual or near-annual basis?

77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124

Recently there has been some discussion within the Program of the respective roles of SDHF and natural flows. SDHF has been defined in various documents, as listed below with key phrases highlighted:

- Relevant parts of the [Adaptive Management Plan](#) (AMP, 2006) include:
 - “Relatively modest management treatments (water during certain periods) will reduce the power of field-scale experiments to detect an effect of the Program over the entire area of interest. Nevertheless, manipulative experiments at the field, meso, and microcosm scale may allow relatively powerful experiments that can detect treatment effects and patterns, and aid in the overall assessment of the Program’s effects during and at the end of the First Increment. Also, the design of Program monitoring will take advantage of likely natural events such as large natural pulse flows and similar management of non-Program lands.” [AMP, pg. 13]
 - “**Hypothesis PP-1:** Flows of varying magnitude, duration, frequency and rate of change affect the morphology and habitat quality of the river, including:
 - Flows of 5,000 to 8,000 cfs magnitude in the habitat reach for a duration of three days at Overton on an annual or near-annual basis will build sand bars to an elevation suitable for least tern and piping plover habitat;
 - Flows of 5,000 to 8,000 cfs magnitude in the habitat reach for a duration of three days at Overton on an annual or near-annual basis will increase the average width of the vegetation-free channel; “[AMP, pg. 16]
 - “Using the Environmental Account in Lake McConaughy and the Program’s ability to deliver 5,000 cfs of Program water at Overton, as well as the flexibility in the CNPPID and NPPD canal and reservoir system operations (assuming mutually acceptable arrangement can be made for the use of that flexibility), short-duration near-bankfull flows will be generated in the habitat reach in the springtime or at other times outside of the main irrigation season. The intent is to achieve these flows, if possible, on an annual or near-annual basis. Testing will begin in the first year of the Program with a pulse flow target of up to 5,000 cfs for three days at Overton.” [AMP, pg. 24]
 - “**Short-duration High Flows:** In the context of the Program, these are defined as flows of approximately three to five days duration with magnitudes approaching but not exceeding bankfull channel capacity in the habitat reach. These flows are desired on an annual or near-annual basis to help scour vegetation encroaching on channel habitat areas and to mobilize sand and build ephemeral sandbars to benefit the target species.” [pg. 6 of Section 11 of the Water Plan, which formed Attachment 5 of the AMP; pg. 316 of the pdf found [here](#)]
- The text under BQ 1 on pg. 11 in the 2012 State of the Platte Report (henceforth abbreviated as **2012 SPR**) was derived from the description of hypothesis PP-1 on pg. 16 of the AMP, and the 2012 SPR uses various lines of evidence to evaluate this hypothesis:
 - “Based upon the SedVeg model and associated assumptions in the FSM management strategy, it is hypothesized that under a balanced sediment budget, a SDHF of 5,000 to 8,000 cfs magnitude for three days (50,000 to 75,000 acre-feet) will build sandbars to an elevation that is suitable for tern and plover nesting.” [page 11 (lines 2-5) of 2012 SPR]

- 125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
- On September 24, 2013, the USFWS issued a 3-page document entitled “FWS Recommendations for PRRIP FSM Implementation” which included the following statements:
 - “The Service believes it is not feasible to address the ability of short-duration high flows (5,000-8,000 cfs) to create and maintain habitat for the target species under existing conditions at the current time. Effort during the remainder of the first increment should instead be focused on the other components of the FSM strategy including (1) increasing channel capacity for flow events (e.g., resolving the North Platte chokepoint); (2) implementing sediment augmentation to reduce the sediment deficit; and (3) using mechanical channel manipulation to widen and clear the channel. Once short duration high flow events can be implemented, it will be possible to analyze and evaluate flow management strategies relative to FSM and increasing the 1.5 year return flow (Q1.5).”
 - “Flow - Flow management (by the PRRIP or the FWS acting as the EA Manager) is currently so limited and constrained that testing the suite of management actions outlined within the AMP is not realistic or achievable. Fotherby (2008) described that the post-Kingsley dam Q1.5 ranged from approximately 3,500 to 6,000 cfs. The PRRIP is currently unable to increase the existing Q1.5. A flow release in 2009 achieved magnitudes ranging from 3,360 to 3,600 cfs while a release in 2013 ranged from 3,690 to 4,070 cfs. Consequently, there is no way to evaluate short duration high flow events and the associated effects given that the PRRIP is unable to release flows within the target range (5,000-8,000 cfs).”
 - “More recently, naturally high peak flow events have also occurred on the Platte River (2008, 2010 and 2011) and have altered ecological conditions to varying degrees based on the magnitude and duration of the peaks and the existing conditions when they occurred. A substantial reduction in vegetation occurred and was visibly noticeable after 2011 high flows. Low flows and drought have also impacted the river since the start of the first increment. A substantial increase in vegetation has occurred as a result of these low flow years. Though natural high peak flows provide valuable lessons learned about how flows of different magnitudes affect the river, they are highly unpredictable and cannot be used as a proxy for the effectiveness of short-duration high flows. It is these flows that work in concert with sediment augmentation and mechanical manipulation to restore and maintain habitat for target species. In addition, the short-duration high flows, by augmenting the flow during lower flow years, will over time increase the magnitude of the average annual peak flow. Finally, the peak flows seen during the first six years of the PRRIP are representative of what was observed in the historic hydrograph and we would not expect habitat (quality and quantity) to drastically change without manipulation of flow beyond that observed historically.”

