

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

Proposal number: 2001-L206

Short Proposal Title: RD-2035

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:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Well done

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Thin, but present. Should be self-evident.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Good... Alternatives analyzed, clearly laid out. Deliverables defined. However, under Pg App-2 there are some inconsistencies between the table and the text (incomplete table). This should be resolved. The existing pump facility is clearly inadequate to support a well-designed screening facility; other locations were investigated and a logical alternative selected.

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:

See Panel general comment. Self-evident. This is a high-priority screen project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

See Panel General Comment for fish screen/passage projects. The proposal calls for elements for fine-tuning and modifying the facility as necessary; both hydraulic and biological testing are called for upon implementation.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Qualified “yes”; “Not applicable”

Panel Summary:

Good as far as stating what the deliverables are. See general comment on fish screen projects. The project is the design. Monitoring plan should be a deliverable under this contract, as proposed. However, divers will probably not be able to observe entrainment or impingement...not practical. Please review this element.

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

Panel Summary:

Specified. Good. Distribution plans needed.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Yes. Other large facilities have been built and successfully operated in the Central Valley. Alternatives analysis resulted in selection of a logical site; the structure will likely be capable of withstanding extreme flow conditions, considering the relationship with the Yolo Bypass and the resilience of other facilities in the general area.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Yes. Team specified. Good.

5) Other comments

Good proposal. This is a very high priority screening project, given the size of the diversion and the number of priority fish species present in the area.

Total project costs appear excessive, especially on a per-cfs basis. Cost review is strongly recommended. Compare to Sutter Mutual or other comparably-sized facilities. There is no cost-share partner, a weakness. Since the District will be getting new, higher-efficiency (lower O&M cost) pumps, it may be appropriate for the proponent to bear some of the costs, even in the design phase. It appears that relocation of the facility is not exclusively for biological purposes, which also argues for internal cost-share.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: CalFed basis: VERY GOOD; Project merit: VERY GOOD...check costs_#