

## Draft Individual Review Form

**Proposal number:** 2001-H202-3

**Short Proposal Title:** Toulumne River Outreach

**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, the objectives are clearly identified and stated in a logical order. The applicant, The Toulumne River Preservation Trust (Trust) proposes an outreach and stewardship project to help implement the Tuolumne River Restoration Plan. Their **objectives** are clearly stated: 1) to increase awareness for the plan, 2) increase watershed stewardship by identifying landowners and community members (stakeholders) interested in developing projects consistent with the plan, and 3) to improve implementation of the restoration plan by using input from landowners and community members. Outreach is one of the most important steps in restoration implementation. The best ecosystem restoration plans will be unfulfilled without identifying and involving the stakeholders. Worse yet, without effective outreach, stakeholders will come to distrust the intentions of ecosystem restoration and those proposing implementation. The objectives, as stated in the proposal, will aid in stakeholder identification and education.

Yes, the hypotheses are clearly stated and logically follow the objectives. The **hypotheses** ( $H_A$ ) being tested may be summarized as follows: 1) outreach will result in greater stakeholder support for the restoration plan, and that 2) this greater support and involvement will improve the quality of restoration projects, and 3) increased awareness and understanding of the plan will result in greater interest in implementation by stakeholders. These hypotheses were taken from the stated objectives.  $H_A 1$  –increasing awareness for the plan will result in greater support– follows that without knowledge (objective 1) of the plan support will be lacking.  $H_A 2$  –stakeholder involvement will improve the quality of projects– follows that stakeholders and their input for restoration plan implementation must be identified (objectives 2 and 3).  $H_A 3$  –greater stakeholder interest and stewardship in restoration plan in implementation through increased awareness– follows that increased awareness has an effect of attracting wider conceptual and practical support for the plan and ecosystem restoration.

**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 Trust believes that this proposal supports the **concept** that outreach and community participation are essential to successfully implement restoration plans and that they encourage local watershed stewardship, which improves the quality and longevity of the restoration projects by involving the interests of the local community of stakeholders. This is a valid conceptual model for the necessity and utility of outreach and stewardship in ecosystem restoration planning and implementation. Local interests must be seriously considered so that trust is established between those planning restoration and those parties that are effected by implementation. Restoration plans will be best implemented and modified to changing natural and cultural conditions if the concerns landowners and others of the local community are incorporated into the restoration process. Without awareness of the restoration plan, stakeholder ownership in watershed stewardship cannot even be established, much less considered a long-term investment.

**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]

Yes, the approach to this proposal uses five clearly stated tasks that can be achieved as demonstrated by past activities of the Trust and others. These five tasks will accomplish the objectives of the proposal. Maps and other printed information are necessary to document the who, where, what, and why of specific ecosystem

restoration projects. Maps and summary documents can ease landowner concerns for private property issues as well as invoke important ecosystem goals for public trust species. Maps and summary brochures are important communication aids when conducting public outreach. A forum of public outreach is necessary so that those proposing ecosystem restoration at a watershed level are in the lead of telling their story. Otherwise, information from sources with incomplete and incorrect knowledge of a watershed restoration plan will confuse issues and delay or prevent implementation of the plan. Communication and awareness for restoration plan implementation is essential for advancing such projects because they provide requisite information to stakeholders for developing informed opinions and ideas for ecosystem restoration.

**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, based on past development of specific tasks, the Trust is prepared to implement their proposal in full. The Trust has developed a summary brochure of the Tuolumne River Restoration Plan and has also conducted outreach. A map of the Tuolumne River watershed below the La Grange Dam does not exist. However, the Trust proposes to hire a cartographer to use existing data (general public vs. private ownership, high water mark, recreation points) to create the map. This seems a logical place to begin and should serve the purposes of outreach. Unfortunately, most watersheds do not have detailed GIS format maps such as those developed by the California Department of Water Resources for the Sacramento River.

**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, to a certain extent. The proposed map, summary brochure, and outreach meetings will serve to increase awareness for a local watershed restoration plan. This is a strong educational component that can influence stakeholders to take action and participate in plan. A decision of participation can lead to watershed stewardship or it may not. But, if it does not lead in stewardship participation by some stakeholders, then it is at least a result of an informed opinion. There are many decisions relevant to the kinds and levels of stewardship participation in watershed restoration implementation that this outreach proposal may invoke.

The map will be a very important communication tool. With ownership and hydrologic features clearly displayed, the map will be a useful planning tool for identifying to stakeholders where severe flooding is likely to reoccur and where natural processes can be restored.