164 **ISAC comments on BQ 1 and the USFWS document:**

165
166 The likelihood of island formation is affected by many factors including channel form, the magnitude, seasonal
167 timing, and duration of flows, and sediment supply. Regarding flows, what matters is what flows actually occur,
168 regardless of whether these flows were naturally generated or from managed releases from reservoirs. The key
169 issue for BQ 1 is whether or not short duration high flows of 5,000 to 8,000 cfs for 3 days, in areas of sediment
170 balance, build sandbars to an elevation that is suitable for tern and plover nesting. The Program does not need
171 to have exactly this magnitude and duration of flows to gain knowledge about their efficacy for habitat creation
172 and maintenance. Flows in excess of SDHF have occurred opportunistically, and where there is sediment balance
173 these events are reasonable tests of SDHF and provide useful information for BQ 1.
174

175 The sequence of flows considered under SDHF descriptions is somewhat vague, referring to “annual or near-
176 annual” recurrence. “Near-annual” has been generally considered to mean two out of three years on a running
177 basis. Sequence and timing of flow pulses may be hypothesized to be important as a means to maintain
178 disturbance, and thereby to prevent vegetation encroachment, or as a way to build bars cumulatively over years.
179 Over the six-year period 2008-2013, there have been four years (2008, 2010, 2011, 2013) with opportunistic
180 flows that equaled or exceeded the SDHF criteria, thereby providing useful information on the role of sequence
181 and timing. Moreover, back-to-back high flows in 2010 and 2011 provide a basis for evaluating whether serial
182 high flows are more effective than those separated by one or more years.
183

184 Naturally high flows from 2008, 2010 and 2011 provide relevant information for evaluating the effectiveness of
185 SDHF and BQ 1, as do flows in 2013 (i.e., 4,000 cfs SDMF in April 2013; 11,000 cfs in Sept 2013), provided that
186 such evaluations occur in areas of sediment balance. The most compelling evidence for sediment balance are
187 the surveys of river and longitudinal profiles downstream of Gibbon, which do not show aggradation or
188 degradation trends¹. Mobile boundary modelling (HEC 6T – 1D) provides supportive evidence of sediment
189 balance, indicating that the channel profiles can be maintained with the estimated levels of sediment input and
190 current flows. There will likely be degradation and aggradation on finer spatial and temporal scales within the
191 reaches and years that have overall sediment balance. Sub-zones and sub-periods with aggradation are the
192 areas and times most likely to create island nesting habitat.
193

194 We have the following specific comments on the evidence presented for BQ 1 in the 2012 SPR:
195

- 196 • Argument 3 on lines 41-46 on pg. 11 of the 2012 SPO should note that Elm Ck was not in sediment
197 balance in 2010 and 2011, so this evidence is less supportive of the general argument under BQ 1;
- 198 • The endnotes should clarify which pieces of evidence have already received peer review, and provide
199 links to those peer reviews (see ISAC answers to Q6)
- 200 • We agree with suggestions made by the EDO in presentations that the primary challenge is neither flow
201 nor sediment in the reaches below Gibbon, but rather the wide channel form, which results in less
202 temporal variation in stage than occurs in other rivers where islands are formed and maintained (e.g., in
203 the lower Platte River). In locations where the river channel is relatively wide and well connected with
204 its floodplain, a given increase in discharge produces a smaller increase in stage. Maximum stage sets a
205 limit on the height to which a given flow can build bars. As such, the wide channel and floodplain
206 morphology of the river below Gibbon is not conducive to achieving the stages required to build suitable
207 nesting habitat for tern and plovers. We agree with the statement from Jason Farnsworth of the EDO
208 that:
209 “The Program’s minimum suitable height criterion of 1.5’ above 1,200 cfs is constant so more
210 discharge is required to increase stage relative to the target in wide channels than in narrow
211 ones. Channels are typically wider in the downstream portion of the Associated Habitat Reach,
212 which decreases the probability of creating suitable habitat at any given discharge.”
- 213 • It would be helpful to evaluate the importance of channel form for island creation hypothesis by
214 examining the attributes of a range of reaches in the Lower Platte which do or don’t build island habitat
215 (i.e., contrasting sites), with the objective of developing a predictive model of the probability of bar
216 formation which could be applied to the Central Platte. This would help to suggest which places along
217 the Central Platte have channel characteristics that make it easier to build in-river, island nesting habitat,
218 and thereby maximize the chances of success.

219
220 In conclusion, the information presented in the 2012 SPR for BQ 1 suggests that SDHFs of the indicated
221 magnitude and duration are unlikely to create tern and plover nesting islands in the Central Platte. Based on this
222 evidence, the documents cited in 2012 SPR endnotes 2-13, other written documents we have reviewed, and

¹ endnote 2 in 2012 SPR

223 presentations at ISAC meetings over the last four years, we agree that the one thumb down conclusion for BQ 1
224 is appropriate at the present time. Given the importance of this information to future flow decisions by the
225 Program, it would be helpful to have the key elements of supportive evidence presented for BQ 1 in the 2012
226 SPR (including endnotes 2-13) consolidated into either a single technical report, or a set of linked manuscripts,
227 which would be formally peer reviewed (see ISAC answers to questions E and F). We understand that some of
228 the information in the endnotes for BQ 1 has already been peer reviewed, which should be noted in the
229 consolidated document. This is a high priority for the Program. It would be prudent to organize the consolidated
230 information into a form which could also be submitted for later publication in a journal, following the Program's
231 peer review process (e.g., one synthesis paper, other supportive papers and appendices – see ISAC answer to
232 question G).

