

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

**Proposal number: 2001-I212**

**Short Proposal Title: Nonreg Mechanisms to  
Alter Dams and Diversions**

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

There are four educational objectives - "1. assist the decision makers, stakeholders, and general public understand the relationship between the proposed PG & E hydro divestiture and the CALFED program goals and projects; 2. assist these groups to understand the potential adverse consequences to the CALFED program if the hydro divestiture is not managed to minimize adverse affects; 3. assist these groups understand the positive and substantial opportunities to enhance the CALFED program through a directed and focused adaptive management approach to the divestiture process; and 4. assist these groups come to a decision that achieves the positive benefits and minimizes the adverse consequences."

The hypothesis is that the best way to achieve CALFED goals and minimize the adverse effects of the divestiture is for the State to own the assets and invest the proceeds of energy revenue to improve the hydro system.

*Panel Summary:*

Agree with Reviewers.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Conceptual model is that there are two ways to handle the divestiture: 1. seek to impose terms and conditions on the PG&E divestiture and run the risk of losing a federal preemption lawsuit; 2. allow a Consumers' Authority to purchase the assets and make the needed ecosystem improvements as the owner, obviating the federal preemption issue.

*Panel Summary:*

Agree with Reviewers.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

All reviewers felt the proposed approach is well designed for meeting the stated objectives, but one thought the proposal was more appropriate as a lobbying effort.

***Panel Summary:***

The Panel felt that the proposal crosses the line from education to advocacy and political action.

The results of the previous CALFED project - the Consumers' Authority - "is now imbedded in AB 1956, legislation written in the first phase of this project which is now making its way through the Legislature."

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Full-scale implementation is justified. Strong adaptive management approach. One reviewer felt this criteria was not applicable to environmental education projects.

***Panel Summary:***

Panel agreed that full-scale implementation was justified, but that it was not an environmental education project.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, that is the whole point of the proposal, to influence decision makers.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, the project incorporates milestones at various points along the way, which coordinate with decision makers schedules and hearings on this matter.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

**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:***

Little data will be collected. Electronic communications will be used.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

The Institute for Fisheries Resources and its staff is well qualified to implement the proposed project.

***Panel Summary:***

Agree with Reviewers.

**5)Other comments**

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Informing the Public Utilities Commission about the impacts of PG&E divestiture on CALFED goals and programs is a worthwhile endeavor. However, the development and advocacy of a particular solution to this issue, a Consumers' Authority - **is inappropriate for an environmental education project.**

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: POOR