

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

Proposal number: 2001-K217
behavior

Short Proposal Title: Juvenile salmon migratory

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Proposal does not provide explicit information on how specific data collected as part of the investigations will be used to test or evaluate hypotheses. How analyses will be performed is not stated.

Panel Summary:

Concur with above comments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Investigators do not provide explicit linkage between the conceptual model, the hypotheses, and the data to be developed.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Specifics on experimental design and especially treatment of data are lacking. Although experimental design will provide important descriptive data on migration, it is difficult to assess the ability to interpret the resulting information with regard to various hydrologic conditions... Use of hatchery fish questionable: no reason to assume that hatchery fish will behave in same fashion as wild fish.

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:

Appropriately characterized.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Because of limited scope of project, unlikely that project will definitely resolve questions that motivated study.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Applicant does not provide detailed methods, so it's unclear whether plans adequate.

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:

Explicit details regarding data collection, management, and analysis not presented.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Radio tagging investigations technically feasible, but validity of results may be questionable.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Quite qualified.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

5) Other comments

Summary Comments:

Reviewer 1: very good

Reviewer 2: good

Reviewer 3: (no score readable)

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel Comments:

Development of this technique useful and pursuit of this line of enquiry useful and interesting, but this proposal does not seem adequate to resolve hypotheses and obtain quantitative answers.

Technological limitations currently prevent better experimental designs from being implemented.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD