

## Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-D203-3

Short Proposal Title: Yolo Bypass, Phase II

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

The objective is stated clearly enough. However, the objective is really to try through a stakeholder process to implement a yet to be determined subset of the actions listed in the ERPP. In short, this is incremental rather than adaptive management. The proposed hypotheses are not really hypotheses to be tested, but rather are statements of assumed justifications for the proposed work. For example, at page 1 the proposal states that "the overall hypothesis is that private landowners can maintain their livelihoods and lifestyles while participating in ecological enhancements activities on their lands." Since the enhancement activities are not defined in any reasonable way, however, the hypotheses cannot be tested, and no criteria are offered to test whether the enhancements that stakeholders may agree to are worth doing.

The proposal lists seven subsidiary hypotheses, but these are no improvement on the overall hypothesis. For example, one is stated differently in two places, as:

Site-sensitive hydrologic modeling and hydraulic modeling that is additive to existing and ongoing macro-level modeling efforts by the Corps needs to be developed to assess hypothetical site-specific habitat scenarios throughout the Bypass. Such an effort would define the potential micro-level efforts of ecological enhancement activities on adjacent landowners and would be necessary to assess potential effects of such activities on the overall flood conveyance capacity of the Bypass. (p. 4)

and

Our hypothesis is that a one-dimensional flow model (HEC-RAS or UNET) calibrated to match the results of previous two-dimensional models (RMA-2 modeling by the Corps) will be a versatile and less expensive analysis tool capable of simulating a full range of flows (for example 500 cfs to 500,000 cfs) and management measures with sufficient accuracy to meet the information needs of flood management agencies. (p. 6)

The second version is potentially testable, by using both types of models and comparing the necessary effort and results, but such a comparison is not proposed. The real request here is for money to do the studies that would be needed to get the enhancement actions (whatever they turn out to be) through the permit process. This would be a necessary part of implementation, but it is not adaptive management. Another of the proposed hypotheses is that post-project monitoring is necessary to determine the value of the project.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

The conceptual model is stated on p. 3 as:

The viability of future ecological enhancement projects in the Bypass is dependent on landowner and flood management agency willingness and participation. Without such support, the likelihood of success of such projects is limited. While anecdotal and scientific data that provide a strong basis of the ecological importance of the Bypass exist, no qualitative or quantitative analyses have been conducted in the Bypass (or any other State Flood Control Project bypass) to better understand the costs and benefits associated with potential ecological enhancements, land compensation, hydrologic and hydraulic impacts and mitigation, and continued relevant government/private landowner communication. Additionally, an analysis of existing habitat in the Bypass to ascribe it a baseline value has not been done. Without such an analysis, it remains uncertain if proposed ecological enhancements in the Bypass are viable or feasible (Figure 3).

In a sense, this does explain the underlying basis for the proposed work, but it does not really seem like the kind of conceptual model that was requested. Figure 3 in the proposal does not help. It looks superficially like some kind of flow chart but does not really depict the proposed flow of events. There is nothing about "how physical and biotic system components respond to anticipated stressors or limiting factors."

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

The objective is flawed, as described above, so the approach cannot really be well designed. As a project in incremental management the design seems reasonable enough.

**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

The proposal is supposedly for research/monitoring. This is not well justified. To be rescued as a research proposal, the proposed project would need some experimental design for testing explicit hypotheses about how to engage stakeholders in the process of developing restoration actions. Since this is really a problem in social science or management, it should be grounded in, or at least show some awareness of, the relevant social science and management literature. What is offered is just a "try it and see" approach. As noted below, there is no real design for a monitoring program.

**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

The proposed project is likely to generate some useful information, especially regarding the likely costs of potential enhancement actions in the bypasses.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

No. See response to 2b.

**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

No. Essentially, the proposal is just to conduct the stakeholder process and write a report on how it worked. No methods are described for data collection or analysis, and no criteria are given by which the project would be evaluated.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes.

**Miscellaneous comments**

Since this is an on-going project, the proponents will legitimately feel that the rules have been changed on them mid-stream. Their stakeholder-centric proposal is going in the direction in which restoration efforts were recently being directed, and for such an effort, the proposal seems reasonable. There may well be policy reasons that CalFed should continue funding on-going stakeholder processes, even if the proposals fail to meet the recently changed standards.

---

**Overall Evaluation  
Summary Rating**

**poor**

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**

The proposed project is a good example of incremental management. It is not adaptive management. However, see the miscellaneous comment above.