

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-G207-3

Short Proposal Title: Sustaining agriculture and wildlife beyond the corridor

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, although the objective and hypothesis seem to be the same idea, that being to develop protocols to assess watershed function and prioritize work on a farm demonstration project, as well as create a web-based landowner conservation decision assistance tool to increase education to landowners about conservation techniques.

Both the hypotheses and objectives were fairly 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]

The conceptual model was vague. The need to include more detail-for instance, on concept #1, the use of examples of overlapping resource problems could have enhanced the concept conveyed. Incorporation of examples would have made the idea more clear.

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-The group recognizes the data that is needed and they cover their objectives. The adaptive management model is extensive and covers what may have been unclear within the text. One small gripe is about table #1- the numbering system used was very confusing but their use of tables in general really helped to convey their message.

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- good job on this aspect. There was a mention of key agencies (page 7) having done supporting work... this would have been a great place to mention (and cite) the supporting work and the key agencies involved.

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]

Yes- that seems to be the main goal of the project- to educate the landowners in order to give them tools to make good decisions as to how to conserve land.

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]

Yes-This group will definitely have their work cut out for them! The monitoring effort is sufficient although I'm curious about the number of samplings/analysis in task 3 that will be done per season. There needs to be enough to give statistical data.

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 section lacks a time line for each given season (mentioned previously). The data management seems standard. The monthly progress reports from the staff is a great idea considering all of the tasks that they will be taking on! It will help to reach all of their goals efficiently.

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-It sounds like there is a good working relationship with the landowners currently. They say that they have backing of major agencies/scientists, so the project should 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]

Yes-They have all of their bases covered- a number of trained and educated individuals all working toward one goal.

Miscellaneous comments

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

A very confusing proposal in the way that it was put together. I felt like I had to hunt for some of the information and that the proposal did not flow. For future reference, it makes it difficult to read a proposal that is double sided (although it saves paper- it's a toss up).

<p>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent isn't the <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	<p>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</p> <p>Rating- good They need to have more specifics on their methods of data collection- although it primary focus of the project, it needs to be included to be scientifically valid.</p>
--	---
