

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-C210-2

Short Proposal Title: San Joaquin River research and riparian restoration 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 objectives are not explicitly stated, but are reasonably clear. The hypotheses are clear, but aren't really testable at this phase of the study. The null hypothesis is that the implementing this restoration project will increase the probability of "success". No construction will occur at this phase of the study, so there is no opportunity for hypothesis testing.

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]

No. The project doesn't have a true conceptual model. The "Conceptual Model" section is really the "Approach".

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, at least for a planning level study.

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]

No. This is probably my biggest concern about the project. The applicants have been "given" an island and wish to do some restoration work. This is admirable. However, there is no indication the island actually needs any restoration. Based on the existing habitat types listed and the cover photograph, it appears that the island already has substantial habitat values. I do not believe that the applicant has justified why restoration is needed in this case. Why not simply leave the island alone and let natural processes guide restoration?

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]

Perhaps. This is a planning level study, so hopefully we will learn something about what types of restoration might work here.

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]

N/A. This is a planning level study, not an actual evaluation of a restoration site.

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. There are virtually no details about this issue.

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]

Perhaps. The main technical component of the study is the biological survey of existing conditions. We don't know who the consultant will be, so it is hard to judge the feasibility of completing this study component.

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]

Unclear. The success of the project depends primarily on the work of a consultant, who has not yet been selected. The applicant may be able to administer the project, but I cannot judge whether the team is qualified without prior information about the consultant's background.

Miscellaneous comments

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

This is an inexpensive proposal, which might make it an attractive investment. However, the proposal is hindered by a "Catch-22" situation. Everything depends on the selection of a good consultant. We don't know who the consultant will be, so we can't adequately evaluate the proposal. On the other hand, I understand that it may be inappropriate for a government group (such as the applicant) to identify a consultant to perform the work if they don't actually have the money. Such projects are frequently put out to bid.

<p>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good<input type="checkbox"/> Good<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<p>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</p> <p>[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]</p>
--	---
