

Appendix E. Peer Review

Procedure for Selecting Peer Review Panels for the Draft Nearshore and White Seabass Fishery Management Plans (10/18/01)

First, a master list was compiled consisting of 34 names. The list came from several different sources. The individuals on the list were sorted according to their area of expertise (*i.e.*, their field, and specialty within their field). We decided that there should be four reviewers on the white seabass panel and six on the nearshore panel, because the nearshore plan was longer, more complex and included 19 species. We also decided that on each panel there should be at least one resource economist or social scientist, one population dynamicist, and one fish ecologist. We thought, too, that it would be desirable to have representation from outside California, if possible. With those criteria in mind we ranked our candidates.

After ranking, we began contacting the candidates to ascertain if they were available and interested in participating. They were offered an honorarium and reimbursement of travel costs. For the nearshore plan we needed the peer review report to be completed within one month and the panel to be able to meet for a day at the end of that month. For the white seabass plan we had six weeks. Many of the people we contacted were not able to participate. Reasons included scheduling conflicts/lack of time (the most frequent reason), self-declared conflict of interest (several had acted in an advisory capacity during plan development), and lack of interest (one recent retiree was not ready to resume his recently discarded profession). Most of the people who declined suggested other candidates. Most of the people suggested were already on our list, but a few were not and they were evaluated. Most of the candidates wished to consider the invitation for a while before saying yes or no, and this further slowed the process as we approached our targeted quotas. We didn't want to have more invitations issued than we had positions for. Through this process, we filled both panels. We believe that the C.V.s which will be appended to each report will confirm that both panels were comprised of highly qualified scientists.