

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

Proposal number: 2001-K202

Short Proposal Title: Delta rearing by Chinook fry

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Yes.

Reviewer: hypotheses are far too vague and not testable.

Reviewer: Yes.

Panel Summary:

Objectives should be explicitly linked to hypotheses stated. Hypothesis statement should be revised so there is an actual null hypothesis, preferably one that aligns better with the objectives of the proposal.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

2 reviewers: yes.

Reviewer: this does not constitute a conceptual foundation for such a broad and potentially important issue.

Panel Summary:

Conceptual model not clearly presented. What is presented does not lay out the logic of why rearing relates to successful recruitment to the adult population.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: yes, if technique proves sensitive enough to distinguish parameters of interest.

Reviewer: No. Use of otolith analysis will clearly distinguish when a fish is in the delta from when in natal stream from when in ocean, but anything on finer scale than that unlikely.

Reviewer: this technique does not provide a means of estimating survivorship, which is an important issue proposal claims to address.

Panel Summary:

Investigators will be able to see whether otolith microstructure can be used to distinguish rearing locations. Objectives and hypotheses are not well-aligned.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: if it succeeds, project would be useful tool to direct management goals and decisionmaking.

Reviewer: project justified as research.

Reviewer: project large in scope and broad in focus, but could be easily partitioned into a series of more testable and progressive projects.

Panel Summary:

Concur with reviewer who suggests a sequence of smaller testable and progressive projects.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Reviewer: if proposed methods can be used to answer questions, then useful information will be generated.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: proposal relies on other monitoring programs, the fate of which is uncertain.

Panel Summary:

This is a research project, and a peer-reviewed publication (or more than one) should be a product. Other reporting plans seem adequate.

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: project largely relies on other programs to get samples; should use Access database program instead of dBase.

Reviewer: parts are well-described, but other aspects of proposal do not seem adequate. Given that it's not clear technique will work, it's not certain objectives will be met.

Panel Summary:

Concur with reviewers' comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewers: this is not a simple 3-year program. At least a 7-year program will be required to get adult returns.

Reviewers: differentiating stocks with otoliths requires a large difference in conditions. Researchers unlikely to reach third or fifth goals.

Reviewers: may not be possible to get the required number of samples from all spawner populations, which may impact ability to draw conclusions about life history strategies.

Panel Summary:

Concur with reviewers' comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

5) Other comments

Reviewer 1: Good

Reviewer 2: Very Good

Reviewer 3: Fair

Unfortunately, some aspects of proposal, as it is written, are lacking justification for some of the claims it makes, namely the ability to differentiate natal streams in otolith microstructure.

While I completely endorse the need to such studies in estuaries, it is my assessment that the authors have not adequately considered what is necessary to significantly reduce the uncertainty in the value of the delta to Chinook production or ecosystem function. ... I would suggest though that they consider progressing from more testable studies and gradually build upon what they learn.

Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS

Panel comment:

Concur with reviewer comments cited under #5 above.

Summary Rating

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Fair
Poor

Your Rating: GOOD