

Proposal Reviews

#114: Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads

Power Hydrodynamics

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

External Scientific Review #1
#2

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 114

Applicant Organization: Power Hydrodynamics

Proposal Title: Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	The basic premise for the proposal (the inventory of the best management practices for reducing pollutant loads to the San Joaquin and Delta) is important and warrants the attention of the CALFED Restoration Program. The present proposal is weak in regards to essential detail (e.g. literature within the Delta, literature in related systems, generation of qualitative data, and the applicant's qualifications) and does not warrant funding from CALFED.
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

The central goal of this proposal is to provide urban and agricultural stakeholders within the San Joaquin River basin (and other areas of the Delta) wThe study is NOT justified relative to existing knowledge and does not contain a single reference! A conceptual model that is entrenched in existing regional and global literature and knowledge is absent.ith the best management practices for reducing non-nutrient pollutant loads (including sediment, pesticides, salts, and metals). This central goal is certainly timely and important to the CALFED Bay-Delta Restoration Program.

The study is NOT justified relative to existing knowledge and does not contain a single reference! A conceptual model that is entrenched in existing regional and global literature and knowledge is absent.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

The approach is vague and lacked references, hence it cannot be evaluated in terms to any of the questions above.

Capabilities cannot be judged from the present proposal. The proposal lacks literature citations, author publications or products, and CVs.

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

Performance measures are presented, but they are vague. A matrix will be generated in stages.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The costs are reasonable for a literature review or information inventory.

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

HIGH & MED----- ratings reflect general concept

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 114

Proposal Title: Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The regional panel favors environmental water quality projects that demonstrate practical clean water protection and that provide the information most likely to be helpful in improving water quality through reductions of pollutant discharges. These efforts tie in well to other regulatory efforts to reduce pollutants in the river.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

The PI should have lists of BMPs and some information on what works to control erosion in the specific areas of concern. Tying the info to land uses and soil types will provide a good management tool.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Protection of species of concern from toxicity. Regional Priority 5 Not threatened by environmental WQ Strategic Goal 6 Sediment and water quality

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Linked to Low DO studies and research. Linked with RWQCB TMDL work on salinity, boron, and selenium. Although they were not explicit, sediment reduction would also reduce OC Pesticides in sediment loads during some parts of the year.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Works with stakeholder groups, Local districts(water dist), and local cities.

Other Comments:

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 114

Applicant Organization: Power Hydrodynamics

Proposal Title: Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This is not high-tech, but is an important step in getting stakeholders needed information efficiently

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

No constraints - basically a literature search.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

SJ-5 and MR-5

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Significant relationship to ERP objectives - necessary to accomplish TMDL goals and meet WQ objectives.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

CALFED low DO Steering Committe endorsement, Farm Bureau support, but lots of upstream stakeholders not mentioned.

Other Comments:

None.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **114**

Applicant Organization: **Power Hydrodynamics**

Proposal Title: **Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
XExcellent	Overall rating falls between excellent and good. This is a meritorious approach, but there are concerns about whether all stakeholders will readily buy in to the process as it is currently set up. An unbiased implementation is critical, and there are some concerns as to how that will be achieved.
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

Yes, excellent on all counts. Involving all interested and affected stakeholders into the process of determining BMPs for reduction of non-nutrient pollutants is the best strategy for rationally determining what these BMPs should be, and how they should be implemented in meeting current or pending TMDLs for various pollutants

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

Excellent conceptual framework, study highly justified on the basis of need to set up a rational decisionmaking process in determining best management practices for reduction of non-nutrient pollutant loads, that also involves all affected stakeholders in the process.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

Rating--good. Tasks 1 through 5 logically organized, and if all interested and key stakeholders (including environmental conservation groups) decide to participate and put a high level of effort into this project, the resulting information will be highly useful. However, participation by all stakeholders will be key, and may be problematic. In Task 5, report should read "Disseminate Reports", not "Desalinate"

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

Rating--very good. Feasibility is highly dependent on committed involvement of major stakeholders representing a broad spectrum of interests, from agriculture to environmental groups. Final recommendations on BMPs may be highly dependent on the "power structure" that will develop within the stakeholders group, as well as that of the PI who apparently has primarily represented agricultural interests. Feasibility for this project appears to be high, because it is a direct recommendation of the stakeholders on the San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen TMDL Steering Committee.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Rating-very good. It will be difficult to assess or quantify the performance measures of this project, but the proposal is honest in stating that the ultimate performance measure will be how many of the prioritized BMPs are implemented by land users over a 5 year period.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

Rating--excellent. Products are likely of great value by providing a model for how BMPs can be located, assessed and evaluated, and recommended by a consensus stakeholders decision model, as a model for other TMDL loadings and other watersheds.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Rating--good. The capabilities of the applicants appear good, and they all have extensive local knowledge and investment in this project. One concern of this reviewer is the apparent close association of the PI with agricultural interests in the San Joaquin River Delta, and the possibility of resultant bias in the make-up of the all-important stakeholders group and advisory committee and possible bias in the recommendations on BMPs made from the literature review

to be done in this proposal. It wasn't clear whether there will be some oversight of these selection processes.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Rating--very good. The budget appears reasonable, especially if there is the stated cost savings if the associated proposal #115 on inventory and evaluation of nutrients is funded.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **114**

Applicant Organization: **Power Hydrodynamics**

Proposal Title: **Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	The basic premise for the proposal (the inventory of the best management practices for reducing pollutant loads to the San Joaquin and Delta) is important and warrants the attention of the CALFED Restoration Program. The present proposal is weak in regards to essential detail (e.g. literature within the Delta, literature in related systems, generation of qualitative data, and the applicant's qualifications) and does not warrant funding from CALFED.
-Good	
XPoor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

The central goal of this proposal is to provide urban and agricultural stakeholders within the San Joaquin River basin (and other areas of the Delta) with the best management practices for reducing non-nutrient pollutant loads (including sediment, pesticides, salts, and metals). This central goal is certainly timely and important to the CALFED Bay-Delta Restoration Program.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The study is NOT justified relative to existing knowledge and does not contain a single reference! A conceptual model that is entrenched in existing regional and global literature and knowledge is absent.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The approach is vague and unreferenced, hence it cannot be evaluated in terms to any of the questions above.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

see #3

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Performance measures are presented, but they are vague. A matrix will be generated in stages.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

see #5

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Capabilities cannot be judged from the present proposal. The proposal lacks literature citations, author publications or products, and CVs.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The costs are reasonable for a literature review or information inventory.

Miscellaneous comments:

none

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 114

Applicant Organization: Power Hydrodynamics

Proposal Title: Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 114

Applicant Organization: Power Hydrodynamics

Proposal Title: Inventorying and Evaluating Best Management Practices for the Reduction of Non-Nutrient Pollutant Loads

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

Yes -No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

information well defined in the budget summary/justification and section D cost in the proposal also gives a breakdown of the budget.