

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

**Proposal number: 2001-C208**

**Short Proposal Title: Tuolumne R. Fine Sediment  
Mgt.**

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

"The hypotheses are real, not manufactured to attempt to fit the RFP requirements, and are presented as testable questions rather than simple and unfalsifiable goal statements."

*Panel Summary:* Panelists felt hypotheses and objectives are relatively simple and straightforward.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

"Fine sediment has been identified as a stressor to salmonid production in a substantial reach of the river, and the combined goal is to reduce both the inputs of sediments to the reach from problem tributaries and to reduce the standing stock of sediment within the reach. An important parallel effort will develop a good scientific basis for characterizing the influence of sediments on quality of the substrate for spawning and egg survival using both natural and manipulative experiments."

*Panel Summary:* The panel considered this proposal to be stronger in its engineering than its science. Previous work was used as a basis for this proposal, but the panel felt the proposal was unclear on the conceptual relationship between previously funded coarse sediment study and this investigation.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:* "This is... ..direct habitat improvement along with substantial research that will have broad application to other restoration programs in the region and elsewhere."

*Panel Summary:* The panel felt the proposal was not very well designed as a scientific study, or good design features were not fully disclosed. The proposal would potentially document what works and what doesn't. The panel was concerned that the interim detention basin on Gasberg Creek would result in in-channel storage of fine sediment. This is a short-term expedient and not a long-term resolution of the problem, and at the end of the investigation the detention basin would be a liability.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:* Reviewer supported the project's combination of direct manipulation of a documented problem (fine sediment in a salmonid spawning area) with an investigation of corrective measures (reducing inputs and physically accelerating fine sediment transport out of the area).

*Panel Summary:* Panel members were willing to support implementation of this investigation, but the questioned whether the science would be strong enough to produce significant results.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:* The results of certain components of the research ... feed directly into the management decisions that will be applied to the system, satisfying the need for 'adaptive mgt.' in the work. I wish that more supporting data could have been presented regarding information developed to-date, but at least previous results were fully cited and appear to be sound.

*Panel Summary:* This project, like most the panel reviewed did not reveal a clear understanding of the adaptive management concept in ecological investigations, and felt the link between results from this proposal and management decisions was not clear.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:* "Looks very adequate and well conceived on all aspects, although details of monitoring methods could have been expanded."

*Panel Summary:* The panel had reservations about the adequacy of monitoring and assessment plans based on the lack of a strong publication record from previous work.

**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:* "Looks very adequate and well conceived on all aspects, although details of monitoring methods could have been expanded."

*Panel Summary:* The panel felt the data collection, management, analysis and reporting plans were not sufficiently developed for a scientific investigation, but the Proposal Solicitation Package does not provide strong guidance, and CALFED bears some responsibility for that.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:* Except for the research components, which will be developed during the course of the study, all other elements of the project are well-tested and appropriate technical approaches.

*Panel Summary:* The panel felt the engineering aspects of the proposal were feasible, the demonstration aspects were more questionable, and the research aspects were problematical because in situ investigations of this sort are so difficult to control.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:* The team is very diverse representing a strong research and application background in both the physical and the biological components of the project.

*Panel Summary:* The panel was confident this team has competent workers.

**5) Other comments**

When a project like this has already received funds and completed some elements, the panel was concerned at the lack of products and assessment from the prior work, and feel there is a need for the investigators to share data and publish. The panel questioned the relationship between the proposed work and the cost.

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

The panel rated the proposal as good overall, but the strength appeared to be the engineering component and the science was less well developed.

Summary Rating

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

Your Rating: GOOD