

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

Proposal number: 2001-H207

**Short Proposal Title: Sacramento Conservation
Area Program**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers believe the objective and hypothesis are stated clearly.

Panel Summary:

There was concern by the panel members that the objectives were implied because of the reference to SB 1086. There is a clear problem statement but the objectives were less clear. The hypothesis statement is not a statement but rather a question, so there is an assumption to the hypothesis.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The conceptual model is a basis of the SB 1086, but there is concern of the incorporation of additional new information acquired since 1989 or the site specific parameters identified in the proposal.

Panel Summary:

Yes, because the plan is to use the handbook as the conceptual model for the basis of the project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers agreed that the locally lead approach for decision making is the best way to go, it has already been proven. The inclusion of a diverse technical team is very important.

Panel Summary:

Agree with the reviewers

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 is not applicable, this is a watershed planning coordination proposal.

Panel Summary:

No, this project is listed as watershed planning

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the implementation of this project would organize the information development of the site specific projects.

Panel Summary:

Agree with the reviewers

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The plans are adequate given the conceptual stage of the project. One reviewer had a concern that there is no identification of data gaps and could effect the adaptive management goal of the project.

Panel Summary:

They need to develop the monitoring plan and link to other watershed projects in the conservation project area. The assessment could be used to identify the number of participants and measurement of the number of fish species or individual species in the water as an example. Is this project coordinating with other projects that could assess the success of SB 1086 projects? They have failed to address the monitoring program success as per the PSP.

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:

There is no clear data management plan. There was concern that there is no discussion of data gaps or data accuracy standards included.

Panel Summary:

Need quantitative accounting for the project and the development of the data collection, storage, management and review protocols.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

There is agreement by the reviewers that the continuation of the coordination and collaborative effort is proven and effective. There was concern that more coordination between the public works and flood control was required to develop environmentally sound performance based operations and maintenance.

Panel Summary:

Yes, technically feasible and the panel agrees with the reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

There is agreement that the personnel on this project are qualified. However, there is concern about the use of CSU Chico as the administrators of the contract. Why isn't this project being done either in DWR or to the Sacramento River Conservation Area program?

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewers.

5)Other comments

Reviewer comments:

One reviewer thought the money is well spent on the coordinator to continue the work that has been done to date on the SCAP. The momentum needs to continue in order for this program to be most effective. I do have a concern about some of the costs in the budget table. What are the \$10k service contract amounts to be used for in Tasks 1 and 3, each year. No mention of these in this proposal. Also, the Federal and state Admin fees are substantial (about \$30K each year). What are these costs? Who do they go to?

The other reviewer says this is a high quality project with ambitious goals. With such a large area and goals, the devil will be in moving from a conceptual plan to the details of implementation. I am also concerned about changes since the plan was developed in 1989.

Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS

There was concern by some panel members as to why is project was not at DWR or at the Sacramento Conservation Area project? The panel members agree that the funding should go directly to the project and not through the CSU Chico Foundation.

There needs to better identify who will do the work on this project beyond Burt Bundy.

The panel members thought this decision seemed to be based on past performance of the program, that this was not a strong technical application. The budget seems to be heavy on administration. The recommendations was that this is a good idea but that the technical aspects of this application need to be reviewed and made stronger for a better and clearer understanding of the outcomes of this proposed project.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD