

LCCMR Peer Review for 2014 ENRTF Appropriations

#	Subd.	Proposal Title	Funded \$	Organization	Project Manager
Subd. 3. Water Resources					
1	3a	Solar-Driven Destruction of Pesticides, Pharmaceuticals, and Contaminants in Water	\$291,000	U of MN	William Arnold
2	3b	Methods to Protect Beneficial Bacteria from Contaminants to Preserve Water Quality	\$279,000	U of MN	Paige Novak
3	3c	Triclosan Impacts on Wastewater Treatment	\$380,000	U of MN	Timothy LaPara
4	3d	Evaluation of Wastewater Nitrogen and Estrogen Treatment Options	\$500,000	U of MN	Paige Novak
5	3e	Antibiotics and Antibiotic-Resistant Genes in Minnesota Lakes	\$300,000	U of MN	William Arnold
6	3f	Impacts of Estrogen Exposure on Minnesota's Shallow Lake Wildlife	\$136,000	St. Thomas University	Kurt Illig
7	3g	Watershed-Scale Monitoring of Long-Term Best Management Practice Effectiveness	\$900,000	Science Museum-St. Croix WRS	Daniel Engstrom
8	3h	Protection of State's Confined Drinking Water Aquifers	\$394,000	USGS	James Stark
9	3i	Identifying Causes of Exceptionally High Mercury in Fish	\$129,000	USGS	David Lorenz
10	3j	Identifying Causes of Exceptionally High Mercury in Fish	\$743,000	MPCA	Bruce Monson
11	3m	Measuring Hydrologic Benefits from Glacial Ridge Habitat Restoration	\$168,000	Red Lake Watershed Dist./USGS	Myron Jesme/Tim Cowdry
Subd. 4. Aquatic and Terrestrial Invasive Species					
12	4a	Blocking Silver, Black and other invasive carp by Optimizing Lock and Dams	\$854,000	U of MN	Peter Sorensen
Subd. 5. Foundational Natural Resource Data and Information					
13	5h	Sandhill Crane population and Management in Minnesota	\$250,000	USGS	David Andersen
14	5j-1	Imperiled Prairie Butterfly Conservation, Research, and Breeding Program	\$380,000	MN Zoological Garden	Erik Runquist
	5j-2	Imperiled Prairie Butterfly Conservation, Research, and Breeding Program	\$245,000	MN DNR	Robert Dana
15	5k	Conserving Minnesota's Native Freshwater Mussels	\$350,000	U of MN	Jessica Kozarek
16	5l	Impacts of Forest Quality on Declining Minnesota Moose	\$300,000	U of MN	James Forester
17	5m	Moose Decline and Air Temperatures in Northeastern Minnesota	\$600,000	MN DNR	Mike Larson
Subd. 6. Methods to Protect, Restore, and Enhance Land, Water, and Habitat					
18	6b*	Understanding Systemic Insecticides as Protection Strategy for Bees	\$326,000	U of MN	Vera Krischik

19	6c*	Prairie Sustainability Through Seed Storage, Beneficial Microbes, and Adaptation	\$600,000	U of MN	Ruth Shaw
Subd. 8. Air Quality, Climate Change, and Renewable Energy					
20	8a	Solar Cell Materials from Sulfur and Common Metals	\$494,000	U of MN	Lee Penn
21	8c	Demonstrating Innovative Technologies to Fully Utilize Wastewater Resources	\$1,000,000	U of MN	Roger Ruan
22	8f	Clean Water and Renewable Energy from Beet Processing Wastewater and Manure	\$400,000	U of MN Waseca	Xiao Wu
23	8g	Next Generation Septic Tank Systems	\$258,000	U of MN	Bo Hu

Notes:

1. LCCMR process: 18 research addendums reviewed, 42 total reviewers, usually 3 reviewers per project
2. USGS Process: Four addendums reviewed by 3 USGS scientists at USGS locations outside of MN
3. U of MN process: One addendum reviewed internally to protect potential patent(s), 3 reviewers
- * 4. Projects previously peer reviewed are only re-peer reviewed in future phases if there are substantial changes

Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund

Peer Review Comment sheet - 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: