

Scientific and Technical Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-K209-1 **Short Proposal Title: Estimating the abundance of Sacramento River juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon with comparisons to adult escapement**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

This is a proposal to provide 3 more years of screw trapping of juvenile winter run chinook salmon (Task 1).

Task 2 is a proposal to extend the monitoring beyond the July through March period to include April through June for an additional 1/8 of the cost.

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

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

The proposal spent quite a bit of time describing the relationships between screw-trap results and the two ways of estimating juveniles. These seem more of an indictment of the RBDD counts an a justification of the screw trap study. Also, I am always worried when anyone tries to make too much of a correlation between 4 or 5 data points.

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

NA

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

It notes correctly that accurate monitoring will be required for estimating allowable take, judging the effectiveness of various improvements to the river system, and estimating time varying effects such as environmental influences on down-stream mortality. This seems to me to make a study such as this one a high priority

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

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

The statistics of the estimation method look OK, and they have been reviewed by others. The one thing that bothered me is that the percent discharged is used to determine the trap efficiency, yet the efficiency can vary depending on where the traps are placed. For example, I think that the density of downstream migrants near the bank could differ from the density in the middle of the river. This would mean that trap efficiency would vary with the trap. The authors may be assuming that all of the traps are in the same part of the river cross-section.

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

The proposal is to continue and extend ongoing monitoring.

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

The proponents have been doing this monitoring for some time.

5)Other comments

In summary, this monitoring is vitally needed for the 3 different reasons cited above. It should go on beyond the 3 years.

Overall Evaluation

Your Rating: Very good

This seems well worthwhile.