

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

Proposal number: 2001-K203

**Short Proposal Title: Merced River Water
Temp...**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Generally yes, no description of data to be collected. No clear case for how their approach will resolve the complexities in this system.

Panel Summary:

Yes, very clear and appropriate.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

No, the model presented is clear but the analyses required to meet the objectives are not described.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The approach is well thought out but lacks detail on how the management alternatives will be developed and addressed. Unsure that existing data will be sufficient to meet the objectives. Conceptual model might be too simple for the complex system.

Panel Summary:

The approach is well designed for task 1.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, task 1 will definitely generate useful information for future decision making. If the management alternatives are developed and analyzed they will guide future operations however, no details are provided how this task would be done.

Panel Summary:

Concur

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

As feasibility study monitoring plans are not included. Database should be a publicly available product of this work. Field monitoring should be adequate for this study.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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 provision is made for data collection, management or QA/QC. No details on methodology.

Panel Summary:

Concur

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Overall outline is sound, but since the proposal does not state how the alternatives will be developed and analyzed it is hard to assess the technical feasibility of this project. Could be limited by ability to gather sufficient data and interpret it.

Panel Summary:

Proposal Executive summary states that “existing records, data, and modeling efforts are not sufficient at this time to allow comprehensive quantitative analysis of potential remedial actions.” If this is true it is unclear that this work is feasible, perhaps the authors mean only that further

analysis is called for and that they believe the data are adequate and the project is feasible. This proposal raises suspicions that some of this work has actually been done already. The inclusion of a cost of \$280,000 for engineering of a temperature control device design in the work plan suggests that more analysis has been done than is presented here.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

No, this project requires expertise in hydrology, engineering and temperature modeling. The team members do not appear to have extensive expertise in these areas.”

Panel Summary:

Concur

5)Other comments

Both reviewers rank the proposal as ‘fair.’

Objectives are consistent with CALFED needs and AFRP missions. Need for management of Merced River for water temperatures to improve survival of anadromous salmonids is clearly indicated. The proposal is solid for task 1 but not for task 2. Price tag for task 2 has not been justified.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Fair overall but maybe good for Task 1 alone. The panel is uncomfortable that if the data are available they would have already been looked at, the statement that the data and records are inadequate for the work they propose to do makes us question whether the work should be done or whether it already has been done.

Summary Rating

Your Rating: FAIR