233
234 Going forward, there is likely to be continued learning about BQ 1 to refine the assessment of BQ1. The current
235 sediment augmentation should create more areas with sediment balance or aggradation, depending on levels of
236 natural flows. After the J2 re-regulating reservoir is completed, implementation of SDHF in 2 out of 3 years with
237 adequate sediment augmentation will by definition be the most direct test of "pure SDHF". However, assessing
238 the effects of "pure SDHF" would be challenging for several reasons. First, it would be difficult or impossible to
239 detect the independent effects of managed SDHF during years with larger natural flows, which could easily
240 swamp effects of managed SDHF. Second, in dryer water years where the signal from managed SDHF would be
241 most easily demarcated, it may be difficult to acquire the volume of water to implement such managed water
242 releases. Third, while having more years of 'before-data' without managed SDHF could increase the Program's
243 ability to detect the complimentary effects of managed SDHF after the J2 re-regulating reservoir is implemented,
244 several challenges will remain in determining the independent benefits of SDHF:

- 245
246 • comparing the effects of [SDHF + natural flows] vs. [natural flows alone] will be very difficult, as there is
247 no control Platte River with only natural flows, or easily defined baseline period for a before-after
248 comparison in areas with sediment balance;
- 249 • regressions with flow variables will likely be required rather than before-after comparisons, but a
250 regression approach also has challenges (e.g., effects of flow events are cumulative, not independent;
251 difficult to characterize the appropriate attributes of each flow event as independent variables; difficult
252 to have sufficient post-event data as dependent variables); and
- 253 • a year with a natural event of flow magnitude, timing and sediment balance very similar to SDHF would
254 likely have similar outcomes to a year with a managed SDHF release.

255 In summary, it is appropriate and useful for the Program to evaluate the effects of natural flows at or above the
256 duration and magnitude of SDHF, and to eventually also learn from managed SDHF flows. Not learning from
257 natural flows would vastly extend the length of time needed to more conclusively answer Big Q1.
258

BQ 2. Will implementation of SDHF produce and/or maintain suitable whooping crane riverine roosting habitat on an annual or near annual basis?

259 We note that there are two parts to BQ 2, which are best addressed separately:
260 BQ 2a) does SDHF *produce* suitable WC riverine roosting habitat on an annual or near annual basis?; and
261 BQ 2b) does SDHF *maintain* such habitat on an annual or near annual basis?
262

263
264 SDHFs are hypothesized to produce and maintain suitable riverine roosting habitat for WC by scouring
265 (removing) in channel vegetation that creates vertical obstructions, reduces unobstructed channel width, and
266 reduces an unobstructed view width. These factors are described in Appendix C, 2012 State of the Platte Report
267 (pg. 50-52), Whooping Crane Habitat Suitability Criteria Descriptions.
268

269 The ability to remove vegetation depends on the mechanisms and flows described in the work completed for the
270 Program by the USDA-ARS National Sedimentation Laboratory in association with the University of Tennessee,

271 led by Dr. Natasha Bankhead². This work clearly shows that SDHF flows are not sufficient to remove most
272 vegetation currently present, particularly *Phragmites*. Hence, the conclusion to BQ 2a) is currently one thumb
273 down.

274
275 With respect to question BQ 2b), it is still uncertain whether SDHF is sufficient to *maintain* WC roosting habitat
276 after clearing by spraying or mechanical treatment. The effects of flow and spraying are confounded. The ISAC
277 supports the EDO's ongoing analysis of the expansion of channel to determine if it was related to spraying or
278 flow by examining both sprayed and unsprayed areas. This analysis may help to reduce the uncertainty in BQ
279 2b). For now, the answer to BQ 2b) is inconclusive, meriting the scratchy head.

280
281 Since BQ 2 has two components, one of which (a) has evidence suggesting the answer is *unlikely* (one thumb
282 down) and the other (b) has evidence suggesting the answer is *inconclusive* (scratchy head), then an overall
283 answer of *inconclusive* (scratchy head) seems appropriate in the 2012 SPR and preliminary 2013 SPR.

284
285 Though originally related to BQ 5, it is appropriate to re-iterate the comment that we made on the 2012 SPR
286 regarding suitability criteria for WC, because it has implications for the criteria applied to BQ 2:

287
288 "A key issue under Big Question 5 is to re-evaluate the target unconfined channel width for whooping
289 cranes, using roosting site data from both the Platte River and all other rivers where such data exist.
290 There is clearly a large difference between the channel widths that whooping cranes use in the Platte
291 and the channel widths that they are believed to require. The ISAC has indicated in earlier reviews that
292 the Program needs to re-evaluate habitat criteria, and this habitat criterion seems like an excellent focus
293 for such a re-evaluation. " [pg. 37 of 2012 SPR]

294
295 We recommend the Program evaluate QA/QC'd data (including locally derived data from aerial and ground
296 observations, local data from telemetered whooping cranes and regional observations of telemetered cranes
297 throughout the Central Flyway) to test if channel widths at observed WC roosting sites are consistent with
298 hypothesized suitable width criteria for WC roosting. Plotting out channel widths for all GPS-controlled,
299 telemetered sites with roosting WCs (both local and regional data), as well as other factors which might
300 influence habitat selection, would reveal the attributes of sites being used, and the reasonableness (or not) of
301 current definitions of suitable habitat.

