

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

Proposal number: 2001-E-204

**Short Proposal Title: Butte Creek/Sanborn Slough
Bifurcation Upgrade Project**

Only one individual review of this proposal was received. The summary of reviewer comments is that of the one review received.

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The hypothesis is simple and clearly stated in a single sentence, with supporting discussion. The objective of removing a specific source of mortality and stress to anadromous fish is clear.

Panel Summary:

Regarding the objective, it is unclear why this structure is needed. The hypothesis is clear. Stating a null hypothesis is a plus.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The model is clear and direct, and its assumptions are clearly stated.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewer.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The proposal covers a late construction phase of the project, which has undergone substantial planning, environmental review, and engineering design, and has obtained necessary permits. It is particularly notable that there is adequate preparation for evaluation and operational tuning of the passage structure after it has been built.

Panel Summary:

The duration of monitoring is too short. Additional years of monitoring are required to fully assess the effectiveness the proposed actions. Otherwise the approach is appropriate.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

This question does not appear to be addressed directly in the proposal. Neither a research, pilot, or demonstration project would provide a feasible means of addressing passage problems at this site.

Panel Summary:

It is appropriate as a full-scale implementation project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The project is specific to a migration blockage at a specific point in lower Butte Creek, and providing passage will necessarily address specific physical conditions at the site. It is possible that monitoring at the site could provide information useful for solving other physical passage problems, or for determining the potential utility of projects further downstream in the Butte Creek drainage.

Panel Summary:

Yes, as long as the monitoring period is of sufficient duration to fully and accurately assess the effectiveness of project actions (see 2a comments).

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The hydraulic assessment plan, designed to observe the structure after it is built and adjust its configuration and operation to real conditions during migration periods, is an integral part of the project. The proposed biological evaluation is simple, direct, and practical, consisting of determine whether and how fish use the structure.

Panel Summary:

The monitoring and assessment plan includes all necessary elements. However, the two year duration of monitoring is inadequate to assess the effectiveness of the project. There is a greater potential of misinterpreting the adequacy of the facility regarding fish passage with only two years

of monitoring. Table 1, which relates hypotheses to monitoring and assessment activities, is good.

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:

The description of data handling for biological assessment is adequate, given the simplicity of the task. The hydraulic assessment data handling is adequately, though not exhaustively, described.

Panel Summary:

Data collection: See comments under 2a.; the two year monitoring period is not scientifically sound.

Data analysis is adequate.

Data handling and storage are not described.

The proposal states that data/progress reports will be prepared each year, but it does not state how and to whom they will be made available.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The planned project has been designed by and approved by registered civil engineers with a record of successful projects on Butte Creek.

Panel Summary:

The engineering aspects are feasible. However, the monitoring period is too short to fully assess the effectiveness project actions.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The project team appears qualified, judging by the materials submitted.. The principal engineer is known by this reviewer to have successfully completed a several similar projects on Butte Creek. The proposal does not state who will carry out the biological aspects of the monitoring plan, since a contractor will be sought at a later date.

Panel Summary:

The project engineers appear qualified. Qualifications for fish biology/ecology disciplines are

lacking and thus can not be determined. The proposal does not identify any specific fish biologists/ ecologists for the project team; it only states (in Table 2) that “monitoring consultants” will be hired.

5)Other comments

Reviewer – None.

Panel wonders where this project falls in the overall program for Butte Creek salmon restoration.

INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER OVERALL EVALUATION SUMMARY RATING AND COMMENTS:

VERY GOOD.

The proposal provides adequate material indicating that this is an expertly-conceived, potentially very effective restoration project. It could be rated as excellent if it included, first, some information on what the Sanborn Slough bifurcation structure is and why it exists, and second a technical description of the proposed passage structure and operation.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

The main weakness is that the monitoring period (two years) is too short to fully assess the effectiveness of the project. Otherwise, the monitoring and assessment plan is sound. Other weaknesses are that the proposal does not identify a specific fish biologist/ecologist on the project team , insufficient information on the structure, and how this project fits into the overall Butte Creek salmon restoration program.

OVERALL PANEL EVALUATION SUMMARY RATING: GOOD