

## Draft Individual Review Form

**Proposal number:** 2001-C212-1

**Short Proposal Title:** Flow & Sediment Transport

**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. The proposed study will attempt to provide a quantifiable means of assessing river channel restoration.

**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 types and extent of data upon which to base the model are fully explained.

**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. Documentation of the approach selected, as well as alternate approaches that were rejected, is thoroughly discussed.

**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]

This is a research proposal that will support actual restoration activities.

**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]

The proposal is to develop a predictive model, so to that extent it is useful for future decision making.

**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]

The component of the research proposal that deals with collection of actual field data does not describe the statistical basis for sample design or frequency, although the collection methods are standard.

**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]

Yes. Sound and thorough data management techniques are described and will result in data being accessible to all users.

**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 proposal uses well documented and tested protocols. In the text of the proposal floodplain modeling is characterized as being done “if time and resources permit,” therefore it is unclear as to whether covering this aspect of the work will be produced. The order of project work products (Table 1 of the proposal) appears to treat floodplain modeling as an afterthought to the main work.

**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 principal investigator (Michael Singer) is the only person identified. His qualifications appear excellent for the work to be undertaken.

**Miscellaneous comments**

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

---

<p><b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	<p><b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b></p> <p>[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]</p>
---	---

---