

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

**Proposal number: 2001-K209**

**Short Proposal Title: Estimating the abundance...**

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, exceptionally clear and testable hypotheses. The objectives are similarly clear and relevant to the hypotheses. However, the third hypothesis will (about the success of restoration actions) will be difficult to test given that there is a cumulative effect of the many restoration actions. Cause and effect will be difficult to identify.

***Panel Summary:***

Concur that these are exceptionally clean and useful hypotheses. Concern that the second hypothesis cannot be tested with the data proposed here; but depends on the continued carcass survey proposed in K-214. Hypothesis 3 doesn't attempt to evaluate success of restoration projects, rather it simply compares abundance in different years in accord with the FWS definition of recovery.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

The conceptual model is excellent in putting this work cleanly into its management importance.

***Panel Summary:***

Concur. The conceptual model is much more appropriate here than in the other proposals turned in by this proponent that also used it.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, the design is well-designed and well-thought out. Both reviewers express concerns about the efficiency tests: one is concerned that efficiency is not linearly associated with flow as the proponent claims but rather probably declines more rapidly at higher flows, the other reviewer is concerned that efficiency may not be equal in all traps and that location in the channel (bank vs midchannel) probably varies.

**Panel Summary:**

Panel concurs and recognizes that the proposed site is an ideal location for use of rotary screw traps. In addition to the reviewers concerns cited above the panel is concerned that the frequency of efficiency tests is not described; the analysis requires daily estimates of efficiency but it is not clear how this assumption will be met. Compliance with the CAMP protocols should be explicitly stated and details on efficiency testing would be welcome.

**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. Much of the research described in the proposal assumes that other work continues to be funded (such as K 214) but for simple monitoring value alone, this project is fully justified.

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

**Summary of Reviewers comments:**

Yes, the basic information is essential for the management of water projects as well as in monitoring the abundance of endangered stocks and their path toward recovery.

**Panel Summary:**

Concur.

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

**Summary of Reviewers comments:**

NA

**Panel Summary:**

NA

**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:**

Yes. Posting data on the IEP webserver ensures a suitable QA/QC.

**Panel Summary:**

Concur, believe that the posting of data in real-time on the IEP server will make the data more valuable.

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

**Summary of Reviewers comments:**

Yes.

**Panel Summary:**

Concur

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

**Summary of Reviewers comments:**

The proponents have done this kind of work at this location since 1994.

**Panel Summary:**

Concur.

**5)Other comments**

Reviewers describe this proposal as ‘excellent’ and ‘vitally needed.’ One reviewer suggests that this work will be needed far beyond the three years proposed.

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

The proposal has independent value, but testing of the hypotheses assumes data proposed under another proposal. There is a strong synergy between the two proposals in improving our ability to monitor and predict winter-run abundance.

Your Rating: EXCELLENT