

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

**Proposal number: 2001-K213**

**Short Proposal Title: Battle Creek Projects**

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: Yes.

Another reviewer: Confusion as to what the specific objectives of monitoring program are.

Relationship of hypotheses and monitoring activities not clear.

***Panel Summary:***

Panel confused about specific objectives of monitoring work, and relationship of hypotheses and work intended to address them.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: conceptual could use work.

***Panel Summary:***

Absence of detailed conceptual model hampers interpretation of proposal for some panelists. As presented here, conceptual model does not explain the underlying basis for proposed work.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Data to be collected are described, but no descriptions of types of analyses that will be performed are provided in proposal.

***Panel Summary:***

Approach is not clear as presented. Proposed scope of work does not adequately address the stated objectives and hypotheses.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: Generally yes, but explanation of specific analyses to be conducted now or in the future is lacking.

***Panel Summary:***

Concur with reviewer quoted above.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: Proposal will provide basic raw data for analyses to inform decision making.

Reviewer: Highly likely that all future decisionmaking regarding restoration will depend on these monitoring projects.

***Panel Summary:***

The data will be very valuable. It is unfortunate that the proposal does not explain how data will be used.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: quite adequate.

Reviewer 2: basic mechanics of field sampling adequate. Analytical plans are not well-enough formulated for generating the actual statistical assessments to evaluate the Battle Creek restoration projects' performance.

***Panel Summary:***

Concur with reviewer 2's comments about inadequacy of analytical plans.

**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:***

Reviewer: Yes.

Reviewer 2: Data collection plan is sound. The specific analytic framework and types of analyses required to assess the project not sufficiently described by proposal.

***Panel Summary:***

Concur with reviewer 2's comments about inadequacy of analytical framework.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes.

***Panel Summary:***

Concur.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewer: investigators qualified for proposed data gathering.

Reviewer: Yes, very qualified.

***Panel Summary:***

Concur.

**5) Other comments**

Reviewer 1: Good

Reviewer 2: Very good.

Difficult to wade through proposal.

Some modification of overall approach and experimental implementation and evaluation of various habitat restoration measures may allow better resolution of the large number of uncertainties associated with this effort. Should CALFED fund such a program, overall annual cost efficiencies should be expected and demonstrations by the grantee.

**Overall Evaluation**  
**PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel comment:

Incompleteness and complexity of proposal were real impediments to panel's evaluation. Rating would be "very good" if analytical approach to be used were more clearly explained.

Summary Rating

Excellent  
Very Good  
Good  
Fair  
Poor

Your Rating: GOOD