

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

Proposal number: 2001-L212

**Short Proposal Title: _Calaveras River
Screens**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Good presentation.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Yes, the model is clearly laid out. The proposal is to be commended for using a watershed approach.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Omit the prioritization elements and have the AFSP Technical Team do the prioritization. Otherwise, the approach is OK.

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:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two “yes”; one “abstain”

Panel Summary:

See Panel general comment on fish screen project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

2 “yes”; one qualified “yes”

Panel Summary:

See Panel general comment on fish screen projects. Just look at the hydraulic performance. Looking at the size of the diversion as related to river Q is a good approach, but let AFSP Technical Team take care of this.

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:

Two “yes”; one qualified “yes”

Panel Summary:

Weak. See Panel general comment.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Yes, with the caveat related to referring prioritization to the AFSP Technical Team.

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

Good approach involving looking at specific channel hydraulics at each site to help design. Base evaluation on hydraulic performance. Forget the fish population evaluation, due to too many other factors (harvest, ocean conditions, etc.). Watershed approach is very good. Not clear exactly how many projects will be taken through preliminary design. If “off-the-shelf” designs are inappropriate for many of these sites, costs for preliminary design may go up very significantly. AFSP Tech Team should review each conceptual and preliminary design prior to going to final design and during the final design process.

A consolidated diversion approach may be the best approach, and this should be given priority consideration as to feasibility, but with due regard to the bypass channel characteristics.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

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