

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

**Proposal number: 2001-L205**

**Short Proposal Title: Lower Butte  
Creek**

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes.

*Panel Summary:*

Yes.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes. Clearly defined.

*Panel Summary:*

Yes, the underlying basis is well defined and explained.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

All reviewers replied in the affirmative.

*Panel Summary:*

Yes.

**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:*

Yes.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

All answered in the affirmative, although one responded that “direct” information for decisions would probably not come out of this project.

***Panel Summary:***

See the Panel’s general comment on the relevance of this question to a fish screen/passage implementation project.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

One “no”, stating that **biological** monitoring will not be done. Two other reviewers placed a similar caveat on the information to be generated. One “yes”.

***Panel Summary:***

No biological monitoring provided, which would provide a benefit. Only physical/hydraulic monitoring is proposed. This is a technical weakness.

**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:***

Three responded “adequate”; one stated that justification for data collection, etc. was weak.

***Panel Summary:***

The ladder should be evaluated biologically, otherwise the procedures are adequate.

**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.

### **5)Other comments**

Add biological evaluation, at least for the first few years. This does not have to be in great detail, but should give an idea of passage efficiency. Project overhead should be investigated. "Research" aspects should be split out. DO NOT FUND Task 5, subtask 3, which is efforts to seek more funding!

## **Overall Evaluation PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

### Summary Rating

Reviewers: 2 very good; one excellent; one fair (lacking in engineering detail and lacking in biological evaluation).

Excellent  
Very Good  
Good  
Fair  
Poor

Your Rating: \_CalFed basis: VERY GOOD (except needs biological monitoring; Project merit: GOOD; needs biological monitoring for ladders (not screens)