

## Individual Review Form

**Proposal Number:** 2001-H200-3

**Short Proposal Title:** Lassen National Forest Watershed Stewardship

**1a) Are the objectives and hypothesis clearly stated?** Yes. The restoration objective is clearly stated on page 9- "Our objective of aggressively treating known sediment sources and applying the best available science in these very important undammed streams on the Lassen National Forest is to validate present assumptions that improving watershed management can best contribute to CALFED's ecological restoration goals."

The educational objective is based on the belief that "... educating the public, fellow stakeholders and our youth, on the principles of responsible watershed stewardship is essential to achieving the Forest's and CALFED's long-term management objectives for the Bay-Delta systems" (see page 14).

The primary hypothesis is clearly articulated on page 10 and basically states "... that roads, poor or inconsistent watershed and streamside management practices, and lack of public knowledge regarding watershed stewardship can cause habitat degradation or destruction, and contribute to the decline of sensitive species." This hypothesis receives further elaboration on page 13.

**1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?** Yes. The proposal's work is based on three conceptual models depicting "... our understanding of ecosystem processes, restoration ecology and adaptive management." The information presented on pages 11 and 12 is very helpful in this regard, as are the citations listed. The Adaptive Management section found on pages 13 and 14 rounds out the discussion in a comprehensive fashion.

**1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?** Yes. The approach relies on past collaboration, including the production of a Road Management Guide. Based on the number of support letters and the nature of their content in Appendix D, it appears this collaboration will continue.

**1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?** Yes. This is a full-scale implementation project. It is also the next-phase of an ongoing CALFED project that was funded in 1997.

**1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?** Yes. The results of the project will be presented in a variety of formats. The process is clearly discussed in the Expected Products/Outcomes section of the proposal (see page 18) and includes utilization of "... our working group and the Conservancies to plan and present field trips to display and discuss effectiveness of treatment measures."

**2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?** Yes. In particular, the table provided on pages 16 and 17 is very helpful in this regard. It is also important to note that "This monitoring supplements and is complimentary to the long-term monitoring efforts already established in the... watersheds" (see page 15).

**2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?** Yes. The Data Handling and Storage section on page 17 is brief and to-the-point. The comments provided under **1c2** above also apply.

**3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?** Yes. As stated on page 18 of the proposal, "The selection of these Phase II projects is a result of a completed watershed assessment, a roads inventory, and site-specific engineering evaluations. The selection also represents a coordinated effort among the LNF, Watershed Conservancies, and other stakeholders to identify the highest priority restoration activities consistent with CALFED's objectives."

**4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?** Yes. The identification of personnel was very detailed. The only questions I have are centered on the Educational Outreach Director position. Who is going to hire this person and who will that person report to?

#### **Miscellaneous Comments**

I am somewhat confused by the cost-share discussion found on pages 25 and 26. It appears that the \$492,000 Forest Service contribution is an addition to the grant request of \$850,000. However, the budget shown in the proposal only shows the CALFED portion. What this leaves in my mind is a question as to the total financial scope of this project.

**Overall Evaluation Summary Rating:** Excellent

#### **Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**

This proposal was very well-written and spoke to all of the issues raised by the grant application. I strongly recommend funding.