

Manuscript: *Recreational Boating, Tourism and Cruise Ship's Technical Work Group – Peer Review Submission – Economic Impacts of Water Levels on the Upper Great Lakes*

Author(s): *Not stated on the document*

Name of Reviewer: *Stuart G. Walesh, PhD, PE*

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 challenge of analyzing several lakes comprising the complex Great Lakes system.

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

Sensitivity to both recreational and commercial boating because of its economic impact.

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

Page 10, paragraph 4: In the economic analysis, nothing is said about the length of the marina operation season which affects annual slip-loss revenue. This is discussed in Appendix A beginning on page 28.

Page 11, paragraph 6: This “slip-loss revenue estimates” section could be the place to discuss the length of the marina operating season.

Pages 15 and 16: I suggest reducing the precision of the costs. The precision used, in spite of all the caveats, may still imply, to some, an accuracy that is simply not there. Perhaps the decimal points and zeros after them could be dropped and the costs rounded to the nearest \$1000.

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?

Page 4, paragraph 6: I suggest explaining why AOSs needed to be representative of eco-regions and bedrock geology. For example, do eco-regions and/or bedrock geology influence spatial water level fluctuations with the four upper lakes? Or perhaps bedrock geology is relevant to marina mitigation/adaption measures.

Page 8, paragraph 1: Reference is made to “each slip’s elevation.” Based on the formula, this means the elevation of the marina “bottom,” that is, at the bottom of the water column at the slip. The expression “slip’s elevation” could be initially confusing. For example, is it the water surface elevation at the slip, the finger pier elevation, etc.? Possibly use “slip’s bottom elevation.”

Page 8, paragraph 4: This is a discussion of marina access channels. Perhaps this should be qualified given that channel depths deduced from nautical charts will not be as accurate as water depths measured within the connected marina.

Page 10, paragraph 2: The reference to “four performance indicators” here may be confused with the “four (4) performance indicators” mentioned in the last paragraph on

page 3. They are apparently not the same four indicators. Perhaps some other term, other than “performance indicators,” could be used on page 10.

Begin the document with a one page, or less, Executive Summary.

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: *Stuart G. Walesh*

Date: *4/29/11*

Comments for Transmission to Authors

It would be useful to have both general comments and specific comments for major and minor revision. Please use additional sheets should they be required.

Please note that my detailed review, including editorial comments, was presented in my March 6, 2011 memorandum to Eric Loucks titled “Review of Recreational Boating Study.”