

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

Proposal number: 2001-K220

**Short Proposal Title: Reintroduction of native salmonids
into central valley**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. Objectives and hypotheses clearly stated, as well as information required to resolve hypotheses.

Panel Summary:

Level of detail not high, but concur with above.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. Logical approach and well thought out. One reviewer: ERP's focus is on restoration of bay-delta watershed downstream of major dams.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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:

Concur.

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

Yes. Results likely to be transferable to other river systems. Potential to inform future decision making strongest attribute of proposal.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

N/A

Panel Summary:

N/A

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:

Yes and No. Proposal does not explicitly describe processes of data acquisition and analysis.

Panel Summary:

Concur, but two important notes. 1. Panel concerned that study be predicated on well-defined scientific justification without any prejudgment about outcome. Identification of three dams presupposes the results. 2. Existing fishery habitat data may be insufficient to support the level of analysis implied in the screening process and detailed assessment portions of the proposal.

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:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

5)Other comments

Reviewer 1: Very good

Reviewer 2: Excellent

Reviewer 3: Very good to excellent

Reviewer 4: Good

Limitations to success of project may arise from limited availability of flow and biological data and political pressure.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel comment:

Success of project may be limited by adequacy of existing physical and biological data.

Summary Rating

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD (but note: “bang for buck” appears very high)