

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H203-3_____

Short Proposal Title: Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

The objectives are clearly stated. The general objective of improving habitat values is a broad one, but the task level objectives are clearly stated. The proposal states that “conclusively testing the hypotheses is beyond our (the applicants’) current means. Developing a framework an integrated monitoring and assessment to help determine future watershed planning decisions would strengthen the hypotheses.

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

Overall the conceptual model captures the feedback loops necessary for watershed stewardship and the links between monitoring, assessment, implementation and stakeholder education.

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

See framework comment in 1a. The conceptual model does not address some factors I feel are also necessary to achieve their stated goals.

- **Watershed Conditions** Does not include problem vegetation areas. Does not say whether land use classification includes impervious surface percentages, infrastructure altering natural hydrology
- **Riparian/Aquatic Conditions** They are assessing sediment quality, but should also include sediment quantity.

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

The individual tasks are appropriate to a watershed conservancy objective. The application does not contain enough background on some of the projects to determine the appropriateness of the task based on present watershed conditions and/or knowledge. Specific tasks that need more information to justify their likelihood success are listed below.

1. Pool Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Sonoma Creek Tributaries (SEC)

What kind of watershed assessment has been done to select restoration sites? Placement of large woody debris can be ineffective if geomorphic conditions are not understood.

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

Yes, the project appears to be designed to utilize information for future decision making.

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

For some tasks the applicant does include enough information about the decisions contributing to the project design to adequately assess monitoring and assessment plans. Questions on specific tasks are outlined below. The application states “ Tasks 1-3, 5 and 9 implement well-understood, small scale restoration actions; therefore monitoring for those tasks is limited to ascertaining if the action was successful.” The applicant does not provide sufficient information to support this claim. This assertion depends on the experience of the designers in the watershed. Many small projects can fail and or cause direct, indirect or cumulative impacts.

1. Monitor Fish Passage (Asbury Creek at Arnold Drive SEC)

Project does not include monitoring and assessment for potential physical changes from culvert modifications. If there is the potential for the culvert modifications to impact channel morphology, the plans should include observations on conditions up and downstream of the culvert.

2. Pool Habitat Enhancement and Restoration, Sonoma Creek Tributaries (SEC)

What kind of watershed assessment has been done to select restoration sites? Will they be doing longitudinal profile? What type of LWD installation- cabled? dropped? Will the designs vary? Monitoring assessment should include geomorphic differences between the sites- to evaluate effectiveness and an analysis in any variations in the installation methods.

3. Restore Fish Passage, Carriger Creek (SSCRCD)

Will removal of the barrier change the grade? Has stream instability / dynamics been considered? Monitoring and assessment should include geomorphic features, cross sections, longitudinal profiles.

4. Digital Orthoquads

Riparian evaluation does not include looking at native/non-native, viability?

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

Comments are addressed in my answers above. I would prefer to see some integration of data from task to task. For example success of the bank stabilization techniques used in the vineyard demonstration projects should be combined with pool enhancement or bank repair proposals included in the application.

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

In general yes. Specific concerns are discussed above

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

The proposed project team is qualified.

Miscellaneous comments

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

<p>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	<p>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</p> <p>With more information this proposal might have merited a Very Good. But, given the information provided, I can tell if enough watershed analysis has been done to ensure success of the technical proposals. Also, some of the education/outreach projects would be stronger if they were collaborative projects between the conservancy partners, so different stakeholder groups could benefit from the collective talents distributed among the different partners</p> <p>[</p>
--	--
