

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

Proposal number: 2001-K216

Short Proposal Title: Evaluation of Rearing...

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two reviewers diverge; one says that the conceptual model is clearly described and provides a sound motivation. The other reviewer says rationale is unfounded, cites a lack of references to support assertion that relative densities in different habitats will provide insights into limiting factors in the Cosumnes and throughout the Central Valley. Similarly, no support is provided for comparative fitness, stranding, and predation. Numerous unsupported and questionable assumptions.

Panel Summary:

Conceptual model is difficult to interpret. Conceptual model does not easily lead to hypotheses and objectives.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Generally well-designed to achieve the stated objectives, although use of contingency sample sites may confound comparisons. Comparing CPUE across different gear types (electrofishing vs seining vs Fyke nets) is unsupportable. Even within one gear type and habitat more replicates would be required.

Panel Summary:

Concur. Although panel is also concerned that many objectives of this project are already being pursued under CalFed funded studies of Moyle and Mount.

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:

#1 No, design is insufficient; #2 Yes, high likelihood of important information.

Panel Summary:

Panel believes that the data generated here will be of limited use.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

#1 says that conclusions cannot be drawn because of the lack of data assessment plans. #2 believes that the proposer provides an adequate plan for these activities.

Panel Summary:

Panel cannot find a description of an assessment plan.

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:

#1 says that collection and analysis are poorly described and in some instances flawed by experimental design. Management and recording plans are vaguely described and not sufficient to meet objectives. #2 believes data collection is well described.

Panel Summary:

Data management, analysis, and reporting are not well described.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Proposal is unclear.

Panel Summary:

Work is feasible but permitting requirements may prevent the proposed timeline.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

#1 found no evidence of proponents qualifications. #2 found them well-qualified.

Panel Summary:

Panel found the included experience statement of the proponent persuasive, and agrees with reviewer #2.

5)Other comments

#1 Experimental design flawed, the hypotheses too vague and far-reaching and the proposed analysis unclear, rated the proposal Poor.

#2 cited two previous uncited works that may be applicable and said goals of project are of high scientific and management importance and rated it Very Good.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel is very concerned that this proposal duplicates work already funded by CalFed and underway, with a better design and more rigorous sampling design and analysis. The obvious draft nature of the proposal undermines its credibility.

Summary Rating

Fair.

Your Rating: FAIR