

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H200-2

Short Proposal Title: Ecosystem Restoration

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 - Objectives are described in Tasks/Sub-Tasks 1-3 on pages 4-8. Educational objectives are discussed on page 14. Hypothesis is stated on page 10. Hypotheses for Subtasks are presented on page 13.

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 – The conceptual model builds on existing “Northwest Forest Plan” models adapted for the project watersheds. The conceptual model focus is on restoring processes, combined with adaptive management. The adaptive management is the direct result of monitoring information collected both pre and post project implementation.

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]

Appears to be – Figure B, Page 12, outlines the three major model components (Ecosystem process, Stressors, and Consequences) and attempts to link these through the watershed processes.

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 – Full-scale implementation is building on previous planning efforts. Makes good sense.

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

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 – Table 4 (pages 16 and 17) details question to be evaluated, monitoring parameter (s)/data collection, and data evaluation approach.

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]

Appear to be following standard USFS sampling protocols. However, would need to see the QAQC to be certain.

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 – straight forward restoration, education, and monitoring work. Not experimental in nature.

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 – See qualifications pages 20–22.

Miscellaneous comments

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

<p>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Very Good</p>	<p>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</p> <p>They have done the necessary planning work. It makes good sense to implement the plans.</p>
---	--
