

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

**Proposal number: 2001-C202**

**Short Proposal Title: Geomorphic Stream  
Restoration Project**

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

"There were conflicting statements between what is being presented as a demonstration as known and proven technology and then as an unknown and testing a hypothesis." "The hypothesis is clearly stated, although not in the traditional form of a null hypothesis. The statement of hypothesis is quite broad, and to be tested, entails a number of monitoring activities not necessarily included in the monitoring element."

*Panel Summary:*

The hypothesis and testing is adequate for a demonstration, although not for research.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

"Project applicants misunderstood the nature of 'conceptual model.' They did not provide an explanation underlying the scientific basis for the proposed work... Rather, within this section, project applicants explained the methodology of their project, including the use of several physical models they will be using."

*Panel Summary:*

The understanding of the role of a conceptual model in designing a project was apparently not clear to these proponents. But it was not clear to most proponents. If CALFED intends to rely on a clear presentation of a proposal's conceptual models to select among projects, it will need to develop a better appreciation of that among proponents.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

"Monitoring elements do not appear to be adequate for the hypothesis stated." Two years of monitoring for the revegetation and fisheries elements may not be sufficient..."

*Panel Summary:*

This proposal would be worth implementing as a restoration of an alluvial channel in connection with its floodplain, but the revegetation component actually confounds the demonstration. If the channel and floodplain elevations are right, and this is essentially an unregulated watershed, the vegetation would be expected to be self-establishing. An interesting investigation of recovery on a site with restored processes becomes less valuable by introducing an artificial revegetation component.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

"The proposal states this is a demonstration and research project; however there are many examples throughout the western United States where stream restoration has been implemented. The methodology does not have to be researched and demonstrated again."

***Panel Summary:***

This is a demonstration, and the outcome is reasonably well-determined in advance.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

"If this project is funded, it should be on the merits of the proposal for doing appropriate habitat restoration."

***Panel Summary:***

It has the potential to do so, because of the well-known hydrology, substantially unmodified by major storage reservoirs, but the proposal doesn't identify them.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

"No. The proposed monitoring is vague and too general. ...Clear baseline information and metrics to measure success would be necessary..."

***Panel Summary:***

There are continuity problems. Data collection period is too brief to assess success of lengthy biological cycles like salmon returns.

**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:***

"No. The monitoring is described generally but not in any detail."

***Panel Summary:***

The planting plans confound information that could inform efforts to restore vegetation in a geomorphic context. This would require strong follow-up, but the proposal's follow-up monitoring is weak.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes. This is a relatively straightforward project that could easily be implemented.

***Panel Summary:***

We readily agree it is feasible.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

"The project team does not have extensive experience in restoration, but they should be able to implement the proposal."

***Panel Summary:***

Credentials are not strong in the restoration field, but the engineering staff would be capable.

**5)Other comments**

This proposal's merits are comparable to C-210, but at a higher price. We would encourage development of the proposal with an emphasis on investigation of processes of CALFED-wide importance, such as how to re-adjust a hydrograph altered by upstream storage to match fish habitat needs in a reconstructed or restored floodplain and thalweg, and what vegetation responses can be expected when one does so.

**Overall Evaluation**  
**PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair X
- Poor

Your Rating: FAIR