Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number:_2001-C213-1 Short Proposal Title: Understanding natural processes through active riparian restoration.

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 objectives and hypotheses are well stated and largely defensible.

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 applicants have taken the time to write a detailed outline of the factors they believe will determine the success of the project. As a consequence, it is easy to understand the basis for the proposed project and why different monitoring elements will be included.

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]

I am not qualified to judge whether the approach is feasible for an enginnering or economic standpoint. But the approach is biologically defensible.

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 following factors provide strong support for the restoration site: 1) natural processes do not appear to be working at the site; 2) the site is already owned by FWS; 3) restoration of this site will provide for a much more contiguous corridor and 4) the site is already flood prone, and therefore of little use for land use such as agriculture.

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. This a unique situation where natural processes are insufficient and "intervention" is needed to initiate restoration. Managers should benefit from data collected from this type of system.

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]

As noted above, I was disappointed that I was unable to determine what the experimental design for this study will be. However, the list of factors to be monitored appear satisfactory.

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]

See previous comments.

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]

One possible obstacle is the evaluation of flood impacts. It is unclear whether the applicants are aware that the Reclamation Board will be an important review agency for the project. Although I was heartened by their consultant's belief that this project will be "flood neutral", the study remains dependent on a quantitative analysis. What are the contingency plans if the hydraulics study shows at least modest negative impacts?

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, at most levels. However, it was unclear whether the team had the scientific qualifications to develop and evaluate such and experiment. Input from Chico State University (project cooperator Dr. Griggs) could be critical for this issue.

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

I was stunned that the applicants have essentially guaranteed a 70 percent vegetation success rate from the project. It was unclear why the applicants had such a high degree of confidence, but I would be very impressed if the project could deliver this success rate.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
☐ Excellent ■ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor	[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]