

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

**Proposal number: 2001-E202      Short Proposal Title: Rhode Island Mgt/Res**

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

No. Objectives stated vaguely and unclearly.

*Panel Summary:*

No. Both objective and hypotheses are vague and lack concrete assertions. Broad statements are used to state objectives, with no real substance or scientific basis provided.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

No. Model was unclear and vague.

*Panel Summary:*

No. The model presents no real information to support the proposal. It simply relies on general statements about CALFED goals and makes little, if any, reference to actual test-case data which would support the generic premise of the project. The model is vague and without substance.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

No. Design was stated so vaguely, that appropriateness of design could not be evaluated.

*Panel Summary:*

No. The approach is not clearly and specifically defined within the proposal. The attached

feasibility study is not really a feasibility study at all, but merely a general report with general recommendations based on a general survey of the site. There are not specifics as to site hydrology, actual engineering surveys, etc.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Project should be demo-project, as specified –but remains insufficiently presented.

*Panel Summary:*

No. This proposal, as presented, does not justify any selection stage. The attached “feasibility report” should be used merely as a general, information report to be used as the basis for a real feasibility study, then a conceptual design, then environmental documentation, etc. Much work is needed before any proposal should be presented.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

No, due to lack of detail and insufficiency of proposal as written.

*Panel Summary:*

No, not as currently presented. If the project proposal were re-written and based on more concrete hypotheses, models, etc...useful information could theoretically be generated. But not in present form.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

No. Lacks detail and is much too general.

*Panel Summary:*

No. The proposal lacked sufficient information for evaluation.

**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. Plans are very lacking and too generally stated.

*Panel Summary:*

No. Panel agreed with individual reviewers.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Probably feasible, but unclear and poorly stated objectives make feasibility hard to determine.

*Panel Summary:*

This project, as it is generically stated, is probably technically feasible. However, since the proposal lacks sufficient detail, it is difficult to do an adequate analysis of the engineering aspects of the project. The deficiencies of this proposal make this question unanswerable in a real sense.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Only from engineering perspectives. Reviewers generally considered team not qualified, though they considered in-house DFG staff able to compensate for this deficiency.

*Panel Summary:*

No. Though it is assumed that the proponent will draw on DFG's in-house biological expertise, the project team identified seems weighted more in the engineering aspects of the required knowledge for the project. Also, the lack of quality in terms of the written proposal, called into question the qualification of the project lead/manager.

## 5)Other comments

### *Panel Summary:*

This proposal has significant weaknesses in regards to substance. It makes quite a large leap from a poorly written “feasibility study” to a fairly large-scale restoration proposal.

### **INDIVIDUAL REVIEWERS OVERALL EVALUATION SUMMARY RATING AND COMMENTS:**

**POOR.** This is an amateurish proposal, poorly prepared. The proposal provides insufficient information to properly evaluate a number of key aspects (see above), and seems to have been summarily thrown together with little effort or background research.

**[No rating given].** This is probably the “skimpiest” CALFED proposal I read. This does not inspire confidence in the project.

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

The proposal has significant weaknesses. The proposal greatly lacks specifics and is poorly presented. The description of the approach is inadequate and thus not well-designed. The monitoring and assessment plans are very inadequate.

**OVERALL PANEL EVALUATION SUMMARY RATING: POOR**