

Peer Review - 2009

Scientific research proposals that the LCCMR recommends for funding are peer reviewed according M.S. 116P.08. (see back side of this page)

When LCCMR conducts the peer review, a group of experts in the specific research areas are asked to review the proposals and to provide written comments. The comments are provided to the project manager of each proposal that is being peer reviewed. The project managers are asked to respond to the comments and to update their research addendum accordingly. The review process generally includes convening review panel and having the project managers interact with the peer reviewers as a group. Some reviewers that are unavailable for the panel meeting also provide written comments. In 2009, due to the late date of funding recommendations the review process was conducted by individual reviewers whom provided written review comments. At least three and up to six individual reviewers provided comments for each project.

Of the projects recommended for funding by the LCCMR in 2009 seven were peer reviewed. Six projects were peer reviewed through the LCCMR process and one through the USGS process.

5a - Removal of Endocrine Disruptors: Treatment and Education / Communication, U of M, Dr. Paige Novak, \$275,000 (VETOED BY THE GOVERNOR)

Proposal: http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/RequestforProposals/2009/2009_Proposals/ C16 PROPOSAL.pdf

5b – Vulnerability of Fish Populations in Lakes to Endocrine Disrupting Contaminants:

USGS Dr. Richard Kiesling (Includes work by Dr. Heiko Schoenfuss at State Cloud State) \$297,000

Proposal: <http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/RequestforProposals/2009/Proposals Dec/ 5b 068-B4 Proposal.pdf>
(Peer review through internal USGS process)

5c - Cooperative Habitat Research in Deep Lakes: DNR, Dr. Don Pereira, \$825,000

Proposal: http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/RequestforProposals/2009/2009_Proposals Oct 2008/ 067-B4 Proposal.pdf

5d - Does Intensified Tile Drainage Create More Erosive Rivers?: Science Museum of Minnesota, Dr. Shawn Schottler, \$300,000

Proposal: http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/RequestforProposals/2009/2009_Proposals Oct 2008/ 038-B1 Proposal.pdf

6a – Ballast Water Sampling Method Development and Treatment Technology: MPCA, Mary Jean Fenske, \$366,000

Proposal: http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/RequestforProposals/2009/2009_Proposals Oct 2008/ 074-C1 Proposal.pdf

6b – Emergency Delivery System Development for Disinfecting Ballast Water: USGS, Scott Smith, \$125,000

Proposal: http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/RequestforProposals/2009/2009_Proposals Oct 2008/ 087-C1 Proposal.pdf

6c - Improving Emerging Fish Disease Surveillance in Minnesota: U of M, Dr. Katherine Pelican, \$80,000

Proposal: http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/RequestforProposals/2009/2009_Proposals Oct 2008/ 075-C1 Proposal.pdf

MS 116P.08

Subd. 6. Peer review.

(a) Research proposals must include a stated purpose directly connected to the trust fund's constitutional mandate, this chapter, and the adopted strategic plan under subdivision 3, a timeline, potential outcomes, and an explanation of the need for the research. All research proposals must be reviewed by a peer review panel before receiving an appropriation.

(b) In conducting research proposal reviews, the peer review panel shall:

(1) comment on the methodology proposed and whether it can be expected to yield appropriate and useful information and data;

(2) comment on the need for the research and about similar existing information available, if any; and

(3) report to the commission on clauses (1) and (2).

(c) The peer review panel also must review completed research proposals that have received an appropriation and comment and report upon whether the project reached the intended goals.

Subd. 7. Peer review panel membership.

(a) The peer review panel must consist of at least five members who are knowledgeable in general research methods in the areas of environment and natural resources. Not more than two members of the panel may be employees of state agencies in Minnesota.

(b) The commission shall select a chair every two years who shall be responsible for convening meetings of the panel as often as is necessary to fulfill its duties as prescribed in this section. Compensation of panel members is governed by section 15.059, subdivision 3.

History:

1988 c 690 art 1 s 12; 1989 c 335 art 1 s 178; 1991 c 254 art 2 s 42, 43; 1991 c 343 s 5, 6; 1994 c 580 s 2, 3; 2001 c 7 s 31; 2004 c 284 art 2 s 14; 2006 c 243 s 7-10; 2007 c 30 s 3

Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund - LCCMR

2009 Peer Reviewers

Main Research Proposals:

Al Alwan, EPA – Chicago, Illinois
Dr. Darren Bade - Kent State University, Ohio
Dr. Don Cloutman - Bemidji State University, Minnesota
Mike Hoff – USFWS, Fort Snelling Office, Minnesota
Dr. Mike Sadowsky - U of Minnesota
Gary Wahlen - Michigan state government
Dr. Jim Winton – USGS, Seattle, Washington
Sandy Verry - WI, USFS Wisconsin (retired)

Aquatic Nuisance - Ballast Water Proposals:

Dr. Sarah Bailey - Great Lakes Laboratory, Ontario, Canada
Dr. Steven Gollasch - Consultant - Hamburg Germany
Dr. Thomas Johengen - University of Michigan
Dr. David Reid – National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Dr. Rochelle Sturtevant – Michigan Sea Grant/NOAA
Chris Wiley - Environmental Affairs-Transport, Canada

The Great Lakes Commission's Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species provided assistance in identifying some of their members and others to provide peer review for the ballast water proposals.

Peer Review Comment sheet

Environment and Natural Resources Trust

Peer Review

(To be completed by individual peer reviewers)

Project Title:

Project Number:

Project Manager:

Reviewer Name:

Date:

I. Project Design

- How well organized and complete is the project design and/or the experimental design?
- Is it scientifically and technically sound?
- Suggestions for changes:

II. Methodology

- Will the proposed methodology yield the necessary information and data?
- Is the proposed approach to the data analysis adequate?
- Suggestions for changes (Please be specific):

III. Probability of Completion as Proposed

- Is the schedule of the project reasonable?
- Can the technical aspects be achieved as proposed?

IV. Innovation

To what extent will the proposed work lead to new discoveries or fundamental advances in its field or across fields?

V. Qualifications

Are the technical and managerial capabilities of the project manager and cooperators sufficient to successfully carry out all phases of the project?

VI. Overall Project Quality

Comments:

Research Addendum for Peer Review

Project Manager Name:

Project Manager Email address:

Project Title:

Project number:

The research addendum should be complete, but does not necessarily need to be long. Each project should include the following information:

1. **Abstract** - Summarize the research and its essential qualities including a clear statement on the purpose of the research.
2. **Background** - Provide the basic information and other relevant work that are the context for this research.
3. **Hypothesis** - State the premise or propositions set forth to explain and achieve the described outcome of the research.
4. **Methodology** - Describe the methodology to be employed to carry out the proposed research. Including descriptions of the sample design(s), if applicable.
5. **Results and Deliverables** - Describe in detail the expected outcomes of each of the results and deliverables.
6. **Timetable** - Layout the proposed times for completing the proposed research including proposed dates for individual results and deliverables.
7. **Budget** - Update the budget sheet from the original proposal based on the amount of funding recommended. Additional details can be added to the budget sheet to more fully describe the budget (The budget sheet is expandable so that additional information can be provided). Additional narrative on the budget can also be provided to more fully explain how the funds will be spent. The "Other Funding" section of the budget sheet should also be updated and include sufficient detail so that the source and amount of contribution is clear.
8. **Credentials** - Provide brief background of the principal investigators and cooperators who will carry out the proposed research and selected publications (targeted resumes are acceptable).
9. **Dissemination and Use** – Describe how the findings of the research will be disseminated and describe the expected audience.

12/18/08