

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

Proposal number: 2001-L203

Short Proposal Title: White Mallard Dam

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewers are split; one strong “no” and 2 “yes”, although some previous work has been done in this collection of sites and this proposal is to add one more.

Panel Summary:

Very general. Part of an ongoing collection of sites/projects. This adds one more “complementary” site. The overall project (collection of sites) is justified.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One review opined that specifics were lacking. Two reviewers answered “yes”.

Panel Summary:

Yes. Specifics were lacking, but the conceptual model was quite strong.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two “no”; one “yes”.

Panel Summary:

Proposal completely lacked specifics. No concept alternatives. Technically deficient.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two “no”; one “yes”

Panel Summary:

This is a design phase project. No appropriate CalFed category.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “unclear”; two “yes”.

Panel Summary:

This is a design project. Question is of questionable relevance, except that information will be generated to allow a decision to build or not build.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “yes” but monitoring procedures are lacking at this stage (appropriate and “adequate”). Two “yes”.

Panel Summary:

OK, monitoring products should be developed as a result of this contract.

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. Sufficient for this stage of the project.

Panel Summary:

This question is not appropriate for this stage of a project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, probably, but no specifics...hard to tell.

Panel Summary:

Technical details lacking. Needs alternatives or some other indication of what is contemplated. The general Butte Creek project is technically good and this site is part of it.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One is uncertain; other two are “yes”.

Panel Summary:

The panel feels “yes”.

5)Other comments

Monitoring plans should be part of this contract work scope. Technical details are limited by the page limitations imposed by CalFed. As part of the overall Butte Creek program, this project is strong.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating]

Reviewers: Excellent; good; very good

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD on a CalFed Basis (lacked site specifics; potential design alternatives, etc.);
VERY GOOD on project merits known to the panel