

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

**Proposal number: 2001-L200**

**Short Proposal Title: City of Sacramento**

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Reviewers all stated the objectives and hypotheses were clearly stated, although hypotheses such as that fish screens prevent fish entrainment are self-evident.

*Panel Summary:*

Needs design detail. Otherwise yes.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

All reviewers answered “yes”; one reviewer noted that the City of Sacramento would face ESA liability if screens were not upgraded.

*Panel Summary:*

Yes, for fish protection. No, for a “conceptual model”.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

All reviewers answered “yes”. The “process” was followed.

*Panel Summary:*

We agree, on the basis of fish protection. The rest of the “purpose” of the project was not justified. Proposal does not support with technical detail.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Two reviewers answered “yes”; one answered “no”...alternatives were not discussed that might justify the proposal configuration. “The fish screen portion of the proposed work is justified but the extent of their final configuration and the architectural enhancements do not seem justified under this proposal.”

*Panel Summary:*

The panel wishes to associate itself with the quoted sentence above. The immense cost of this project is mostly associated with non-fish screen embellishments. Justification of costs needs investigation.

No technical drawings were submitted. No design information was presented. This makes this proposal technically deficient.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

One reviewer omitted this category, apparently feeling it was irrelevant. One reviewer answered “indirectly”, trying to give a generic response. One answered “yes”, citing CVPIA monitoring requirements.

***Panel Summary:***

In general, evaluation and monitoring of fish screens will yield important information for future fish screen design. There should be a 5% performance bond to assure both maintenance and monitoring. This should apply to all fish screen implementation projects.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

“Yes” from two reviewers, citing CVPIA requirements. One stated that such a plan “will be developed”.

***Panel Summary:***

The proposal does NOT specify what sort of monitoring will be implemented, relying instead on CVPIA requirements. This is probably good enough.

**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:***

One reviewer answered “yes”; two answered “no”. Details were not spelled out.

***Panel Summary:***

No, but proposal states that CVPIA requirements will be complied with.

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

**Summary of Reviewers comments:**

All responded ‘yes’.

**Panel Summary:**

Yes.

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

**Summary of Reviewers comments:**

All responded “yes”

**Panel Summary:**

The proposal did not identify individuals responsible for various aspects of this project. Although the reviewers already knew that technical expertise would be available, the proposal did not reflect this and is technically deficient in this respect.

**5)Other comments**

Some panel members felt strongly that an independent outside audit should be conducted as a requirement of funding. Such an audit should assure that 1) design is appropriate to the need (e.g. appropriate criteria); 2) cost is appropriate to design; 3) costs are appropriately allocated to funding sources. Some panel members felt that the AFSP process has taken care of (1).

Please refer to general comments from the Panel regarding the CalFed proposal process as applied to implementation projects.

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

This proposal has a big price problem unrelated to fish screens. The budget needs further review. The proposal is technically weak, but part of the reason may be the CalFed proposal process. The project should move forward.

**Summary Rating**

One reviewer rated “excellent”; one “fair”; one “poor”

Excellent  
Very Good  
Good  
Fair  
Poor

Your Rating: FAIR on CalFed basis; EXCELLENT on project merit

1

1