

## Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-C206-1

Short Proposal Title: Murphy Creek Protection and Restoration Feasibility Plan

**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]

Since this is a feasibility study there are no real objectives to be obtained. The restoration of watersheds is a concept which is well documented and does not need to be revisited.

**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.

**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]

Yes. The approach is well thought out but is not new. The concept of local involvement and control over restoration is being implemented in many areas of the state.

**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]

Not very well. As stated above, this concept is not new and does not need to be 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 nothing new though there may be agreements generated from the proposal which would ultimately result in on the ground work.

**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]

Not really. It is not clear if the plan is going to result in ready to fund proposals or if it will only be a document with agreements to proceed with some vague restoration principles.

**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]

Too vague. Should have more specificity in exactly what is being proposed and what the expected outcomes will be.

**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. The approach is straight forward and should be easily 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]

Seem to be well qualified.

**Miscellaneous comments**

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

This proposal is rather simple in concept but lacks detail. One major shortcoming is the title speaks of a watershed plan but the work is limited to the stream corridor. In order to be effective the upslope areas need to be addressed. This reviewer is not familiar with the watershed so upslope areas may not be important but, if this is the case, it should be spelled out somewhere that it was at least considered.

---

**Overall Evaluation  
Summary Rating**

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

**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**

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

---