

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

Proposal number: 2001-H202

**Short Proposal Title: Tuolumne River Watershed
Outreach and Stewardship**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the reviewers agree that the objectives and hypothesis are clear and logical in order.

Panel Summary:

Yes, the panel agrees the objective and hypothesis are clear relative to the objectives.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The three reviewers believe the public outreach to educated the local landowners and general public to know and understand the “Plan” to appropriate. They all believe this approach will increase the acceptance and implementation of the “plan”.

Panel Summary:

The conceptual model does clearly explain the basis for project and we agree with the reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers support the meeting approach and believe this is an effective way to get the information to the landowners accurately. However, there was a concern about the cost effectiveness of a more rigorous evaluation to analyze the differences between knowledge and attitude.

Panel Summary:

While the panel agrees it is appropriate to bring all parties together, there is concern the Trust has developed a vision without including the stakeholders (especially agricultural landowners and assoc.) in the process. They appear to be using a lot of theory without having a clear idea of what the problem is, outsiders not insiders did the work. The proposal doesn't include the entire watershed in the plan presented, it appears to be only a corridor plan. This approach might have been more appropriate in the development of the plan, there is concern by the panel that this approach will not be as effective in the sale of the plan.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers believe the project is justifiable.

Panel Summary:

This is an educational project for watershed restoration, none of the above apply.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the reviewers agree that the map will serve to influence future decision making. They all believe this information will, at least, inform the landowners of the project and that it may influence future management decisions.

Panel Summary:

Yes, this project could provide, as proposed on page 6 of the proposal, information that would provide quantifiable data that identifies the effectiveness of this type of outreach approach.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers indicate this is an educational project and a monitoring protocol is absent.

Panel Summary:

The proposal clearly quantify whether or not the proposal will be effective. On page 6 the phrase “how many...” is used in determining the amount of participants and use of the information.

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 reviewers do not appear to be convinced on the effectiveness of the proposed data collection and management analysis recording. The map production information dissemination appears to be adequate.

Panel Summary:

This question does not apply to this proposal, this is an educational proposal. The map will be created by use of GIS information that will be used to digitize the map.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers believe this is technically feasible because the Trust is reproducing work that has already been completed and using data already collected to create the map.

Panel Summary:

There is concern that there was no involvement of the local landowners (i.e. RCD, Farm Bureau, landowners, etc.) in the development of the plan, there appears to be only water districts and representatives of the environmental community. There was agreement to the technical feasibility to recreate a map and reprint the brochure. The proposal does not demonstrate the Trust has the ability to do the outreach work. There is concern that the approach will not be effective because of the lack of public involvement.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers could not determine the qualifications of the outreach coordinators. There was confusing and vague information about the project team.

Panel Summary:

The proposal does not demonstrate there are qualifications by the applicant to do outreach work.

5)Other comments

The reviewers comments were that this was a good project, but that it did not go far enough. There was the recommendation that CALFED seriously consider increasing the allocation to this program to allow for a more rigorous quantitative analysis.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

This proposal should have been put in the educational section not watershed. This panel recommends this proposal be moved to the educational section and be funded by the educational

program. Additional comments were this is a simple project: produce map, distribute brochures, hold meetings: recommend funding. There also seemed to be a fair amount of cost sharing money.

The concern by the panel with this proposal is that the Trust is ready to “educate” the landowners and locals on a plan that they were not included in when it was being developed. There is real concern that this project will not be effective with the local landowners because they will feel as though they are being force fed the information not included in its development.

This project could have received a higher rating if it had included the general public in the development of the project.

The panel recommends that the Trust to use the community meetings to introduce the plan and improve the connections between the plan the community and the watershed. Also, identify how to expand the context of the plan to the watershed beyond the channel. Then add an additional task that would develop a report that relates the community concerns and comments.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: FAIR

1

1