

Draft Individual Review Form

(
Proposal number: 2001-H205-3 _____ Short Proposal Title: Battle Creek Watershed Stewardship II

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

The objectives for specific tasks are clearly stated. What is not clearly stated is the over-arching objectives that connect the three proposed tasks to one another, nor are the tasks well presented in the context of the larger Battle Creek restoration program. Hypotheses are not clearly stated. The social premises stated in the Statement of the Problem could be developed into hypotheses correlating with tasks 2 & 3, bearing in mind the underlying scientific objectives for the program. Neither the scientific nor social hypothesis for task 1 is addressed.

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

There is no clearly-stated conceptual model presented for this proposal. This proposal appears to be one element of a larger restoration program for Battle Creek. The proposal does not clearly identify how the tasks proposed for funding correlate with this larger program. Are there existing planning documents that identify soil erosion (task 1a) as the next priority to address? It would appear that Phase I is still in the process of working with upper watershed stakeholders to identify their concerns, so it would appear to be a unilateral action on the part of the applicant to “move on, now, to projects of even greater scope...”(pg 3). Lacking a conceptual model, It is not clear that task 1 is the next logical step. It also is not clear that the data compilation and outreach tasks, as proposed, fit with a larger program.

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

Because the objectives, hypotheses, and conceptual model are not well presented, it is not possible to assess if the approach is well-designed or appropriate.

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

This is a watershed planning proposal. The tasks, community involvement, scope of planning area and broad level of participation justify this project as a watershed planning proposal.

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

Task 1 could generate information for future local decision-making regarding potential soil erosion problem areas. Task 2 would compile existing data and make it more accessible. Task 3 targets community outreach with the intent to improve future local decision making.

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

There are no monitoring plans presented for assessing the outcomes of the project. (The PSP implies that monitoring plans may not be required of watershed planning proposals)

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

This criterion is most applicable to task1. Insufficient information is provided. If the watershed assessments for Mill, Deer and Antelope creeks are well-described, scientifically sound, and adequate, then this one likely will be too....

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

The work likely could be done in the timeframe proposed.

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

Likely – although somewhat difficult to identify how workload will be distributed between BCWC and Kier Associates. Not clear whether BCWC staff member identified will be sole staff, or if additional staff/talent will be recruited. The qualifications statement for the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy and staff would be stronger if their assertions that they are capable were backed up with some supporting detail, such as the number of grants the Conservancy has successfully managed, deliverables produced, projects completed, years of experience in related work, etc.

Miscellaneous comments

<p>Overall Evaluation</p> <p>Summary Rating</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent the PSP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Very Good even in</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Good into the</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	<p>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</p> <p>This proposal would have been clearer to review if the author had adhered to proposal format. Hypotheses and Conceptual Model development is critical, Watershed Planning. It is critical for understanding how the proposed tasks fit overall watershed strategy.</p>
--	--