

## Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-D202-4

Short Proposal Title: Non-Structural Alternative at the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge: Refinement for Habitat Enhancement

**Explain connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution:**

None

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

The proposal clearly states its objective is to assess predicted ecosystem benefits such as benefits to anadromous fish through the use of a one-dimensional model. Information gained from this effort would help predict expected ecological benefits and refine the proposed non-structural flood management alternative to improve the likelihood of successfully attaining those benefits.

The hypothesis stated on page 3 of the proposal is also clear. The modeling effort outlined in this proposal is expected to help refine the project design and permit the testing of the accuracy of the modeled conditions and compare predicted uses by aquatic resources with those that actually occur following implementation.

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

This proposal includes a clearly articulated conceptual model for this proposal and the overall project. It explains the underlying scientific basis for the proposed work by describing the inundation benefits of floodplains to anadromous fish. References are used to cite support for seasonal floodplain inundation and its role in sustaining the ecological integrity of the river ecosystem. The conceptual model is consistent with the ERPP and general ecological and ecosystem restoration principles. The proposal's model does not fully articulate the relevant unknowns. Nevertheless, the recognition and integration of adaptive management into the proposal should address any uncertainties that may be identified.

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

The approach described is well designed for this stage of the proposal. Given the experience of the consultant proposed for the modeling effort the proposal has a high probability of success in meeting its objectives.

**1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?**

The proposal is described as a demonstration channel-floodplain reconstruction project. In my view, the applicant has and is justified in how the project is characterized. Given the uncertainty described relative to documenting fisheries benefits it is appropriate to

characterize this phase as a key element of a demonstration project. Nevertheless, when implementation occurs the restoration of up to 3,100 acres of floodplain is large enough to be considered full-scale implementation. This ecosystem restoration project will inform future restoration and management actions. The proposal provides little reference to related demonstration projects.

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

There is a high probability that the proposal will inform future decisions. Experience gained from conducting the modeling will help demonstrate how similar modeling in other locations in the Delta can guide future restoration design and decisions for other restoration efforts in the Delta.

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

The proposal does describe a monitoring component and how the monitoring results will be used to assess the outcome of the project. Development of the details and design of that monitoring plan are part of the proposal.

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

The data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans are generally described. The data collection and assessment strategies are scientifically sound and likely to be adequate to meet the proposed objectives when more specificity is provided in during this phase.

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

The proposal outlines an approach that is both feasible and appropriate. Furthermore, based on the scope of the effort outlined, the probability is very high that this phase can be completed in the time allotted. Allowance should be made to address likely delays in implementing the floodplain restoration.

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

The project team has the training and experience to conduct the proposed work. Specifically, Phil Williams and Associates, Ltd. has the ability to efficiently and effectively implement the proposal. This firm has demonstrated that ability through the successful implementation and management of other ecosystem restoration efforts in California.

## Miscellaneous comments

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	The proposal overall is very well done. There are few if any deficiencies. The proposal is one that can provide critical information to inform other floodplain restoration efforts in the Delta and in areas upstream from the Delta.