

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-C203-1

Short Proposal Title: Restoration of floodplain terraces

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]

Yes. Both were concise and clear, unlike most other proposals I reviewed.

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]

Yes. The narrative and figures present a readily understandable conceptual model.

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]

A proposed approach had few details, so it was hard for me to determine whether it is likely to meet project objectives.

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]

Yes. The applicant has indicated that there are specific opportunities at the proposed sites for restoration that may be lost without corrective action. The proposed project hopes to fill this gap.

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]

Yes. Ecologically sound bank restoration is one of the most important priorities for Delta channels. This appears to be a good opportunity to test various techniques in high energy channels.

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]

Reasonably so. But I was somewhat disappointed that the proponents will not examine benefits to fish and primary production. The applicant is correct that this is difficult to achieve, particularly for fish. However, This project is important and deserves a reasonably comprehensive study to be effective for adaptive management. I disagree with the author's assessment that documentation of fisheries benefits is virtually impossible. At the very least, basic comparative information could be collected on fish density, size, species composition and perhaps feeding success in restored versus reference sites. If possible, I recommend that the applicants contact IEP or local universities (Sac. State, UCD) to see if there are aquatic biologists interested in this issue.

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]

Data collection procedures appear satisfactory. The applicant's goal of broad dissemination of project results is also commendable. However, data management and analysis was rather vague. It is unclear whether there will be any QA/QC for the project.

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]

Sediment dynamics and the effectiveness of biotechnical methods are beyond my area of expertise. However, the author's detailed review of the literature suggests that the methods are likely to be feasible. One possible shortcoming of the approach is that it may not work or be easy to evaluate if the three monitoring years each have extreme hydrology. It may be difficult to evaluate project success if we have 3 consecutive years of drought. Obviously, this is beyond the control of the applicant.

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]

Yes, but the team would be more complete with an aquatic biologist. I do not consider this a fatal flaw, however.

Miscellaneous comments

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

The proposed project is only marginally within my area of expertise. I recommend significant additional review by individuals more familiar with biotechnical methods and bank restoration.

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

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