

## Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-C212-2

Short Proposal Title: Flow, Sediment Transport in the Sacramento Basin

**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. Well presented hypothesis.

**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]

Yes. The concept is to measure the geomorphic processes of the Sacramento River in order to develop a predictive model for decision makers for future restoration projects.

**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]

Yes.

**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]

Yes.

**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]

Not clear if the ultimate outcome will be easily usable by someone who is not technically capable of understanding the parameters used in building the model. If it is user friendly then it could be a very valuable tool.

**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]

It seems that the proposal is technically feasible but this reviewer is not capable of evaluating the underlying assumptions which will be used to generate the model.

**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]

It appears the applicant is qualified to complete the work as proposed.

**Miscellaneous comments**

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

This proposal would develop a model which would predict future geomorphic processes resulting from human and naturally induced changes in the bed and banks of the Sacramento River. There are two areas of concern. First, there are other researchers doing very similar work (e.g. Eric Larsen at UC Davis) and this appears to be a duplication of that work. If this is complimentary that would be good. Second, the applicant states that this work is to complete his dissertation including presentations at professional society meetings and writing technical reports. The budget does not break out these activities which may not be appropriate for CalFed funding.

---

**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]

---