

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-C202-1

Short Proposal Title : Geomorphic Stream
Demonstration Project

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The proposal was not well presented. There were conflicting statements between what is being presented as a demonstration as known and proven technology and then as an unknown and testing a hypothesis.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

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 [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The proposal states it is a demonstration and research project however there are many examples throughout the western United States where stream restoration has been implemented. The methodology does not have to be researched and demonstrated again.

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 [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Probably not. As stated above, the technology for restoration is known and does not need to be researched further. If this project is funded it should be on the merits of the proposal for doing appropriate habitat restoration.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No. The proposed monitoring is vague and too general. If this is indeed a demonstration project the monitoring should be a significant part of the work. Clear baseline information and metrics to measure success would be necessary for evaluating a demonstration project.

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 [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No. The monitoring is generally described but not in any detail.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. This is a fairly straight forward project which could easily be implemented.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The project team does not have extensive experience in restoration but they should be able to implement the proposal.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The overall impression is that the proposal is somewhat confused between a demonstration and a restoration project.

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- X Fair
- Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]
