

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-G207-1

Short Proposal Title: Sustaining Agriculture & Wildlife

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes, the five project objectives are: develop compressed protocols to assess watershed function, conduct on-farm research and demonstrations, quantify the effects of conservation practices, construct a web-based tool to assist landowners with conservation decisions, and increase direct participation of landowners.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes, the underlying scientific basis is clearly presented in the conceptual model, project design, practices, analysis, and interpretation. The applicant's model of engaging landowners is comprehensive and well developed. The term "wildlife-friendly" is thoroughly explained and specific practices and tasks are listed.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes and No. This is an innovative and practical approach that has adopted successful components of other projects. For example, the Yolo OnePlan is modeled after the Idaho OnePlan. Unfortunately, **Table 4** that details the cost of the project is not included in my copy of the proposal. Without a budget it is impossible to evaluate if the approach is appropriate for meeting project objectives.

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

Yes. This is a model demonstration project. On-farm research and demonstrations projects, strong grower outreach, field days and workshops, all focus on the relationship between watershed health and farm profits.

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

Yes. This project has the potential to influence future land management decisions of private farmers by producing scientific, economic, and management data germane to their daily operations.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. The proposal articulates a very comprehensive and detailed monitoring protocol that is designed to assess the outcomes of the project.

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

Yes. The applicant has assembled a very impressive team of specialists to collect, manage, analyze, and report data. The data will be scientifically sound and relevant to the project's objectives.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. All of the proposed actions, compressed watershed assessment protocols, on-farm demonstrations of cover crops and tail water ponds, a web-based conservation decision assistance tool, and landowner education programs, have been successfully implemented elsewhere.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. The project team is exceptionally well qualified. The applicant has done a remarkable job of assembling experts for each component of the project, from USDA, Oregon State University, UC Davis, UC Cooperative Extension, Audubon, and Yolo County RCD.

Miscellaneous comments

The proposal compilation and binding make it difficult to read. My copy is missing Table 4 (budget) and the backside of page 5 is a copy of the PSP Cover Sheet.

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

Excellent

- Very Good
 Good
 Fair
 Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

This is simply an outstanding proposal. The underlying objective of empowering landowners to directly participate in conservation is timely and compelling. The project is well developed, on target, and realistic. A highly qualified team of specialists, skilled in both science and farmer outreach, is on board and ready to begin work. Unfortunately, my copy is missing the budget so it is impossible to know how the applicant is proposing to allocate expenses. Given the strong financial match and the detailed task breakdown I can't see a component of the proposal that is not worth funding. The broad support, as evidenced by the excellent letters attached to this proposal, further suggest that CALFED should fully fund this proposal.
