

## 2005 National Criteria Score Sheet

TITLE: Effects of Organochlorines Pesticides on Fish and Wildlife Resources of  
Matthews Brake NWR, Leflore and Holmes Counties, Mississippi

PROJECT I.D.: New \_\_\_\_\_ REGION: 4 RO RANK: \_\_\_\_\_

TARGET STATES:

### Pass/Fail Criteria

The investigation proposal **DOES** \_\_\_ **DOES NOT** \_\_\_ pass the minimum required standards of the Environmental Contaminants Program.

Yes/No Proposal clearly identifies (1) an environmental problem related to anthropogenic contaminants and (2) site-specific management actions designed to resolve that problem. If not, explain:

Yes/No The proposal clearly identifies a level of biological impacts that must be investigated. Abiotic only sampling is clearly linked to an established threshold level of concern. If not, explain:

Yes/No At least one substantive peer review has been conducted and is attached. The proposal has been revised as appropriate. The study design is sufficient to meet the objectives of the proposal. If not, explain:

Yes/No The required surnames have been obtained. If not, explain:

### Ranking Criteria

For the above referenced proposal, determine a score for each of the following criteria in accordance with the criteria definitions described in Chapter 5 of the investigations manual. Identify the location of the text that supports the score. If you disagree with a score previously provided, explain why.

#### *A. Threats to resources are **DOCUMENTED** (20 pts) or **SUSPECTED** (15 pts).*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIA\_\_\_\_, ¶ 3–5 Score: 20

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

#### *B. Management actions are **DIRECT** (15 pts) or **INDIRECT** (10 pts).*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIC, ¶ 1-3 Score: 15

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:

Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*C.1. The study question(s) or hypotheses being addressed by the investigation **ARE (4 pts) or ARE NOT (0 pts)** clearly stated.*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIA, ¶ 6-7 Score: 4

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*C.2. The study design as described in the proposal **WILL (4) or WILL NOT (0 PTS)** answer the study question(s)/hypotheses.*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIB, ¶ 1-2 Score: 4

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*C.3. The scope or complexity of impacts being addressed by the investigation **IS (4 pts) or IS NOT (0 pts)** appropriate.*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIB, ¶ 1-2 Score: 4

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*C.4. The most severe type of biological impact addressed by the investigation is an **INDICATOR OF ADVERSE EFFECTS (4 pts) or ACTUAL ADVERSE EFFECTS (7 pts)**.*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIB, ¶ 1-2 Score: 7

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*C.5. Source of the contaminant **IS (3 pts) or IS NOT (0 pts)** sufficiently addressed.*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIA, ¶ 3 Score: 3

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*C.6. Pathway of the contaminant **IS (3 pts) or IS NOT (0 pts)** sufficiently addressed.*

Field Office Supporting Text (**in bold**): Section IIA, ¶ 3 Score: 3

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*D. Final regional rank order is \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ proposals submitted. Score:*

*E1. Regional Performance Score Score:*

*E2. Total Partnership Effort*

Field Office Supporting Text: Section VIB, ¶ 1-2 Score: 0

Regional Office Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

Reviewer Supporting Text: Section \_\_\_\_\_, ¶ \_\_\_\_\_ Score:  
Explanation (if scores differ):

*General Reviewer Comments or Major Concerns:*