

**Panel Scientific and Technical Review Form**  
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public).

**Proposal number: 2001-H200**

**Short Proposal Title: Lassen NF-Butte, Deer, Mill  
Cks.**

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, the objectives are clear. The objectives are sediment reduction for aquatic species protection, public out reach and education, watershed stewardship. Yes the hypothesis is clearly stated. Roads, pore or inconsistent watershed and streamside management practices, a lack of a public knowledge regarding stream stewardship can cause habitat degradation or destruction and contribute to the decline of sensitive species.

***Panel Summary:***

We agree with the reviewers. The objectives and hypotheses are clearly stated.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, there are three conceptual models that explain the underlying basis: 1. Ecosystem process, 2. Restoration ecology, 3. Adaptive management.

***Panel Summary:***

Yes, but we feel that another model would be useful that places the project in the context of the whole watershed, county, or conservancy management plans or needs.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, the approach relies of past collaboration and a pre-developed road management guide. Letter of support show collaboration will continue

***Panel Summary:***

Yes, the approach is well defined but the document lacks detail of the scientific methods that will be followed and the restoration actions that will be implemented. The proposal refers to other documents but these are not in the appendices. In short, the document does not describe specific actions at specific sites.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes, this project is the continuing phase of a CALFED 1997 funded project. Use of literature and past projects justify the project. It is a full-scale implementation project building of planning efforts

*Panel Summary:*

Yes, we agree with the reviewers.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes, the results of extensive monitoring could be used in other similar watersheds

*Panel Summary:*

Yes, we agree with the pair reviewers

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Yes, there is a data evaluation approach in place using established methodology.

*Panel Summary:*

Yes, they have a post implementation monitoring program that will determine if the restoration actions, education etc have been appropriate. There is unlikely to be success or failure reporting as part of this project.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

The project participants appear to be following standard USFS sampling protocols however we would like to see QAQC

*Panel Summary:*

Yes, we agree with the reviewers.

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

#### ***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, the project is technically feasible. It uses standard techniques after a watershed assessment, roads inventory, and site-specific evaluations. Not experimental in nature.

#### ***Panel Summary:***

Yes we agree with the reviewers but there is no detail of the methods within the proposal. The proposal refers to other projects and documents for the details of the methods. We assume that the methods are of high quality but are not entirely familiar with them.

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

#### ***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, having worked on previous CALFED grants together, the team will benefit from continuity. There is a question of who will be employed as the outreach director and who will that person report to?

#### ***Panel Summary:***

Yes, we assume that the applicant has excellent technical ability. The team has worked together in the past but there are some unknown people that are not identified and have similar concerns regarding the outreach director because of the importance of that position to the success of the project.

### **5)Other comments**

#### ***Reviewers:***

One reviewer suggests that they have done the necessary planning work and now it makes good sense to implement the plans. Another reviewer remained confused on the cost share. This reviewer felt that road decommissioning was the most worthwhile and cautioned on the use of campground hosts for doing law enforcement. The third reviewer was also confused on the cost share but felt that the proposal was well written and worth funding. The reviewers rating were good to excellent.

## **Overall Evaluation PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

The budget lacks a breakdown on where exactly the money will be spent. We suggest a task-oriented budget including match expenditures. It is not clear from the proposal whether there is a problem and if there has been a cause and effect relationship proven for this watershed. We feel that the success of the project will be difficult to measure for that reason. The project needs to be

put in a bigger context. We recommend continued expansion on non-forest service lands. Assuming that there is a cause-effect relationship between erosion and fish habitat we support the continuation of the project. However we emphasize again that there is no cause-effect demonstrated in the proposal. The strength of the project is the site-specific analysis of sediment sources and techniques to reduce erosion. The weakness is that there is no documented evidence in the proposal that shows that sediment has had a significant effect of the habitat and/or fish population.

#### Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD