

## Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-C204-1

Short Proposal Title: Sediment in the Delta and Suisun Bay

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. The concept of the study is clearly stated; however, the relationship between the proposal and the objectives of CalFed is less clear.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

This reviewers knowledge of the subject is limited but the approach seems sound.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

As stated above, the approach seems well thought out based upon sound principles.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The research will likely result in adding to the body of knowledge related to the geomorphic processes in the lower Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and Delta. The assumed benefits to anadromous fish seem problematic but the information gained relative to sediment movement and heavy metals will be of value. This information would add to decision makers ability to evaluate other proposals.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Seems good though this reviewer has limited knowledge in this particular area of research.

**2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Probably, though as mentioned above, reviewer not really qualified to judge the technical merits of the project.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Since the project is ongoing research it is assumed they know what they are doing.

**Miscellaneous comments**

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Overall impression is that the information gathered would continue to add to the body of information concerning geomorphic processes in the lower rivers and Delta and would thus benefit decision makers in the future

---

**Overall Evaluation  
Summary Rating**

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

**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

---