

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

Proposal number: 2001-K207

Short Proposal Title: Lower Yuba River...

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The proposal does relate issues and hypotheses to their biological relevance but no conceptual models or explicit linkages as to how specific information will be used to address fishery issues at Deguerre Dam.

Sound approach with the exception of mercury work which is not well-tied in to how the data will be used to address fish passage problems.

Panel Summary:

Not conceptual models as much as justifications for objectives. Mechanisms of impact adequately described.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The proposal and experimental design appear to be appropriate for providing information related to each hypothesis. The proposal mentions several experimental flow studies but provides no information on how these studies would be designed. The proposal should include development of a more rigorous experimental design that articulates how information collected would be used to address specific hypotheses.

Panel Summary:

Concur with reviewer. Proposal lacks rigorous experimental design. Proposal doesn't provide sufficient detail for all tasks.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The proposal is appropriately justified as research.

Panel Summary:

Concurs with reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The proposed investigations would provide information that would potentially be used to inform future decision-making, particularly the mercury assessment task.

Panel Summary:

Concurs with reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The study doesn't explicitly articulate how the information would be analyzed or used to address key issues on the lower Yuba.

Panel Summary:

Concur 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:

A more detailed and rigorous experimental design and study plan would need to be developed to more fully identify more specific methods and protocol for data collections and analysis and how the data would used to address each of the identified hypotheses. No QAQC information provided.

Panel Summary:

Concur with reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

#1. Yes. The data collection techniques are feasible and can be accomplished. Potential permitting requirements are not addressed.

#2 Details are inadequate to assess technical feasibility.

Panel Summary:

Panel considers this proposal technically feasible.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The proposed team has all the necessary scientific credentials.

Panel Summary:

Concurs with reviewers.

5) Other comments

A more detailed description of the proposed investigation in context with previous and ongoing research would provide a stronger linkage of the relevance of the proposed study for the decision-making process on the Yuba River.

In one reviewer's opinion, the proposal is still in "rough draft" form and would greatly benefit from additional thought and literature review/synthesis.

The reviewers rated the proposals as "Good" and "Fair".

Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS

The potential impacts of Deguerre Point Dam on fishery populations have not been put in the context of overall restoration needs. This study should be developed with a more rigorous approach. But, a broader assessment of fishery limiting factors on the Yuba River may be needed first.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD