Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number:_2001-C204-3 **Short Proposal Title:_**Sedimentation in the Delta and Suisun Bay

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?
The objectives are fairly well stated; the hypotheses are not. The objectives describe what is to be accomplished through the work, and the relevance of the work to the larger CALFED goals. The hypothesis only references a "geomorphic hypotheses" that propose to explain the limitations of sediment supply and the accumulation of sediment within the study area. The actual hypotheses themselves are not stated, though they could be inferred through the continuing narrative. It would have been preferable had the applicants clearly stated all the hypotheses in the form of a question to be answered through the research. This was done in a couple of instances, but not consistently through the section.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?
Yes, the narrative conceptual model describes the physical connections and processes between environmental variables (flows, tides, wind) and the movement of bedload and suspension of sediment.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?
The approach appears to be well designed. Well-known and conventional methods will be used to monitor sedimentation and bedload sampling. Geographical areas have been selected and rationale provided for their selections; methods for data collection and analysis have been developed by prior studies and have been referenced in the literature. Monitoring sites coincide with locations of hydrodynamic and water quality measurements presently made by the USGS and other agencies. Data handling and storage considerations have been incorporated into the approach.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?
The applicant has correctly identified the proposal as one of monitoring/research. All facets of the proposal are directly related to research and monitoring.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?
There are few quantifiable studies on sediment and bedload movement in the Delta, particularly on the geographical scale as being proposed. Information developed on sediment movement in the Delta will help provide a clearer picture of adherents to the sediment, including nutrients, toxic metals and organic compounds. Information derived will also assist in the development of aquatic and terrestrial restoration projects in the Delta by providing a better understanding of sediment transfer processes, thus helping in the development of design criteria for these projects.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?
The monitoring plans are part of the project's research methodology and appear to be sufficient for a successful outcome. The approach has proven to be feasible in the Delta with previous projects. The information assessment plans include formal and informal technical reports, and presentations at appropriate forums, such as the CALFED Science Conference. They are adequate to convey information learned from the project to technical colleagues, managers and decision-makers.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?
As described in the previous sections, the data collection (monitoring) data management, analyses and reporting plans are well described in the proposal and are adequate to meet project objectives.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?
The proposed work is likely to be technically feasible principally because known and tried techniques are being used to conduct the project. The approach has already been proved to be feasible in the Bay-Delta based on previous work conducted by the Principal Investigators and reported in various technical reports.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?
The project team is very qualified to conduct this work. They have both practical experience and knowledge of what they are doing – (they have conducted previous work using similar methodologies) and also have appropriate academic qualifications.

Miscellaneous comments
It is noted that this project is not a restoration project; rather it is a project that will provide sediment and bedload movement information to help make restoration and similar projects more successful .

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
☐ Excellent	The objectives of the project are clear; (the hypotheses, not so); the conceptual model is well thought through; the techniques and methodology are proven; and qualifications of the investigators are excellent. The project provides information that is needed for a better understanding of sediment transport in the Delta – but the benefits of this project might not be immediately realized or recognized unlike a physical project such as restoration of a habitat.
X Very Good	
☐ Good	
☐ Fair	
☐ Poor	