302

BQ 3. Is sediment augmentation necessary for the creation and/or maintenance of suitable riverine tern, plover and whooping crane habitat?

303
304 The ISAC agrees with the 2012 SPR and preliminary 2013 SPR that it is absolutely necessary to augment sediment
305 (one thumb up). However there are significant unknowns about how far augmented sediments will propagate
306 downstream, the inter-annual variability in the amount of sediment needed given the annual variability in flow,
307 and the challenge of predicting quantitatively just how much sediment is sufficient. Given these uncertainties,
308 one thumb up seems appropriate.

309

BQ 4. Are mechanical channel alterations (channel widening and flow consolidation) necessary for the creation and/or maintenance of suitable riverine tern, plover and whooping crane habitat?

310
311 There are several mechanical actions being used to prepare the channel for FSM, including channel widening,
312 flow consolidation **and** vegetation removal. It makes sense to also include vegetation removal as a mechanical
313 action in the phrasing of BQ 4, since the spraying of *Phragmites* is essential to increase sediment mobility. One
314 thumb up appears to be an appropriate conclusion. Flows are often either too low to remove vegetation, or so
315 high that existing islands are washed away, which implies that mechanical actions will continue to be required

² endnote 23 in 2012 SPR

316 for tern and plover island maintenance. Mechanical actions (including spraying) are likely to continue to be
317 required to maintain unobstructed widths for whooping cranes.

318
319 Flow consolidation was meant to move the river more towards a braided condition, and to help scour vegetation
320 from islands. The incremental benefit of flow consolidation at Cottonwood Ranch was judged to be negligible,
321 and was not provided with a 404 permit by the US Army Corps of Engineers³. In the absence of flow
322 consolidation, mechanical widening and vegetation removal appears to be even more necessary to maintain
323 suitable riverine habitat for terns, plovers and whooping cranes.

324

BQ 5. Do whooping cranes select suitable riverine roosting habitat in proportions equal to its availability?

325

326 There are three parts to this question which need to be assessed⁴:

- 327 1. What habitats do WC select (i.e., what is “suitable habitat”)?
328 2. Are these habitats increasing over time in the Central Platte?
329 3. If these habitats are increasing over time in Central Platte, do recorded WC stops in the Central
330 Platte make up an increasing proportion of the overall WC population in North America?
331 [beyond BQ 5, but provides a necessary link to BQ 10]

332

333 Answering BQ 5 may take a long time, given the small sample sizes of WC observations on the Central Platte. The
334 ISAC strongly recommends analyzing the existing data on WC (both GPS telemetry at all Central Flyway sites used
335 by cranes for roosting during migration and local data collected by the Program through aerial and ground
336 surveys), continuing the telemetry study of GPS-banded birds, and maintaining the current level of banding. We
337 were concerned to learn that the level of banding is expected to gradually decline in future years. This
338 information is vital to both BQ 5 and also BQ 2 (our response to the latter is above).

339

340 The ISAC additionally notes the importance of early assimilation of WC telemetry project data. These data have
341 strong influence on pending decision making in the PRRIP, especially in defining minimum channel distances for
342 habitat assessment and channel maintenance. The WC telemetry data also have important potential to test and
343 validate local habitat-use data. An agreement amongst researchers could help to allow early access to these data
344 by the Program without interfering with the rights of primary researchers to be the first to publish in journals.

345

346 We understand that habitat availability determinations involve an area 3 miles N and S of the Platte River, from
347 Lexington to Chapman. The Program selects random points within this area and then computes habitat
348 availability for each of these points which are then compared with sites where WC were found. This procedure
349 makes sense. Since WC landing areas are likely affected by the level of moisture / drought in the larger landscape
350 (i.e., what the birds would see as they first approach the Central Platte), it would be worth also including year-
351 specific covariates for this regional habitat attribute (e.g., the area of the rainwater basin, the data that go into
352 the Palmer Drought Index (Palmer 1965), indexed stream flow which would take into account GW withdrawals).
353 Ideally such an analysis would be completed over multiple regions, to test whether interregional variation in
354 moisture within a given year causes WC to shift where they land.

355

BQ 6. Does availability of suitable nesting habitat limit tern and plover use and reproductive success on the central Platte River?

356

357 The ISAC agrees with the Preliminary 2013 SPR that it’s reasonable to change the answer to BQ 6 from a scratchy
358 head to one thumb up, based on the Program’s recent data analyses. The data analyses presented at the
359 October 2013 ISAC meeting are convincing, and it’s worth writing up this work as a manuscript which can be

³ EDO memo to ISAC on flow consolidation Sept 24, 2013

⁴ Parts 1 and 2 are described on pg. 43 of 2012 SPR, which describes hypotheses WC1 and WC3 from the AMP.

