

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

Proposal number: 2001-K208

**Short Proposal Title: Evaluation of
Central Valley Floodplain Fish Rearing Habitat**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The hypotheses are generally clear although a couple are involved and complicated and may not be adequately addressed. Hypothesis C2 isn't very useful. There are 17 hypotheses in the proposal.

Panel Summary:

The hypotheses are reasonably clear. Tying each of the hypotheses to the tasks is useful and provides clear evidence of the approach taken to test the hypotheses.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The conceptual models adequately explain the underlying basis for the proposed work. One reviewer offered a different rationale for the proposed work, that is, little is generally known of fish use of flood plains, surveys should be done to identify fish species use and timing which is adequately addressed by the proposal but not comprehensive.

Topographic features of floodplains are addressed but detailed maps and numbers of fish collected per feature should be provided. One reviewer was concerned that the conceptual model did not address life cycle implications.

Panel Summary:

Conceptual models reasonable define the basis for the proposed work.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Sampling period may not be enough time to assess apparent growth rates for each species and each habitat. Apparent growth rates can be confounded by unquantified fish immigration and emigration. Sampling frequency may not be adequate to address rapidly changing floodplain conditions. Fish growth determination may be compromised because the channel and floodplain are open systems and are being invaded by migrating fish. Poor habitat conditions on the flood plain are being defined by predators which may

indicate that conditions are favorable to all species. Methods for analyzing floodplain sampling are poorly defined and may be inadequate. Proposed level of effort may not be sufficient to provide definitive answers.

Panel Summary:

Concur that the methodology may not provide accurate assessment of the value of floodplain habitat or effects of stranding. The unquantified biases of the sampling methodology limit the likelihood of finding statistically valid results.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Concur

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One reviewer believes the proposed study will not add significant new information, at least with the proposed methods. Two reviewers state that the information will be useful.

Panel Summary:

Concurs that the effort will not likely lead to significant improvements in our understanding of floodplain habitats and stranding.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two reviewers stated no, one reviewer said yes.

Panel Summary:

Since this is a research effort, monitoring and assessment plans are not applicable.

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:

This effort may meet the objectives of the proposal but will not test the hypotheses.

Panel Summary:

Concur

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, depending on suitable conditions in floodplains.

Panel Summary: Concur

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

May not be sufficient manpower, but those identified are qualified.

Panel Summary:

Agree

5)Other comments

The proposal is a mix of disciplines; concerns about study design and data interpretation were expressed by all reviewers; the survey level information will not provide adequate data for rigorously testing the hypotheses.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Your Rating: FAIR