

Individual Review Form

Proposal Number: 2001-H202-2

Short Proposal Title: Tuolumne River Watershed Outreach and Stewardship

1a) Are the objectives and hypothesis clearly stated? Yes. The objectives are clearly stated on page 3 and the hypotheses are clearly stated on page 4.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Yes. As stated on page 3, "This project builds on the concept that outreach and community participation are necessary for successful implementation of any project and that they foster local watershed stewardship." Further clarification is provided on page 2 (Problem statement) where it is stated that "This proposal... addresses the problem of a lack of further outreach over the past year to the general public to maintain awareness of the progress of the (Tuolumne River Restoration) Plan."

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? The approach is well designed and can be found on pages 5 and 6. It is divided into five distinct tasks. However, the appropriateness of the approach being taken is bothersome. The applicant makes it clear that the method of evaluating this approach will be qualitative in nature (page 5). Subsequently, on page 7, the statement is made that "a more rigorous **quantitative** analysis of differences in attitudes and knowledge through pre-and post-program surveys involving randomized control and treatment groups is possible, but prohibitively time-consuming and expensive" (my emphasis). The applicant then goes on to say "If CALFED is interested in obtaining data on the efficacy of such outreach, we would welcome the opportunity to apply a rigorous experimental design to this outreach and stewardship program. We assume, however, that such an effort is not cost-effective for CALFED at this point in time." If it is not "cost-effective" now, when would it be? In short, I don't believe this assumption should remain unquestioned.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project? Yes. This is clearly a watershed planning project.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making? Yes. The list of expected products/outcomes makes the likelihood of this very clear (see page 7). In addition, it is stated on page 6 that "The Trust will bring information learned during the outreach to the TAC to inform current and future implementation of the... Plan and to bring the next phase of stewardship projects forward."

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project? Doubtful. The applicant is very honest about this. As stated on page 6, "The experimental design used to assess the outcome of this project is very weak. This is a 'one shot case study' that evaluates only the post-outreach group in a qualitative manner, with no pre-test and no control group." See also **1b2** above.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives? Appear to be, though not a lot of detail given (see page 7). The only reporting is to the TAC, with no timeline or other interested parties identified.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible? Yes. I agree with the applicant that this is a very feasible project for the reasons given (see page 8).

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Hard to say. Jenna's qualifications are excellent. No information is given on the consultants. The Central Valley Program Director position is vacant.

Miscellaneous Comments

In the Cost section, the salary of the Executive Director in Task 1 is shown as \$43,333/yr., while the same salary is shown as \$50,000/yr. in Task 4. Why the difference?

The cost-share is very appropriate, especially in terms of the sequence of tasks to be done.

Though I am not familiar with the literature cited, I appreciated the number and content of the references

I don't understand why there is a need for a consultant to reprint the summary brochure.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating: Very Good.

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

I thought this was a very good proposal. However, it didn't go far enough. I would recommend that CALFED seriously consider increasing the allocation to this program to allow for a more rigorous quantitative analysis