

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

**Proposal number: 2001-L208**

**Short Proposal Title: \_Mokelumne River  
Restoration**

**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:*

Two “yes”; one qualified “yes”

*Panel Summary:*

Project needs a ladder. Must be integrated. If the whole project is not integrated, it could become severely compromised. This is a “must”.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes

*Panel Summary:*

Channel morphology is an important issue. As pointed out by one reviewer, and according to Panel prior knowledge, the bypass/spillway relationship could create a serious problem (temperature and predation) if not taken care of properly.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Two “yes”; one qualified “yes”

*Panel Summary:*

Yes. Should be self-evident. See Panel general comment.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes

*Panel Summary:*

Yes. See Panel general comment.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Two “yes”; one qualified “yes”

*Panel Summary:*

Page 6, third paragraph, the proposer proposes to assess the need by doing entrainment studies. Some of this has been done. This work is superfluous to the need to screen these diversions. The “Riparian Fish Screen Prioritization Study” should be omitted and prioritization should be done by the AFSP Technical Team.

**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:*

The relationship between the proposer and what other people in the watershed are doing is not clear. This element appears to be non-responsive.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes

*Panel Summary:*

Omitting the Prioritization study, yes. See comments above about *integrating* adult passage...**very important.**

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes

*Panel Summary:*

Prior Panel knowledge indicates that the experience of the engineering consultant may not match the needs for this project, especially considering the site-specific characteristics at this location and local hydrology.

**5)Other comments**

None

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Would be very good or excellent with the following changes:

1. Integrated ladder/screen design (prior Panel knowledge)
2. Address potential problems with pool at toe of dam
3. Refer prioritization to AFSP Technical Team
4. Scrutinize project administration costs.
5. Require close coordination with AFSP Technical Team

Summary Rating

Excellent  
Very Good  
Good  
Fair  
Poor

Your Rating: \_CalFed basis: FAIR; needs a ladder to be integrated and prioritization study needs to be omitted; Project merit: GOOD, except for scope as noted in specific Panel comments