

Panel Scientific and Technical Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: 2001-C206

Short Proposal Title: Murphy Creek Watershed

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

"Since this is a feasibility study there are no real objectives to be obtained." "The primary hypotheses being tested by this Plan is whether historic salmonid spawning area can be restored through conservation easements, removal of barriers to fish and providing alternative water sources."

Panel Summary:

This is not presented as a scientific investigation so the objectives and hypothesis are not crucial. This proposal is an example of the situation where hypotheses could be stated but would be trivial to pursue. Alternatively, interesting hypotheses could have been developed to the great benefit of the proposal.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

References the "...conceptual model objectives (Figure 5)..."

Panel Summary:

The conceptual model presented is that changes can be made to the watershed to correct past degradations.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

"... they did an adequate job of explaining but some specifics are not presented." "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."

Panel Summary:

The panel concluded the objectives and approach don't conflict, but they also don't further CALFED objectives very much.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a

full-scale implementation project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

"Yes - Pilot/Demo Project" "As stated above, this concept is not new and does not need to be demonstrated again."

Panel Summary:

The panel agreed with proponents' selection.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

"Probably nothing new though there may be agreements generated from the proposal which would ultimately result in on-the-ground work."- "The Murphy Creek protection and restoration plan can help educate future CALFED projects regarding the benefits that upper elevation watersheds play to fish migration and riparian corridors. Removal of the instream reservoirs should also provide information regarding the benefits of enhanced sediment transport and budgets from upper elevation watersheds."

Panel Summary:

The panel thought this was not likely to generate new insights for decisionmaking.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

"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." "...actual monitoring will not take place in this phase of the project."

Panel Summary:

Because there is no actual commitment to implement restoration work, the lack of monitoring and information assessment plans is not a fatal defect.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments

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

outcomes will be." "Adequate, but not much detail...- The data will be handled, stored and used in ARC-View, AutoCAD, Word and Excel programs"

Panel Summary:

As a community watershed planning exercise, without any implementation, the data collection will principally be word processing, and the proponents have a plan for that.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

"Yes, but cost seems somewhat excessive."

Efforts to restore and enhance riparian habitat through both re-vegetation and the removal of grazing pressure from stream corridors have also proven to be highly successful in restoring riparian density and productivity. The nine-month timeline envisioned to develop the plan should be more than sufficient to identify the opportunities and constraints to protection and restoration, and developed design level solutions.

Panel Summary:

As a cooperative planning effort this is inherently feasible.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

"Seem to be well qualified."

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees the proponents are qualified to work out a cooperative plan.

5)Other comments

The panel thinks this proposal has not met the threshold requirements for consideration under the grant framework. As a planning process and easement evaluation (without actually obtaining easements or solving identified problems) there is not much scientific justification for funding this proposal.)

Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS

Summary Rating

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

Your Rating: FAIR