Because of the necessary general nature of the map, individual landowners in the Tuolumne River watershed may feel threatened by general restoration plans having a perceived, direct or indirect (i.e., third party) influence on their property. However, a more detailed parcel map would not necessarily convey better information and would be cluttered and distracting for the proposed purposes.

**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]

Probably, but since this is an education and outreach type of proposal, quantitative measurements and numerical analysis are absent. The Trust acknowledges this and includes a paragraph summarizing the implications of a modified proposal using more scientific rigor. Experimental design is important to test for an effect from an experimental treatment. In this case paired groups –a treatment group paired with a control group– for both pre-treatments and post-treatments is necessary to determine statistically significant differences associated with the outreach components of this proposal.

However, this is a simple education and outreach proposal. Accordingly, qualitative data the Trust proposes to monitor –documented stakeholder input from outreach meetings that improves restoration plan

implementation and identification of new individuals interested in supporting or participating in watershed stewardship— will give some measure of success for the objectives of the proposal. Additionally, the Trust could compare qualitative results of past outreach—that which this proposal builds upon—with the proposed effort in a “before/after” comparison.

**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]

Not all forms of data management and reporting are fully described. For example, the proposal does not reveal how the above stated qualitative monitoring data is to be reported. Although the Trust gives reasons for weaknesses in “before/after” comparisons without controls, it is not clear if such data analysis will be attempted.

It not clear if the Tuolumne River watershed map will be of GIS quality (e.g., ArcInfo, ArcView) or simply representative (e.g., Corel Draw). Either format will serve outreach purposes.

It is clear that hard copies of the watershed map and summary brochure will be produced and that the map will also be electronically posted on a web site that currently describes the “Restoration Plan.” It is not clear if this plan is the full plan or a summary of the plan (i.e., the original brochure that the Trust proposes to re-print). The summary brochure should also be posted on their web site. As well as dates and logistics for public outreach meetings, when determined. The web site should be a “clearinghouse” for outreach-related products and activities.

**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, the Trust has demonstrated that the Tuolumne River Restoration Plan summary brochure can be accomplished because it has been produced and simply needs to be reprinted. Likewise, the Trust has held outreach meetings. A map of the Tuolumne River watershed has not been developed, however existing information is likely available to merge into a map useful as an outreach tool.

**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, based on statements provided in the proposal. Jenna Olsen, Executive Director of the Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, has sufficient experience to implement the proposed project. While only with the Trust for less than one year, she has gained experience through a CALFED Bay/Delta program and the Sierra Club with Central Valley water and salmon restoration programs, respectively. Her experience abroad, planning and training conservation strategies emphasizing easement programs, will likely have particular relevance with conservation strategies that involve private land on the Tuolumne River. Her dual Masters degrees in Natural Resources and Public Policy will likely serve her well navigating through various public programs that are likely to be implemented throughout the watershed. In summary Jenna Olsen’s qualifications as judged by education and experience seem sufficient to implement the proposed project.

At the time the proposal was submitted the Trust was in the process of hiring a Central Valley Program Director to lead this program. There is no information on who will direct this program although the Trust was to fill this position in June. The Trust also plans to rely on Board members with relevant experience. Board members who may be asked to participate are not identified—they are identified on Trust letterhead only. Therefore, no information on their qualifications is available. It is not possible to evaluate the qualifications of the project team when they are not identified. Of particular concern is the director since that should be a primary position to outreach and stewardship programs and activities.

**Miscellaneous comments**

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

Concerning the watershed outreach map, referring to *Section 2. Proposed Scope of Work, b. Approach*, the last sentence of the first bullet, states that some of the “information may be added or subtracted from this draft conception” owing to stakeholder input. What the Trust proposes here is important outreach work, and although it appears the initial map will be available to stakeholders for editorial comment, a better idea of what they expect for a final product seems appropriate. A letter from the Trust to the East Stanislaus RCD dated April 6, 2000 shows additional information that may be included in the outreach map. I believe a decision to include this information in the content of the initial map would yield a more complete map and accordingly make editorial comments more meaningful because more information is disclosed to the stakeholders. Thus, a more complete expression of the science implicit in this proposal would be communicated to the watershed community.

---

<p><b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Very Good</li><li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Fair</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Poor</li></ul>	<p><b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b></p> <p>Implementation of this proposal will accomplish one of the most basic but often overlooked components of science –communication. Outreach is essential to implementing conservation practice. This proposal stresses the importance of printed, electronic, and oral presentation in watershed outreach and stewardship. The proposal is weak on monitoring and information assessment. This proposal has a strong educational component, however the project director was not identified and qualifications are therefore unknown.</p>
--	---

---