

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

Proposal number: 2001-L201

Short Proposal Title: USDA Sac. R. Fish Screen Program

Note: An outside review of this proposal was made by a reviewer who had a conflict of interest because of an association with another proposal within the same topic area. That review was inadvertently distributed to this Topic Area Review Panel prior to the panel discussion. All panelists were polled and stated that they felt neither their opinions nor the panel discussion were influenced by having seen that particular review. This panel review was modified to remove any references to that outside review.

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All answered “yes”, although one reviewer noted that there are “many” objectives, since this is a **program** as opposed to an **individual project** and that this should be broken into a “research/development” phase and a “demonstration” phase.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All reviewers answered in the affirmative, although one noted that details are “sketchy”.

Panel Summary:

Yes, but details are sketchy...but this is a “program”, not a “project”. The “conceptual model” is not clearly stated. See Panel’s “general comments”.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One reviewer answered “yes”; one answered that the approach was “not well defined” and needed well-defined benchmarks and explain methodologies more clearly.

Panel Summary:

This project should be split into a “research/development” phase and a “demonstration” phase. Perhaps more sites in the second phase will be needed for the variety of designs that may come out of this process. At least one site will be needed in Phase I per design concept. This is a valuable program for working with smaller diverters where funding for detailed engineering design is often

an impediment to implementation. There is also good collaboration among agencies stimulated by this program, and it serves as a “buffer” between fisheries agencies and potentially reluctant diverters.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All reviewers answered “yes”.

Panel Summary:

See 1C1. This program forms a “bridge” between “demonstration” and “implementation with elements of both. See 1b2.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All reviewers answered in the affirmative, and elaborated on the value of this proposal.

Panel Summary:

We feel that this proposal does respond to this question and does so very well. This is very important, in the view of the Panel, and enhances the merit of this proposal. There is a need.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All reviewers answered strongly in the affirmative.

Panel Summary:

This question was broadly covered, but somewhat lacking in detail. This is probably the result of a “one-size-fits-all” CalFed proposal process. See general Panel comments.

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:

All answered “yes”

Panel Summary:

Yes. Good. This will lead to greatly superior data collection and analysis than is going on now.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. However, there will be certain risks.

Panel Summary:

Yes. The risks are important to take in the development of new technologies. This is good.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, but urged additional coordination and co-participation with NMFS and CDFG.

Panel Summary:

Yes. The panel supports the collaboration with CDFG and NMFS.

5) Other comments

The proposal lacks specificity regarding individuals to be involved, but NRCS is a “known quantity” in this arena. Collaboration with CDFG and NMFS, which is expected occur, and if continued, will add to this capability. MOU’s should be established to formalize collaboration.

This is an EXCELLENT place for extra funds to be allocated. This will be an extremely valuable program for small diversion screening, and any surplus funds or additional funds could only enhance this program.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

Reviewers: Fair (wanted separated into phases); excellent.

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD