

Panel Scientific and Technical Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: 2001-K200

Short Proposal Title: Mill Creek...Plan

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: No. Objective of improving adult salmon migration clearly stated, but not adequately described.

Reviewer: Yes.

Panel Summary:

No.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

No. A generalized description of parts of proposal provided, not a conceptual model.

Panel Summary:

Concur. No biology in conceptual model at all – and it is needed.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Yes. Each of components appears adequate, but how whole project will be integrated is not clear. Local support encouraging.

Reviewer: No. Approach is confusing; not clear whether project addresses problem.

Panel Summary:

No. If objectives were clearer, it might have been possible to answer this question.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

No. Acquisition of water rights etc. not applicable to a research or demonstration project.

Panel Summary:

No.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: No. Science isn't new or interesting, but local involvement a good thing.

Reviewer: No. Because studies not described, not possible to predict value of end product.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Yes, with one exception. Understates importance of putting a fish counting device in Mill Creek. Extraordinary effort may be required to do this.

Reviewer: No. Vague.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Yes.

Reviewer: No.

Panel Summary:

No. One reviewer makes assumptions outside scope of proposal about oversight, peer review, etc.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: No, without fish monitoring device.

Reviewer: Too vague to evaluate.

Panel Summary:

No. Water acquisition is feasible, but irrelevant to technical evaluation.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: No. Participants qualified except for unnamed fishery biologist, who is an unknown quantity.

Reviewer: No.

Panel Summary:

No.

5)Other comments

Reviewer 1: Very Good

Reviewer 2: Poor

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel Comment:

This is an important location, and it is important to have local involvement. However, this proposal falls short on technical merit.

Summary Rating

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Fair
Poor

Your Rating: POOR