

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

Proposal number: 2001-K214

Short Proposal Title: Carcass Survey

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, but it isn't clear that they can be tested.

Panel Summary:

Hypotheses presented are irrelevant to work planned.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, shows how carcass count will fit in to larger scheme of recovery actions.

Panel Summary:

Conceptual model too generally detailed, and partly irrelevant.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Unclear how population estimates will be adequate to test various hypotheses.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, because tracking of winter run population size is critical to assessing the status and recovery of species.

Panel Summary:

Concur, and could go beyond value stated by reviewer, to include improved estimates of population size (not just population size tracking).

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, but see concerns about whether study well-designed.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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:

Not convinced it's adequate; scales should be read before being archived and results about age/gender/size relations should be included in annual report.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

5)Other comments

Reviewer: Good.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel Comment:

Investigator should focus on developing improved population size estimator. Other hypotheses and objectives are generally not testable, and detract from main focus. Panel considers these data important and would like to see them collected, despite proposal shortcomings. Proposal would have rated higher without extraneous hypotheses.

Summary Rating

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Fair
Poor

Your Rating: GOOD