

Panel Scientific and Technical Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: 2001-G203 Short Proposal Title: Battle Creek Riparian Protection

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Somewhat. The objectives and hypotheses that are provided are clearly stated, however specific easement restrictions and wildlife compatible agriculture are not defined.

Panel Summary:

Agrees with reviewers comments

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, but the proposal would be improved if details on the effects of listed species were included.

Panel Summary:

Yes for the purpose of acquisition, but there is no explanation of how the easement will meet the objectives.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the approach of buying easements is well planned and appropriate for this watershed.

Panel Summary:

Same as reviewers' comments

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, these proposed acquisitions will build on previous successful projects in this area.

Panel Summary:

Same as reviewers' comments

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

There was general agreement that the conceptual model leaves a lot of room for adaptive management. However, one reviewer felt that since existing easements are already in place in the watershed, these easements will not provide any additional information.

Panel Summary:

This panel felt that this project is not designed for making future decisions.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

No, the proposal lacks details for methodology, and also is not very in depth.

Panel Summary:

Same as reviewers' comments

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Not explained in enough detail. There needs to be baseline data collected as well as more in depth data collection.

Panel Summary:

The panel did not think that an acquisition proposal requires a lot of data collection, however baseline data is important.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Specifics of the team were not provided, including detailed biographical information, however the track record of TNC speaks for itself.

Panel Summary:

Same as reviewers' comments

5)Other comments

Very important work considering the winter run salmon.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Very good because of endangered species, however once the easement restrictions are put in place, detailed land-use monitoring plans need to be developed that address compatible agricultural uses.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD