

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-G200-3

Short Proposal Title: Canal Ranch Habitat 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]

The hypothesis that acquiring and restoring this land (canal ranch) will aid in recovery of the listed species is clear. The objectives are clear as well.

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]

A very short model that leaves out causes of problems and interactions- it only tells what will happen with the acquisition/restoration. I don't feel that it explains the whole picture.

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]

Approach for this phase and others to follow will include maintenance of agriculture (did not mention what type of agriculture) while restoring permanent seasonal wetlands, etc... This is dependant upon the first two phases currently in progress as well as the acquisition of the land. If the acquisition goes through, then the approach for the next phases of restoration should work.

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]

Although not addressed by the proposal directly, this project should be considered a demonstration project.

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]

There is very little mentioned about the adaptive management strategy or the role that it will play for future phases. Once the monitoring begins in phase 4, usable information will be generated but as this proposal stands, phase 3 only, I do not see how information will be generated.

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]

Not for this proposal of phase 3, which deals with acquisition of the land. The monitoring will not begin until phase 4 and this proposal deals with phase 3 only. Once the monitoring starts, they will be looking at more than enough factors to reach their objectives of their "master plan."

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]

The data collection is extensive in phase 4, but this proposal is not addressing phase 4. The management of the data for phase 4 is standard and acceptable. Reports will be submitted which will include specifics of the project (peat regeneration, sediment accretion levels, etc...). Data analysis was not mentioned but needs to be addressed because they will have a lot of it once this area of the project starts!!!

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]

As stated, implementation of the restoration is dependant upon the acquisition. Owners seem agreeable, which will make the process faster.

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]

DFG definitely has the people and resources necessary for a project like this. Involvement of other groups mentioned (Ducks Unlimited, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, etc...) will be helpful with the data aspect.

Miscellaneous comments

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

-I would be curious to find out what type of native riparian plants will be planted. Need to keep in mind that riparian plants get large and agriculture land needs light...especially rice.

-There were no references within this proposal indicating that the project is based on someone's opinion rather than science.

-Didn't mention the role of the levees, ditches, ponds, etc... in the species preservation

-If the plant community composition were already planned out, it would have been nice to include

Overall Evaluation

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- is difficult
-
- Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

Rating- Good

I feel like some of the things left out of the proposal were probably an oversight. It is difficult to make a full plan with out knowing if you have the land to use.