

## Geographic Review Panel Form

**Proposal number:** 2001-C204

**Short Proposal Title:** Sedimentation in the Delta and Suisun Bay

**1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** CALFED ERP - The research results can help understand efforts to rehabilitate natural processes (Goal 2) – sediment movement in the Delta and restore habitats (Goal 4), particularly tidal marshes which rely on accretion.  
CVPIA – Fish in Delta could benefit indirectly if a deeper understanding of sediment dynamics resulted from this study; however, the connection is not strong in the proposal.

Indirectly, it will apply to all ERP goals and other CALFED programs.

**2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** The Project is a continuation of a project to measure sediment transport. The data could assist in the understanding of results from other CALFED water quality projects on carbon, Selenium, and Mercury transport, but the project should be coordinated with these efforts in more direct fashion. The CALFED ERP Water Quality Program should ensure that this coordination occurs if the project is funded.

An individual reviewer noted that “this proposal could generate information of some use to Delta restoration projects that rely on the accretion of sediment, but those would require more detailed analysis of local conditions than a project at the scale of this one would provide. Likewise, investigators of contaminant transport, and others studying the fate of organic compounds important in treating drinking water might use the information.” The start-up restoration projects could benefit if they are near the sites.

**3. Feasibility, especially the project’s ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** The proposed work is likely to be technically feasible principally because tried techniques are being used to conduct the project.

**4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** All researchers are highly qualified.

**5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** Not clear in proposal beyond professional presentations.

**6. Cost.** Budget should be reviewed. Overhead does appear excessive. See TARP comments.

**7. Cost sharing.** None. Using some in-kind.

**8. Additional comments.**

---

## **Regional Ranking**

**Panel Ranking:** Medium high

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** The Panel supports this proposal since it would increase necessary and valuable baseline data on sediment transport that supports restoration projects throughout the ecosystem.