360 easily be updated with more data over time. The ISAC did some analyses to check on the conclusions to BQ 6.
361 We confirmed that the slope of log(nests) for plovers vs. habitat area has a positive slope for program lands, but
362 no slope for non-Program lands, consistent with the 2013 SPR conclusion. In addition, path analyses (Asher
363 1983) confirmed that nests are correlated with habitat but not time, which is also consistent with the 2013 SPR
364 conclusion.

365
366 Alternative hypotheses, which should also be investigated and confirmed as reasonable or rejected:

- 367 • H_{a1} : Tern and plover numbers are going up over time in Central Platte on Program lands due to increases
368 in the overall population of terns and plovers in North America, but not on non-Program lands due to
369 some unspecified differences between Program and non-Program lands.
- 370 • H_{a2} : Terns and plovers are attracted to more recently created habitats in preference to older habitats
371 (this hypothesis appears to be contradicted by the high fidelity of banded birds to certain sites, so it
372 might only apply to first time visitors to the Platte).
- 373 • H_{a3} : The number of nests is more strongly driven by mortality factors (e.g., predation) than by the area of
374 habitat. Since most OCSW habitat areas are fenced and have predator control, it may be very difficult to
375 disentangle the benefits of predator control and increased habitat area.

376

BQ 7. Are both suitable in-channel and off-channel nesting habitats required to maintain central Platte River tern and plover populations?

377

378 The ISAC's concerns about BQ 7 remain, which were raised in the ISAC's detailed comments on the 2012 SPR
379 provided to the EDO. In summary our concerns are:

380

- 381 • It's not clear what criteria are necessary for a yes/no response to BQ 7. Maintaining the population at
382 the present numbers of nesting adults? Without a clear definition of *maintaining tern and plover*
383 *populations* there is no way to answer this question. How would the Program know if only one or the
384 other nesting habitat were sufficient to 'maintain' this population?
- 385 • Does the Program really just want to *maintain* the present populations of both species or does the
386 Program want to increase them?
- 387 • What is the Program's measure of the '*population*'? Is it nesting adults, adults + fledglings, or something
388 else?
- 389 • The Program would need to have persistent in-channel nesting habitat over a long period of time to be
390 able to assess the relative productivity of in-channel and off-channel nesting habitats. To date it has not
391 been possible to create persistent in-channel nesting habitat other than by mechanical means, and
392 several of those potential nesting islands have washed away in high natural flows. If the tern and plover
393 populations increase in the absence of river nesting (i.e., just off-channel nesting with in-river foraging),
394 then that would provide evidence against BQ7.
- 395 • Off-channel nesting habitats require construction and maintenance, but so far it appears that in-channel
396 nesting habitats require at least as much construction and maintenance, and are less durable than off-
397 channel nesting habitats. Off-channel habitat may play an important role by providing nesting habitat
398 during high flow years/seasons when in-channel habitat is inundated.

399

400 The ISAC suggests that the BQ 7 should be rewritten in such a manner that it can be feasibly (i.e. quantitatively)
401 answered (eventually) with a thumb up or thumb down response. For example, let's assume that the Program
402 stated that a 5 year running average of 100 nesting pairs of piping plovers was the 'target population' (a
403 hypothetical number). Then it might be possible to build enough off-channel habitats and maintain them free of
404 vegetation to meet this goal, and in-channel bars would not be required for nesting, though in-channel habitat
405 would always be required for foraging.

406

407

408

BQ 8. Does forage availability limit tern and plover productivity on the central Platte River?

409

410 The ISAC agrees with the two thumbs down conclusion in the 2012 SPR. We recommend peer review and/or
411 publication of these results.

412

BQ 9. Do Program flow management actions in the central Platte River avoid adverse impacts to pallid sturgeon in the lower Platte River?

413

414 The current conclusion is one thumb up, which is reasonable. The peer-reviewed stage change study confirms
415 that answer to BQ 9 is at least one thumb up. If there are minimal predicted effects on water physical and
416 chemical conditions below the Elkhorn River from Program flow management actions (as determined in the
417 peer-reviewed stage change study), then it is unlikely that sturgeon below the Elkhorn River are exposed to any
418 effects from Program flow management actions, either positively or negatively. If evidence were provided which
419 redefined the area of concern to include areas above Elkhorn River (i.e., from ongoing studies by USGS and the
420 Nebraska Game and Parks Commission), then it would be necessary to repeat the stage change study for areas
421 further upstream. The ISAC recommends publishing the water results of the stage-change study in a journal, and
422 using the tool developed in the stage-change study to examine the effects of the proposed operations of the J2
423 re-regulating reservoir.

424

425 While a one thumb up conclusion is justified, we do not support a conclusion of two-thumbs up at this time. The
426 water part of the peer-reviewed stage change study is robust. However, the connection to sturgeon habitat is
427 less certain because we don't know if the area modeled for sturgeon habitat suitability was sufficient given the
428 true distribution of sturgeon, as discussed above. We recommend that the Program uses the stage-change tool
429 to adjust Program water operations to further minimize downstream effects during low-water conditions, and
430 then re-evaluate the evidence for BQ 9.

431

BQ 10. How do Program management actions in the central Platte River contribute to least tern, piping plover, and whooping crane recovery?

