

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

Proposal number: 2001-L210

**Short Proposal Title: _Red Bluff Diversion
Dam**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes; qualified yes

Panel Summary:

Yes. All clear.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes; qualified yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes. Clearly explained with text and graphics.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Very strong.

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:

This is a final design 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:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes. To construct or not to construct. Will also generate much ecosystem restoration info. This project will fill out some important and key data gaps for the Sacramento River fish migrations.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “yes”; one “no”

Panel Summary:

Monitoring/info assessment good for ecosystem restoration purposes. The outcome of this project will be final design for implementation. Needs endorsement letters from agencies to be involved in the actual work.

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 emphatic “no”

Panel Summary:

Not addressed specifically; probably will be adequate based on past performance.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “no”; one “yes”

Panel Summary:

No detailed technical information in this proposal. From past experience, probably.

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

Proposal needs more technical detail for feasibility review. Costs for Task 1 seem excessive for documentation of work already partially funded. This project needs an audit for line item justification of costs, especially Tasks 1 and 4.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

Reviewers: very good; good

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Fair
Poor

Your Rating: #_CalFed basis: GOOD (lacking some technical info.); Project merit: VERY GOOD, based on Panel prior knowledge