

**Manuscript: Chapter 8 - Addressing Future Water Levels: The Role of Adaptive Management**

**Author(s):** Moin/Stakhiv/Yuzyk

**Name of Reviewer:** P.A. Johnson, R. A. Halliday,

1. Are the objectives of the work clearly stated? 1 2 **3** 4 5
2. Are the methods employed valid, appropriate and sufficient to address the questions, hypotheses or the problem? 1 2 **3** 4 5
3. Are the observations, conclusions and recommendations supported by the material presented in the manuscript (e.g., data, model and analyses)? 1 2 **3** 4 5
4. Are the assumptions used valid and are the mathematics presented correct? 1 **2** 3 4 5
5. Is the manuscript well organized, material precise and to the point, and clearly written using correct grammar and syntax? 1 **2** 3 4 5
6. Are all of the figures and tables useful, clear, and necessary? 1 2 **3** 4 5
7. What is the quality of the overall work? 1 2 **3** 4 5

**Recommendation** (please circle your response)

**A** - acceptable

**B** - acceptable with suggestions for revision

**C** - acceptable if adequately revised

**D** - unacceptable

If you have selected **C**, do you wish to receive the revised manuscript for further review?

yes **no**

**Rating** (Circle the rating you would like to give this manuscript. Unacceptable work should be given a score of 40 or less.)

100 90 80 **70** 60 50 40 30 20 10 0

Comments (limit responses to one paragraph for each question; reference pages, charts, and data. Please distinguish if responses are of major or minor concerns.)

A. What is the best/most unique part of the analysis?

The report provides a very good presentation of the decision making analysis procedure. Supporting material is clearly presented.

B. What is the most critical aspect of the study/analysis? Why?

The report was somewhat difficult to follow because the phrases vulnerability assessment and adaptive management seemed to be used interchangeably. In the end, what was presented was more of a risk-based decision making process rather than an adaptive strategy. These are quite different.

C. Which aspect of the analysis/modeling is weakest? Why? How can it be improved?

See comment B.

D. Are there any other suggestions that are related to how this analysis may be used more effectively or the results explicated in a more understandable manner?

- Section 8.1.2 is quite confusing and should be rewritten. At the bottom of page two, eight items are listed, but the following discussion covers five items and figure 8.3 contains boxes that don't agree with the workplan items nor the other five.
- Section 8.2.3 the last sentence refers to a gateway under development. Wouldn't most reader find the word portal more understandable?
- On page 16, should this section contain a discussion of the results from perfect forecasts as a means of demonstrating the limits of operational flexibility? Also should the water management implications of the water use priorities contained in the treaty be discussed? Note typo paragraph three, line 10.
- In 8.4, a call for a new advisory board may appear a bit of a damp squib to the public. Think it would be better to reverse the order of recommendations 2 and 1.

Please indicate any confidential comments to the Co-Chair(s) of the Independent Peer Review Group in the space below. Comments for transmission to the author(s) should be on a separate sheet attached.

Signature: Alballyday Date: November 8, 2011

Signature: Peggy A Johnson Date: November 8, 2011

## **Comments for Transmission to Authors**

### **General**

Although the report was well organized and written, it was somewhat difficult to follow because vulnerability assessment and adaptive management seemed to be used interchangeably. In the end, it appeared to be more of a risk-based decision making process rather than an adaptive strategy being put in place. These are quite different.

### **Detailed Comments**

- Section 8.1.2 is quite confusing and should be rewritten. At the bottom of page two, eight items are listed, but the following discussion covers five items and figure 8.3 contains boxes that don't agree with the workplan items nor the other five.
- Section 8.2.3 the last sentence refers to a gateway under development. Wouldn't most reader find the word portal more understandable?
- On page 16, should this section contain a discussion of the results from perfect forecasts as a means of demonstrating the limits of operational flexibility? Also should the water management implications of the water use priorities contained in the treaty be discussed? Note typo paragraph three, line 10.
- In 8.4, a call for a new advisory board may appear a bit of a damp squib to the public. Think it would be better to reverse the order of recommendations 2 and 1.