432

433 The ISAC agrees with the 2012 SPR that answering this question will take time. We suggest a minor tweak to BQ
434 10. Since the answer to BQ 10 in the 2012 SPR implies a consideration of cumulative effects, it might be
435 appropriate to make that more explicit in the question (i.e., "How do Program management actions in the
436 central Platte River **cumulatively** contribute to least tern, piping plover, and whooping crane recovery?"). We
437 note that on page 39 of the 2012 SPR, BQ 10 is linked to hypothesis S-1 in the AMP, which explicitly considers a
438 combination of actions, so our proposed tweak is consistent with the AMP:

439

S-1: A combination of flow management, sediment management, and land management (i.e.,
440 Clear/Level/Pulse) will/will not generate detectable changes in the channel morphology of the Platte
441 River on Program lands, and/or habitats for whooping crane, least tern, piping plover, pallid sturgeon
442 and other species of concern. [pg. 14 of AMP]

443

444 It might be more feasible to address the cumulative benefits of all Program actions on smaller spatial scales (e.g.,
445 tests of SDHF under BQ 1 and BQ 2 in specific locations assume multiple actions such as flow consolidation and
446 sediment balance).

447

448 **B) Based on your understanding of the Flow-Sediment-Mechanical (FSM) management strategy, should
449 Program data, collected during natural high flow events in areas in sediment balance (i.e., below Kearney), be
450 used to provide insight into whether management actions such as Short-Duration High Flows (SDHF) will result
451 in the creation of suitable in-channel tern and plover nesting habitat as defined by the Program?**

452

453 *Reference Documents* – 2012 State of the Platte Report; FSM packet provided to ISAC for October 2013 meeting;
454 Tern and Plover Habitat Suitability Criteria (see 2012 State of the Platte Report)

455
456 **Yes!** See answers to BQ 1 above under ISAC question A.

457
458 **C) Can the Program still learn important information relevant to decision-making from the results of the FSM**
459 **“Proof of Concept” experiments at the Elm Creek and Shoemaker Island habitat complexes?**

460
461 The ISAC believes that it is still worth learning from natural events in advance of managed SDHF events
462 generated by the J2 re-regulating reservoir, as discussed under ISAC question A – BQ 1. It is worth testing FSM in
463 the parts of the river where it has the maximum chance of success, including Elm Creek and Shoemaker Island. If
464 FSM doesn’t work in these locations, then it is unlikely to work elsewhere on Program complexes in the Central
465 Platte. The comparison effort with Lower Platte areas described above under ISAC Question A – BQ 1 may
466 provide some insights on channel attributes which maximize the probability of island formation.

467
468 **D) Does the technical information provided to the Governance Committee in the 2012 State of the Platte**
469 **Report and subsequent annual State of the Platte Reports seem useful for making policy decisions on program**
470 **management actions?**

471 *Reference Documents* – 2012 State of the Platte Report

472
473 **Yes!** However, please see detailed comments on individual big questions, from both the ISAC 2012 review and
474 this document.

475
476 **E) Do all reports, documents, or other reference materials need to be published in refereed journals in order**
477 **to be considered useful for making policy decisions?**

478 *Reference Documents* – PPRIP Adaptive Management Plan (2006), Appendix A – Peer Review Guidelines including
479 Attachments A-E; PRRIP – ED OFFICE FINAL 02/06/2008, Peer Review Process Flow Chart

480
481 **No.** The primary attribute of PPRIP products for them to be useful in making policy decisions should be the
482 quality of the work informing the decision, not the outlet where they are disseminated. Rigorous independent
483 scientific review (ISR) can help ensure that decisions and policy making reflect the best scientific knowledge
484 available. Meffe et al (1998) identified seven criteria of an ISR to meet this goal:

- 485
486 1. the best available scientific knowledge is brought into the decision- or policymaking process;
487 2. the influences of bias and special interests are minimized in environmentally relevant decisions or policy
488 making;
489 3. science is separated clearly from nonscientific issues;
490 4. decisions or policies are achieved in an open and transparent manner;
491 5. all relevant information is considered and evaluated;
492 6. all conclusions drawn are consistent with the available scientific information, and assumptions are made
493 explicit; and
494 7. the risks associated with different interpretations of data or alternative management decisions are
495 articulated

496
497 The ISAC feels that the current PPRIP peer review process meets these criteria. We recommend that the
498 Program consider three nested types of Program documents, and two levels of peer review (for document types
499 2 and 3, as illustrated in Figure 1):

- 500
501 1. All program documents (green box in Figure 1).
502 2. Draft documents subject to PRRIP independent peer review (red box in Figure 1). This Program review
503 process should only be applied to the subset of documents which have important implications for

504 management decisions. Programmatic peer review should continue *in parallel* with production of
505 executive summary reports, so that it does not slow down learning and feedback to the GC. The
506 Program’s current emphasis on rapid data analysis and evaluation, motivated by the annual AMP
507 reporting sessions, is essential. It’s more critical to have peer review of draft final reports as you move
508 from a one thumb to two thumbs conclusion on the big questions, and is less critical for scratchy head or
509 one thumb conclusions.

- 510 3. Subsequent publication of a journal version of a subset of the final, peer-reviewed documents (blue box
511 in Figure 1). Manuscripts submitted for publication should be those which:
- 512 a. are appropriate for journal publication (i.e., the paper presents innovative information that
513 significantly advances science/management, or provides insightful information about currently
514 important issues that are of more than regional interest) and
 - 515 b. are potentially valuable to other recovery / restoration programs; or
 - 516 c. if published would have incremental benefits to the Program in terms of greater “weight” in
517 future decisions, including Biological Opinions.


