

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

**Proposal number: 2001-L214**

**Short Proposal Title: Molulmne River Diversion  
Feasibility**

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Three “yes”; one “no”

*Panel Summary:*

Work scope is clear; hypotheses are self-evident.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Three “yes”; one “no”

*Panel Summary:*

None stated. Non-responsive. Applicant may have felt this to be self-evident. Work scope goes beyond the purpose of the request. One reviewer felt that the approach may be intended to make an argument for “other factors”.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Three “yes”; one “no”

*Panel Summary:*

Element 1 is inappropriate; parts of element 2 are inappropriate (GIS Coord; river hydrography). Alternatives are being considered, which is a strong point. Element 4 appears to be overkill. Other elements appear sound, except, perhaps, for aesthetics.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Three “yes”; one “not applicable”

***Panel Summary:***

This is a feasibility study, forced, perhaps appropriately, into “research”. See comments above regarding various elements.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Three “yes”; one abstain

***Panel Summary:***

See Panel general comments on fish screen/passage implementation projects.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Two “yes”; two “not applicable”

***Panel Summary:***

N.A.

**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”; two “not applicable”

***Panel Summary:***

Quarterly reports are specified. Data collection methods, specifics not given. Technically weak.

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

**Summary of Reviewers comments:**

Yes

**Panel Summary:**

As modified above, yes.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Two “yes”; two qualified “yes”

***Panel Summary:***

The Panel shares the concerns of one reviewer about the intent/capabilities of the proposal team. However, this set of diversions are on the CDFG Action Plan and are priority sites. Screening is recommended. With a reduced scope (see Panel recommendations concerning Elements), this project should go forward. The design team is not specified, although the subsidiary firm of the lead consultant is known to have had qualified staff. The Panel recommends obtaining assurances regarding team members.

**5)Other comments**

Refer to 4) above. There appears to be a mis-match between the work scope and what CalFed asked for. Project must be administered by AFSP Technical Team, empowered to modify proposal and/or scope of work.

Summary Rating

Excellent  
Very Good  
Good  
Fair  
Poor

Your Rating: #\_CalFed basis: POOR; Project merit: GOOD, should be implemented, especially with consolidation.