

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-B202-1

Short Proposal Title: Arundo Survey and Eradiction

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

The objectives are clearly stated: 1) Native woody plants will recolonize the *Arundo* removal sites, and 2) planting nursery stock in removal areas will be more successful than natural regeneration. I find it odd that there are no reference cited to speak of (one workshop proceeding) and nothing to support the impacts of *Arundo*. While I am aware of its reputation, it would be advisably from a scientific standpoint to provide some support for the assertions made about its impacts on riparian systems. Again, as with other proposals, if this is supposed to come under some scientific review, then there should be at least some minimal attempt to provide scientific justification for the assertions made.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Their model is as stated: “simple.” Removal of *Arundo* will result in regeneration of native vegetation. The work does follow logically from this and is a straight forward plan to remove the invasive plant and wait for the natives to come in.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Different sections are explained with varying degrees of detail, some of which are adequate and others leave some questions. The mapping appears to be relatively well designed and the partners involved including the GIC and other collaborators seem able to map this species. Distinguishing this large and obvious species remotely is a straight forward task and the mapping and data base resources are apparently in place.

Under eradication, the authors state the three methods most likely to work, and appear flexible about their uses. This seems justified, although they should be cautious about statements found in the proposal that state “eradication is a proven science.”(p. 4 under educational opportunities). Eradication is not “proven,” rather it is unpredictable and often unsuccessful. However, there appears to be adequate follow up and subsequent monitoring, so I am confident that substantial eradication (as well as some control) will occur. Again, there needs to be some support for key assertions such as “three methods or eradication commonly used.” (p. 6). Who used it and was it successful? I am a little surprised at the lack of references since the project director is an academic.

The monitoring and assessment plan is a little light on details. There is no mention of what will be monitored other than *Arundo*? Native vegetation presumably, but which types? Will the nursery plantings also be monitored and replaced if needed? What criteria will be used to determine success? What criteria will be used to determine if “replanted” removal areas are more successful than “unvegetated” removal areas? How will they distinguish between species that can “take care of themselves” and those that need management intervention.

Lastly, while I understand the project description is very space limited, a map showing some of the spatial details of the planned project would be helpful to answer questions like how many, how big, and how far apart will the removal areas be and how and where will the revegetation be planted?

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

In general, there appears to significant justification for a full-scale implementation project. Although no reference is made to previous removal projects, I am making a number of assumptions including that prior removal has met with success, that no T/E species were affected, that water quality wasn't drastically affected, etc.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes, this will certainly provide important guidance and experience for future *Arundo* eradication and revegetation projects. This type of restoration experiment is clearly needed.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

The monitoring and assessment plans are adequately described in some areas and a little short on information in others. The key features missing are the criteria for successful restoration and how and when these goals would be met.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Data analysis, collection and management would presumably be take care of by the GIC and collaborators. Lots of description of mechanisms for reporting, outreach, and dissemination.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Although there is minimal detail on the mechanics of eradication, the methods are likely very doable and the monitoring, although also minimally explained is likely to be relatively straightforward.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

The project leader (Wright) is clearly qualified with much construction background and others (Griggs) is clearly qualified to oversee the riparian restoration with extensive background in this area. The GIC appears

to have good leadership and there are many outreach and other partners well connected with this group and with a record of previous collaboration. Many letters in the appendix attest to the collaboration and support of the project.

Miscellaneous comments

The work plan is very detailed, and provides confidence that the team understands the work involved in such a project.

The budget contains provisions for more than \$300,000 in service contracts, so I hope there is sufficient oversight for these contracts.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> XX Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	Although I thought there could be more explanation of some of the work involved, the importance of the work and the likelihood of success are high.
