

## Draft Individual Review Form

**Proposal number: 2001-H201-2      Short Proposal Title: Upper Trinity WS Stewardship Project**

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

Objectives somewhat confusing-reduce sediment in reservoirs, identify sediment sources and fuels reduction/thinning none of which are clearly tied to ecosystem restoration in this proposal.

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

Model use/explanation very shallow, not clearly defined.

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

Not enough info and too diverse, not clearly tied together.

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

No real justification-except for the need to reduce sediment for water supply improvement and need to form ES Stewardship group.

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

Hard to determine as no detail on actions planned.

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

Too sparse-not enough detail to be determined if monitoring will be effective.

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

No information-to be developed later?

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

Not enough info provided to assess technical feasibility.

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

Staff from the TCRCDD seems to be well known in the area of and has been involved in grant funding activities. This group can probably do the local stewardship part of the proposal.

**Miscellaneous comments**

Summary—Proposal may result in sediment reduction, thus resulting in water supply benefits to water users using Sacramento water supplies (CVP). However, it does not appear that any ecosystem benefits to the Sacramento system would result and maybe only marginal benefits to salmonids on the north coast system (Trinity River.) I recommend funding only the \$18,800 for Watershed Coordination. Not enough info is provided to determine if the rest is worthwhile and/or feasible. I also believe USFS should pay for their own fuels reduction/thinning work-not CALFED funds.

---

| <b>Overall Evaluation<br/>Summary Rating</b>   | <b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b> |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent<br><input type="checkbox"/> Very Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Fair<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor | See above in Misc. comments                               |

---