518
519 Some studies that are not decision-critical could be submitted to a journal for publication (with Program
520 approval), without having to go through prior independent peer review by PRRIP (i.e., arrow in Figure 1 from the
521 green box to blue box, bypassing the red box). For studies which the Program would like to ultimately publish, it
522 would be prudent to consider this ultimate objective in how the scope of work is crafted for a given study. The
523 ISAC wishes to emphasize that the internal peer review process in the red box of Figure 1 can be as stringent, or
524 more stringent, and more relevant than the peer review process applied by many journals. Other recent papers
525 emphasize the limitations of the journal peer review process (e.g., Conroy et al. 2006, Bohannon 2013). This
526 point was also raised by OMB (2004):

527
528 “Publication in a refereed scientific journal may mean that adequate peer review has been performed.
529 However, the intensity of peer review is highly variable across journals. There will be cases in which an
530 agency determines that a more rigorous or transparent review process is necessary. For instance, an
531 agency may determine a particular journal review process did not address questions (e.g., the extent of
532 uncertainty inherent in a finding) that the agency determines should be addressed before disseminating
533 that information. As such, prior peer review and publication is not by itself sufficient grounds for
534 determining that no further review is necessary.” [page 22 in OMB 2004]

535
536 “Section III(4) requires agencies to provide reviewers with sufficient background information, including
537 access to key studies, data and models, to perform their role as peer reviewers. In this respect, the peer
538 review envisioned in Section III is more rigorous than some forms of journal peer review, where the
539 reviewer is often not provided access to underlying data or models.” [page 25 in OMB 2004]

539 The process outlined here is consistent with that recommended by the National Research Council (2002; pg. 44-
540 45) who suggested that “... increasing ‘project magnitude’ and ‘project risks’ warrant an increasing degree of
541 independence of review, with an increased depth and complexity of review, and an increased scope and
542 diversity of the expertise of the reviewers”, which is illustrated in Figure 2.

543




544

545 **Figure 1.** ISAC’s recommended framework for thinking about the different types of Program documents, and the
546 criteria for deciding if they warrant Program review or publishing.

547

548



549

550

551 **Figure 2.** Illustration of how increasing *project magnitude* (y-axis) and *project risks* (x-axis) warrant a higher level
552 of independent peer review (i.e., darker shades further along diagonal arrow) with an increasing degree of
553 independence, depth, and complexity of the peer review, and an increasing scope / diversity of reviewer
554 expertise. In the lower left hand part of the diagram (low project magnitude and risks), independent peer review
555 is likely not required. Adapted from Figure 4.2 on page 45 in NRC (2002).
556

557 **F) Does the ISAC recommend any improvements to the Program’s peer review process?**

558
 559 See above answer to question E. We do not recommend any major improvements to the Program’s peer review
 560 process, but we do recommend improved documentation of this process. Our evaluation of Program documents
 561 indicated that the present peer review process (shown below in Table 1) has improved over what was published
 562 in PRRIP Adaptive Management Plan (2006), Appendix A – Peer Review Guidelines including Attachments A-E.
 563 Consequently, we recommend that Program ‘Scientific Peer- Review Guidelines’ be revised to reflect current
 564 practices as outlined in Table 1. PRRIP guidelines as shown in Table 1 are consistent with peer review guidelines
 565 from OMB (2004) and USFWS (2012). They are also consistent with the recommendations for peer review in
 566 Meffe et al. (1998), National Research Council (2002) and Turner (2009). If the Program peer review follows
 567 PRRIP guidelines and authors respond thoroughly to peer reviewer comments in the judgment of the EDO (acting
 568 like an editor of a journal to assess comments from multiple reviewers), then Program peer review will be
 569 adequate.

570
 571 An effective peer review process occurs when the peer reviewers thoroughly understand the work, and the
 572 investigators thoroughly respond to the peer review. We believe that face to face dialogue between peer
 573 reviewers and investigators to clarify questions is always beneficial. It increases the reviewers’ understanding of
 574 the details of what work was done, and minimizes the risk of having peer reviewers misunderstand the scope
 575 and consequently recommend approaches that are not relevant to the objectives or have already tried and
 576 rejected.

577
 578 **Table 1:** Comparison of PRRIP peer-review process with OMB (2004) and USFWS (2012). Source: EDO, based on
 579 documents supplied by ISAC.
 580

OMB Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review December 2004	
OMB Peer Review Guidelines Feature	Present in PRRIP Peer Review Strategy?
Peer reviewers selected based on expertise, experience, and skills	Yes
Avoid conflicts of interests with peer reviewers	Yes
Reviewers are independent and did not participate in development of work product	Yes
Peer reviewer report includes verbatim copy of comments	Yes
May commission independent entities to manage peer review process and selection of peer reviewers	Yes (Atkins)
Develop clear “charge” or plan of work for peer reviewers	Yes (specific scope of work)

