

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

Proposal number: 2001-L202

Short Proposal Title: Suisun Marsh

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 in the affirmative.

Panel Summary:

Yes. The proposal is to: first, identify diversions needing screens; second, identify willing participants; third, move toward implementation.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. The “uncertainties” cited in the proposal are not “uncertain”. Limitations ascribed to fish screens are a function of design and what is technically prudent.

Panel Summary:

The Panel agrees. The proposal is responsive.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers did not think the approach in the proposal was good. Not enough sites or willing participants. This proposal is technically quite weak in this area. Too open-ended.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the above. This proposal is not adequately supported, and has substantial implementation uncertainties and risks. There are no diverters identified as willing to accept O&M responsibilities.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewers answered generally in the affirmative, but the proposal did not list all the justification it could have. Full scale implementation is probably justified, however.

Panel Summary:

Proposal is somewhat weak in the justification area. The implementation is appropriate, however.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

No monitoring plans were identified in the proposal, and in fact, the proposal states that there will be none. Therefore, NO.

Panel Summary:

No monitoring, therefore, No. However, this may not be needed, since this technology is well known and additional information may be superfluous.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

None proposed, except a “test” after installation. Additional data are probably not necessary.

Panel Summary:

Insufficient information, except that typical hydraulic performance testing should be sufficient.

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:

N.A.

Panel Summary:

N.A.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes, based on independent Panel knowledge, but the proposal is not technically responsive to this question.

5)Other comments

See above. See Panel general comments.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

Reviewers: Poor; good

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: POOR based on CalFed criteria; GOOD from a project perspective AFTER site selection and identification of willing participants.