

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

Proposal number: 2001-H203

Short Proposal Title: Southern Sonoma Creek
Watershed Conservancy

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, while the objectives/hypotheses are diverse, they are clearly stated.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewers that the objectives/hypotheses are clearly stated. #

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, clearly stated

Panel Summary:

Panel concurs with the reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The project is well designed for meeting objectives. One of the reviewers indicated that the conceptual model does not address some factors that are needed to achieve their stated goals. Under Watershed Conditions vegetation problems are not included and land use classification does not include impervious surface percentages, and infrastructure that alters the natural hydrology. Under riparian/aquatic conditions the project does not address sediment quantity while it does address sediment quality.

Panel Summary:

The panel felt that the project approach was appropriate but that the project should address the above comments from the reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One reviewer indicated that this is an implementation or continuation project based on previous efforts. One reviewer indicates that the individual tasks are appropriate for the objectives. Suggests a better linkage between task, objectives and watershed conditions.

Panel Summary:

For the most part they have justified a full-scale implementation project. Need justification for budget items based on the justification for practices to be implemented.#

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Yes in conjunction with other prior CALFED funded work and sediment analysis being done by the San Francisco Estuary Institute this proposed project will result in information useful for informed decision making.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewers indicate that monitoring elements are insufficiently described.

Panel Summary:

Existing monitoring elements insufficiently described to justify the proposed budget or to adequately assess the outcome of the project.#

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:

Two reviewers indicate that these items could be substantially improved and one reviewer felt they adequately addressed this issue. One reviewer lists four items from the proposal that demonstrate the inadequacy of the monitoring component (see page 2 of proposal).

Panel Summary:

The data descriptions are not adequately described to judge scientific soundness or and adequacy of monitoring. We concur with the four items discussed by one of the reviewers on page 2. #

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Yes

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Panel Summary:

Yes. However, they have been highly successful in acquiring support for projects in the watershed. CALFED should verify performance on existing contracts to insure adequate progress given the workload they have very successfully incurred. This is not a negative comment

5)Other comments

Monitoring description and detail insufficient to assess appropriateness of budget. Should complete QA/QC and then review budget. #

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Rating would be improved if the monitoring section provided more detail on watershed analysis. Monitoring should document changing watershed conditions and change due to project practices and activities. One reviewer summarized that that this proposal might have rated very good had it provided more information about watershed analysis and if there had been more collaborative education/outreach projects between the conservancy partners. Overall the tasks completed through this project will provide valuable information regarding the condition of the watershed and provide information useful in future planning and restoration.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD.