

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-G204-2

Short Proposal Title: Conservation easements

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Yes, hypotheses and objectives (goals) are clearly stated. Data needed to test the hypotheses, which will aid in achieving the proposed objectives, are identified.

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

The conceptual model explains the underlying basis of the proposed work, however the one reference used in explaining the model needs to be clarified as there are six references on the lit cited page that could relate to it.

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

Based on the details given, the approach seems adequate to meet the objectives. This is particularly so because they have incorporated adaptive management into the plan, which is the main way they will meet the objectives.

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

Yes, based on the criteria given in the 2001 PSP. Within the proposal, the applicant has provided sufficient information on past projects to justify the classification of this proposal as “full-scale implementation.”

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

Yes. From the easement acquisition process to data collected through monitoring, some of the information can be used in future decision-making activities. However, the monitoring needs to be outlined in more detail.

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

For monitoring plans, no. Those plans need to be more detailed. The assessment strategy seems sufficient, through adaptive management, to aid in assessing the outcome of the project. The level of assessment depends on the data acquired through monitoring.

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

Data collection techniques are lacking in this proposal. Management of data involves its compilation on CD ROM, which makes it easily accessible. Data analysis appears to be done in terms of adaptive management, but the precise details of how it will be analyzed are lacking. Reporting plans are on a by-request basis and are sufficient for this project.

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

Yes. Based on the objectives, the proposed work is technically feasible. The project could be reasonably completed in the time allotted in the proposal.

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

Yes. The project team appears to have sufficient qualifications to implement the proposed work based on past experience with this sort of activity, as provided in the proposal.

Miscellaneous comments

<p>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	<p>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</p> <p>The applicant has provided sufficient justification to warrant acquisition of the proposed easements. However, more detail on monitoring needs to be provided as it is necessary to completely understand how the applicant meets its objectives. Overall, a good proposal based on the need to preserve wetlands.</p>
--	--