

**Draft Individual Review Form**  
**(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)**

**Proposal number:** 2001-G203-3

**Short Proposal Title:** Battle Creek Riparian  
Protection

**Explain connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write “none” if no connection):** [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

None

**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 of limiting fragmentation, instream physical disturbance, and preserving high quality riparian habitat are all clearly stated.

The hypothesis that purchasing this land will help to achieve these objectives is also clear.

**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-This is a well-written model, as well as a great diagram. I was able to fully visualize what the author was trying to convey. The model allows for adjustment, which is great!

**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 and No-The sites have been chosen well to obtain the goals. It seems as though some of the sellers may be an issue when trying to obtain the land. The approach should have included collection of fish data and analysis- these are the things that will tell if a project has been worthwhile.

**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- they have documentation supporting the hypotheses that they are presenting and it seems necessary to protect a large area in order to meet their objectives.

**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]

Definitely! If this area truly is one of the only spawning areas for winter run salmon, then it is necessary to protect this habitat. The conceptual model they are presenting leaves a lot of room for adaptive management.

**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]

No-The discussion on monitoring seems weak- the agencies doing the data collection should have been discussed, at least minimally. Data handling was covered, however the actual data to be collected wasn't discussed in much detail. If other agencies are doing data collection (as was alluded to), a TNC person or specialist needs to be actively involved, not just reviewing the data that they generate.

**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]

Again, this proposal is weak in the area of data collection. Even a discussion of what data should/will be collected would have been helpful. Analysis was not mentioned, although some will be necessary through the years to see if the project has been worthwhile on the account of the salmon.

**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-Some of the landowners may be a hold up but otherwise the project will definitely be feasible.

**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]

Specifics of the team were not mentioned, however, the track record of TNC speaks for itself.

**Miscellaneous comments**

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

- Very important work considering the winter run salmon
- The clear and concise manner in which the proposal was written was great

---

**Overall Evaluation  
Summary Rating**

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

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

**Rating-** Good

Data collection and monitoring should be top priority for this habitat. It is very important that the habitat be maintained for the winter run salmon in particular. I understand the land has to be set aside to do this but the plan needs to have some sort of scientific backing- this has to be done through data collection and analysis.

---