

Geographic Panel Review 2 - Sacramento River/Butte Basin

Proposal number: 2001-K205

Short Proposal Title: Influence of Discharge on the Hyporheic Zone

- 1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities in your region.** Concur with staff assessment that it weakly addresses CALFED goals and CVPIA priorities. This project does not seem to have clear goals. The relationship between information generated and management protocol is unclear. On the one hand, they expect it to be useful for managing reservoir releases on the Sacramento River and on the other hand to support land use management in the Deer Creek watershed. There also is some doubt that it will yield significant new data.
- 2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** Weak linkages in that the proposal addresses sediments in Deer Creek and the Sacramento River. However, immediate applicability of results in management of these areas is unclear. A significant portion of the work is to be done in Denver and Washington State.
- 3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** There seems to be some doubt that they will be able to obtain spring-run eggs. There is even more doubt that they would get permits to implant Feather River or Coleman Hatchery eggs in Deer Creek as seems implied in their protocol. Panel concurs with Staff Review that the project as designed appears incapable of providing the information being sought.
- 4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Unknown.
- 5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** The Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy will be involved. The Deer Creek part of the study seems peripheral to the main purpose of the study. Sacramento River groups should be involved.
- 6. Cost.** Cost not justified by potential benefits.
- 7. Cost sharing.** Cost sharing is involved. (24 % of the total)
- 8. Additional comments.** Not recommended.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Low

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: Poor proposal with low regional relevance.