

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

**Proposal number: 2001-K205**

**Short Proposal Title: Influence of discharge...**

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

2 “yes” answers.

Reviewer: no. Hypotheses are extremely awkward sentences. Subject matter well studied.

***Panel Summary:***

Yes, but concur with reviewer’s comment that this is a well-studied subject. Hypothesis three is very awkwardly worded.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: No, the entire proposal does not explain underlying basis for work. Fatal flaw: how will work reduce uncertainty regarding factors limiting salmon recovery in the Sacramento-San Joaquin watershed.

Reviewer: Yes.

Reviewer: Yes.

***Panel Summary:***

Conceptual model provided but not terribly useful (doesn’t capture important details affecting egg survivorship).

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: Yes, except hypothesis 4, for which no hypothesis provided.

Reviewer: No, but agree with general concept.

Reviewer: No. Insufficient detail how project will be done, so no way to evaluate.

***Panel Summary:***

Insufficient detail to evaluate. Panel concurs with reviewers’ concerns about testability.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: Yes.

Reviewer: Yes (very little justification given or needed). But why outreach?

Reviewer: No – not justified. See comments to 1b1.

***Panel Summary:***

Yes.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: yes, will generate data useful to modify dam operations etc.

Reviewer: no. Basis is that hypotheses have been answered already. Nothing apparently new.

Reviewer: yes, but question value of lab work.

***Panel Summary:***

Unlikely to be useful because it's not new information. (See, e.g.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: yes.

Reviewer: no, no mention of sampling strategy or experimental design, etc.

Reviewer: no, not described in detail.

***Panel Summary:***

No. Concur with reviewers' comments about lack of detail and vagueness.

**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, except with respect to hypothesis 4.

Reviewer: details are vague.

Reviewer: no, inadequate detail.

***Panel Summary:***

No. Concur with reviewers' comments about inadequate detail.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: lacks sufficient detail to evaluate.

Reviewer: highly feasible.

Reviewer: Yes.

***Panel Summary:***

Methods not adequately described to evaluate.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: highly qualified; although Walt Duffy qualified, role not clear. Why is he a PI?

Reviewer: yes, except in connection with hypothesis 4.

Reviewer: not clear.

***Panel Summary:***

Panel doesn't know investigators, so can't comment.

**5)Other comments**

Reviewer 1: Good

Reviewer 2: Good

Reviewer 3: Poor

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel Comment:

See reviewers' comments

Summary Rating

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Your Rating: POOR