

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

Proposal number: 2001-K211

Short Proposal Title: Effects of water temp on salmon parr

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Not clearly, but may be inferred.

Panel Summary:

Concur with reviewer comment above.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

None.

Panel Summary:

Concur with above.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Incompletely described or incomplete.

Panel Summary:

Concur with above.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewers didn't really answer this.

Panel Summary:

Proposal is overly brief and lacks justification.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes – but information may be misleading to managers.

Panel Summary:

Information will probably not be useful. Absent explicit description of what will be done, there's no way of knowing what information will be developed.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes (2 reviewers). Further documentation should have been provided for measures of smolt quality. What methods will be used not stated.

Panel Summary:

No. Proposal is overly brief and inadequate for panel to evaluate adequacy.

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 (2 reviewers).

Other reviewer: "while analytical methods not actually described, they may be adequate."

Panel Summary:

No. Proposal is overly brief and inadequate for panel to evaluate soundness and adequacy.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Probably, but unclear.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes (2 reviewers)

Other reviewer: unclear whether GS-4 and GS-7 personnel qualified. Lead person qualified.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

5)Other comments

Reviewer 1: Fair

Reviewer 2: Poor

Reviewer 3: Fair

Reviewer 4: Excellent

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel Comment:

This is an important research topic, and the investigator is well qualified for these studies. However, this is an inadequate proposal.

Summary Rating

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Your Rating: POOR