

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

Proposal number: 2001-L207

Short Proposal Title: Patterson I.D.

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:

Yes. Feasibility of screening alternatives at an existing pump station. The hypothesis is that reduced (presumed) entrainment will lead to more fish returning to spawn.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

This proposal is relatively weak in this area. This does not diminish the need for the project. Diverted water is for seasonal agricultural use, and the relationship between the time of use and fish occurrence is vague in the proposal. Comparisons with other fish screen projects on the San Joaquin River are inaccurate.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two "yes"

Panel Summary:

Very good.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All “yes”

Panel Summary:

Yes. This is the largest remaining unscreened diversion project on the SJR. HOWEVER, this is a “design” project, and there isn’t a CalFed. category for this type of project. Nevertheless, this is a high priority screening project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “yes”; one N.A.

Panel Summary:

See Panel “general comment”

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “yes”; One N.A.

Panel Summary:

Adequate for this stage of the project. This is a feasibility project, and this proposal does a good job of addressing this issue.

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:

One “yes”; one N.A.

Panel Summary:

Yes, for a feasibility project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All “Yes”

Panel Summary:

Very good. This proposal is excellent in this area.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

All “yes”.

Panel Summary:

Yes. This proposal is excellent in this area.

5) Other comments

This is a feasibility study; the costs seem high, but the level of detail, including the identification of a preferred alternative in the feasibility analysis appear to warrant these costs. Benefits analysis is weak (see above).

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

Reviewers: 2 excellent

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Your Rating: CalFed basis: VERY GOOD; Project merit: EXCELLENT