581

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information Quality Guidelines and Peer Review June 2013	
Service Peer Review Guidelines Feature	Present in PRRIP Peer Review Strategy?
List all peer reviewers	Yes
Results of peer review maintained in the public record	Yes
Can utilize management assistance for peer reviews	Yes (use Atkins, which is a firm under contract through 2017 to provide similar services to DOI)
Peer reviewers are external and independent	Yes
Select the best, most qualified peer reviewers with expertise in the subject area	Yes

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information Quality Guidelines and Peer Review June 2013	
Service Peer Review Guidelines Feature	Present in PRRIP Peer Review Strategy?
Can review draft documents	Yes (PRRIP does review draft documents and process allows changes in response to peer review)
Can review final documents (peer review comments evaluated and addressed by Service staff)	Yes (PRRIP does review final documents and process allows comments to be evaluated and addressed)
Utilize standing panel evaluations when necessary	Yes (ISAC)
Keep a running record of peer reviews to be completed or underway; update every six months	Generally (keep an annual record, could do a six-month update)
Responses to peer review comments are included in the official record and made available to the public	Yes

582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602

G) Should the Program pursue publication of PRRIP-related manuscripts in refereed journals either as a special issue compendium or as individual manuscripts? If 'yes', what would be the purpose of publishing?

The purposes of publishing were listed under ISAC question E (points 3a, 3b and 3c). We offer three possible approaches to externally peer-reviewed publication for consideration, with a mixture of pros and cons (Table 2):

1. individual articles tailored to the requirements of separate journals, and where appropriate multiple articles in the same journal, for example:
 - a. insights on adaptive management could be published in journals like [Ecology and Society](#);
 - b. tests of hypotheses related to regulated rivers, published in journals like [River Research and Applications](#);
 - c. regionally relevant empirical evidence for deriving habitat suitability criteria in journals like [The Prairie Naturalist](#); and
 - d. habitat restoration actions and outcomes relevant to listed species recovery in journals like [Restoration Ecology](#)
2. a special issue compendium (e.g., River Research and Applications, Restoration Ecology) ; and
3. a thematic book, such as the series on the Science and Practice of Ecological Restoration, published by [Island Press](#).

603 **Table 2.** Pros and cons of three different approaches to publishing Program results.

Approach	Pros	Cons
1. Articles published in separate journals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • most rapid publication of 3 options • topic stands alone • can target the journal most relevant to paper’s topic • peer review typically the most rigorous of 3 options • program website can link papers together, including overview papers like Smith (2011) • potentially highest Program credibility when published in top-tier journals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides readers with the least integrated source of information • requires repetition of background information on Program • longest time to get the full story of Program accomplishments • open-access policies vary among journals, possibly limiting free electronic access by users; • variable editorial consistency among journals
2. Special Issue Compendium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enables publishing major program actions into a series of integrated articles under a single cover • generally can be made available as open-access (i.e., free download for any user) • introduction can give Program background so subsequent papers can be less repetitious • peer review rigor typically intermediate between separate journals and thematic book • editor can set uniform standard for papers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires editor to administer project; • publication delayed by slowest author • relevance of single issue reduced given ease of electronic access of individual papers • some publishable papers might be excluded due to uniform standards for all manuscripts
3. Thematic book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides readers with the most carefully integrated source of information covering multiple dimensions and disciplines • page length less limited than options 1) or 2) • editor can set uniform standard for papers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires editor to administer project • peer review typically the least rigorous of 3 options • recommended to delay submission until most program actions are completed and responses evaluated • publication delayed by slowest author; • access limited to those who purchase book

604

605

606

607 **References Cited**

- 608 Asher, H.B. 1983. Causal Modeling. Sage University Paper on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences,
609 07-003, Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.
- 610
611 Bohannon, J. 2013. Who's afraid of peer review? Science (342): 60-65.
- 612
613 Conroy, M.J., P. Beier, H. Quigley, M.R. Vaughn.2006. Improving the Use of Science in Conservation:
614 Lessons from the Florida Panther, J. Wild. Mgmt. 70(1):1-7,
615
- 616 Meffe, G.K., P.D. Boersma, D.D. Murphy, B.R. Noon, H.R. Pulliam, M.E. Soule and D.M. Waller. 1998. Independent
617 scientific review in natural resource management Cons. Biol. (12):268-270.
- 618
619 National Research Council. 2002. Review procedures for water resources project planning. The National
620 Academy Presses, Washington, D.C. <http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?isbn=030908508X>
621
- 622 Office of Management and Budget. 2004. Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. December 16, 2004.
623 45 pp. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/fy2005/m05-03.pdf>
624
- 625 Palmer, W. 1965. Meteorological Drought. Research paper no.45, U.S. Department of Commerce Weather
626 Bureau, February 1965 (58 pgs). Available online by the NOAA National Climatic Data Center at
627 <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/temp-and-precip/drought/docs/palmer.pdf>
628
- 629 Smith, C.S. 2011. Adaptive management on the central Platte River – Science, engineering, and decision analysis
630 to assist in the recovery of four species. J. Env. Mgmt 92(5): 1414-1419
631
- 632 Turner, R.S. 2009. Best Practices in Peer Review Assure Quality, Value, Objectivity. J. Nat. Grants. Mgmt. Assoc.
633 17(1): 43-47.
634
- 635 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2012. Information Quality Guidelines and Peer Review. June 2012. 15 pp.
636 http://www.fws.gov/informationquality/topics/InformationQualityGuidelinesrevised6_6_12.pdf