

Individual Review Form

Proposal Number: 2001-H205-2

Short Proposal Title: Battle Creek Watershed Stewardship, Phase 2

1a) Are the objectives and hypothesis clearly stated? Yes. As stated in the proposal (page 2), "The premise is that the Battle Creek watershed residents' lifestyle preference, which is to live where human population is dispersed and where the dominant land uses are range livestock and timber production, favors the success of the (Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead) Restoration Project."

The objectives, as near as I can tell, are represented by the statement that the project "... connects the Battle Creek watershed residents with information about the Restoration Project and with information about conditions in their watershed to promote a level of community awareness and action that will help sustain the preferred lifestyle and foster appropriate support for the objectives of the Restoration Project."

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? As near as I can tell, no conceptual model is presented.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Yes. There are three primary tasks: 1. Complete a watershed assessment and treatment plan, 2. Implement a Battle Creek watershed information system, and 3. Sustain implementation of the Battle Creek Watershed Strategy (pages 3 and 4). The three (3) primary tasks are broken down into eighteen (18) subtasks in a very complete and logical sequence (see pages 5-7).

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. All three primary tasks speak to the generation of information, with particular emphasis on Task 1 (watershed assessment- page 3) and Task 2 (watershed information system- pages 3 and 4).

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project? As near as I can tell, no such plans are identified in the proposal. I'm not sure if the applicant assumes monitoring will be accomplished through the contracting process or is inherent in the proposal itself. Oversight responsibilities are also unclear, though it appears that the Board of Directors of the BCWC plays a key role in this area.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives? This project is heavily dependent on the functioning of the Klamath Resources Information

System (KRIS), described in the proposal as "an electronic watershed information integration tool." I have had no personal experience with this system, so cannot speak to its soundness. I would suggest that agency members of the Battle Creek Working group be asked to comment on this issue.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible? Yes. This is a watershed planning effort that is focused on work that has already been shown to be technically feasible elsewhere. No new ground is being broken with this proposal.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? It appears so. More detailed information on Sharon's background, including how long she has been with the BCWC, would have been helpful. I have had occasion to interact with Bill Kier over the years and hold him in high regard.

Miscellaneous Comments

This project is being "hitched" to the success of the \$50 million CALFED Battle Creek Restoration Project. This point is made abundantly clear in the Existing Project Status Appendix (second page), where it is stated that "The community organizing and outreach efforts of the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy, and the fact that CALFED is willing to assist the community in addressing its concerns, including those about fire, appear to be keeping the community **positively engaged** in the development of the Restoration Project" (my emphasis).

The BCWC, as stated in the Appendix, has 94 members. The implied cost-share for this project by BCWC is estimated to be "at least \$3,000 per year."

Sierra Pacific Industries will be contributing a cost-share of \$75,000 in watershed assessment labor on its own lands.

It would have been helpful to have more information on the establishment of a permanent KRIS/Battle Creek "hub" (see Subtask 2.7, page 6), especially in terms of ongoing maintenance costs.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating: Good.

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

The viability of KRIS/Battle Creek is key to this proposal. My lack of knowledge concerning it makes me cautious.