

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

Proposal number: 2001-K215

Short Proposal Title: Clear Creek...

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Objectives are clear, the hypothesis is poorly framed.

Panel Summary:

Concur, a good hypothesis would be nice to show that the use of the data is understood but monitoring objective of the proposal does not depend strongly on the hypothesis.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Model shows how monitoring in Clear Creek fits into the broader picture of recovery of Chinook salmon.

Panel Summary:

Concur, but not really the ecological conceptual model for this work.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

It is unclear how different runs will be identified. Growth rates or length-at-age would add to the value of the project. Does not show how biases associated with Rotary Screw Traps will be overcome. Proposal should show links to stock-recruit dynamics which would be a better assessment for the effects of restoration actions.

Panel Summary:

The reference to standard CAMP methodology addresses the concern of one review. Methodology seems appropriate to meet objectives. Panel is also concerned about inability to distinguish runs according to this proposal; this inability could reduce the utility of this monitoring for management.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. This project is part of a continuing monitoring program. Lack of apparent coordination with other restoration activities.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. Yes but, coupling to stock-recruitment work and other work would add considerable value.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. Analytical framework not as effective as it could be.

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:

Yes, but some problems with design limit conclusions. Methods of data analysis are not sufficiently detailed to determine whether the hypothesis can be tested, or objectives can be met.
Yes but, analysis inadequate to assess restoration.

Panel Summary:

More detail would be good and more coordination with other studies, but methods generally will meet proposal objectives.

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

Two reviews, one at 'good,' and one at 'fair.' Data would be useful but more analysis needed. Efforts should focus on improving data quality so that meaningful results are obtained and statistical analysis among different runs and years is possible.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

By itself this study cannot test the hypothesis but we expect that data on adult numbers and habitat conditions will be examined. Such analyses would benefit greatly from the data gathered by this monitoring proposal.

Summary Rating

Your Rating: VERY GOOD in the context of meeting monitoring objectives.