

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

Proposal number: 2001-H201

Short Proposal Title: Upper Trinity

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewers felt that the objectives and hypotheses are not clearly stated in this proposal. They also felt that the connection between objectives and ecosystem restoration was not clear or adequate. One reviewer felt that the objectives regarding sediment related impacts to Trinity Lake are clearly stated. The hypotheses, while stated in a single table, have no supporting text to tie them to the conceptual model. It was also noted that no task in the Approach section addresses implementation.

Panel Summary:

The objectives are partially stated but not clearly connected to tasks or a conceptual model. It appears that a major objective is small wood harvest in the watershed. This aspect is not obviously connected well to the issue of turbidity in the reservoir. The hypotheses are not explained beyond mention in Table 1, leaving doubt about the relationships between hypotheses, objectives, and a conceptual model.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewers all agreed that the conceptual model is "shallow" and not clearly stated, although one felt that the structure described would adequately guide development of a "comprehensive watershed stewardship plan."

Panel Summary:

The planning model presented is good but lacking in detail. Implementation conception models are lacking. There needs to be thorough linkage demonstrated between sediment source, generation, transport and delivery and the listed downstream values. The sketchy model discussion does not make this connection.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One comment from one reviewer well summarizing reviewers' comments: "The proposal contains many positive components that will achieve some of the project objectives. However, all project

objectives are not addressed by proposed tasks." Reviewers also had concerns that the methodology for sediment survey is not described, and the relationship of turbidity in Trinity Lake to conditions in the Sacramento River.

Panel Summary:

The planning portions of the proposals are reasonably well defined. Implementation objectives are not clearly or coherently addressed by the proposed project design. Non-planning portions of the proposal seem disconnected from each other, and some are not clearly presented. The issues, methods, and relationship of sediment input to Trinity Lake, effect of sediment input on turbidity, and the effect of turbidity on the Sacramento system are not discussed in adequate detail to determine if the approach is well designed or appropriate.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The planning portion of this project is adequately justified and likely to produce a good project. The other portions of the proposal are not strongly justified, but may have some relevance to demonstration projects.

Panel Summary:

The planning parts of the proposal are justified as watershed planning. The other sections have tenuous connection to other classifications, although some justification exists as demonstration projects.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Comments ranged from "yes" to "hard to determine."

Panel Summary:

While some of the baseline data gathering is likely to be helpful to future decision making in the watershed, lack of clarity regarding objectives and methods makes it hard to determine if the non planning portions of this proposal will provide valuable information to inform decision making.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers noted that there was "not enough detail to determine if monitoring will be effective," and in the planning phase "only pre-implementation project monitoring can be conducted."

Panel Summary:

As a planning project, this proposal is likely to yield baseline information that will assist with monitoring later. The proposers have a general sense of what to monitor, and likely will develop an adequate monitoring plan to accompany a plan. There is little detail regarding monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the project itself.

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:

Not fully explained. Methods used are vague, need to be described in more detail, especially methods used for sediment source assessment.

Panel Summary:

Key elements are missing regarding turbidity monitoring. In particular, the relationship of sediment source to measured turbidity, persistence of turbidity after spikes, and impact of turbid water on the Sacramento River at the times of discharge are not addressed.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers felt that the planning portion is technically feasible, but other portions of the proposal cannot be judged owing to lack of information.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewers. The planning portion is technically feasible, but the technical portions leave too many questions unanswered to determine the feasibility of their implementation.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, for the planning portions of the project. They have a history of accomplishment, and have qualified personnel based on support letters. One reviewer noted, however that the proposal plans to retain consultant assistance with the planning.

Panel Summary:

Although the description in the proposal was short on detail, the panel felt based on comments in the support letters, that the applicants are qualified. There is insufficient information in the proposal to determine if the applicants are qualified to pursue the more technical elements of turbidity and sediment mentioned in the proposal.

5)Other comments

Reviewer Summary Comments: One reviewer felt the project would be a good one if it was a tributary directly into the Sacramento River. Others stated that the proposal makes a good planning project, but the technical implementation portions need more scientific justification and more thorough detail. One recommended that the planning portion of the proposal (\$18,800) be funded.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

This project is a good project as a planning project. Removing item T8 from the budget will save \$28,000. Connection to CALFED ERP is not strong. Turbidity may not be as big an issue as stated, particularly regarding impacts on the Sacramento system. In particular, the implementation elements regarding sediment reduction are not connected in the proposal to response effects in Trinity Lake turbidity levels. For the non-planning portions of this proposal issues such as response time of turbidity change in the Lake, details regarding persistence of peak levels, additive effects of turbidity on the Sacramento system, and other details of the sediment/turbidity/ecosystem quality effects relationships need to be addressed in the conceptual model. Tasks then need to be clearly described and connected to the model.

While the sediment/turbidity issues may have some impact on the Sacramento system, most impact is in the area of water supply quality and reliability. Quality planning and subsequent implementation in the Trinity basin will likely provide some benefit to the Bay-Delta ecosystem as long as Trinity River water is moved into the Sacramento basin.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD