

Paul Dalke, Acting Assistant Director,
UI Wilderness Research Center
J. Fazio

Will be paid for by Davis Fund
(\$1,000 left for him. He is interested
in opposing research)

Proposal Competition

April 15, 1976

Here are my opinions on the four proposals forwarded to me from Jerran. I have passed the proposals on to John Schomaker. We are obligated to announce the winner(s) by April 30, and I suggest we all get together prior to making a final decision.

Gimbel (Marmots)

- Color streamers on marmots invites criticism.
- No evidence that wilderness environment is needed for this study.
- Objective #1 is already well established.
- Not very convincing regarding the importance of this research.
- Seems to be a generally well thought-out study and nicely organized proposal.

Wilson (Bryophytes)

- Poorly written and vague proposal.
- Little detail on sampling procedures. Does he plan to cover the whole "Idaho Wilderness" - whatever or wherever that is?
- How are "physically disturbed" areas defined? Air pollution, camping areas, inholdings, mines?

On the other hand, if this study is what I think it might be, this is the kind of work I would like to see funded by the Center. I suggest the proposal be returned for resubmission containing more detail if the student is serious about this.

Peck (Columbian Ground Squirrels)

- Coloring squirrels will not endear us to the Forest Service.
- Wordy proposal but seems well thought out. However, I can not judge the technical soundness. Can it be accomplished in the prescribed time frame?
- Reflects some thought and understanding of wilderness values.

Thurrow (Peromyscus)

- Compatible with wilderness and Center objectives.
- Wish the air travel could be reduced.
- I don't have the technical background to analyze his theories, but it seems convincing and worthy of research.

This would be my number one choice for funding from among the proposals in hand.

Decided May 5, 1976