

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

Proposal number: 2001-L211

Short Proposal Title: Sutter Mutual

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two “yes”; one “no”.

Panel Summary:

Objectives/hypotheses are self-evident, or should be. This is a fish screen and the objective is to screen fish. However this was not stated. The format is not responsive to the RFP.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two “yes”; one “no”.

Panel Summary:

No conceptual model given.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two “yes”; one qualified “yes”.

Panel Summary:

Yes, but no “approach” is stated per se, the approach is in there.

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 “no”

Panel Summary:

Not specifically stated, but this is the agencies’ highest priority for the Sacramento River. All this is known to the Panel, even though not specifically stated in the proposal

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

This project should be submitted for funding in separate phases. Each stage should provide information that would feed into the next. Alternatively, reporting requirements should lead to contingent funding of the next stage.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “yes”; one qualified “yes”; one “no”.

Panel Summary:

No biological testing is discussed. Only formal criteria compliance is proposed. For a project of this size, this is a possible weakness. The panel suggests adding a biological component. Again, staging would be appropriate. A 5% performance bond is strongly recommended. If funded by other agencies (e.g. CDFG), monitoring should not be funded by CalFed.

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”; two “no”

Panel Summary:

This category is weak on detail. This is a technical weakness.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Not enough technical detail in the proposal to assess. Yes, based on prior knowledge of the Panel.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One “yes”; one “?”; one “no”

Panel Summary:

Not assessable. Desperately needed design team not here. This is a major technical weakness of this proposal. We recommend assessment of qualifications of the team **prior to funding**.

5)Other comments

Get the team on board before funding. No objectives/hypotheses stated; no conceptual model; no approach (although implicit) no bio. Modeling; no discussion of fish screen types; engineering/environmental team not on board.

Could be a good project but the proposal is not good at all. HOWEVER, screening of Sutter Mutual is NMFS highest priority for the Sacramento River.

The basis for the overall costs and cost share needs to be investigated. Reevaluate costs after feasibility analysis stage. Send back proposal for compliance with CalFed standards.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Fair
Poor

Your Rating: _CalFed basis: POOR; Project merit: EXCELLENT