

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

Proposal number: 2001-H205

Short Proposal Title: Battle Creek watershed

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes the objectives are clearly stated, however, one reviewer made the observation that the three proposed objectives don't link very well. The social premises stated in the problem statement could be developed into hypotheses however this was not done. Neither the scientific or social hypotheses in task one are addressed.

Panel Summary:

We feel that the objectives or hypotheses are not clearly stated. There are a number of issued stated and a number of tasks which undoubtedly fit into the main objective but it would have been great to see the objective stated on one clear and concise sentence. The objective of this project is to...???

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

No, the proposal appears to be part of a larger program. The proposal does not clearly identify how individual tasks correlate with the wider program. The applicant states we are ready to "move on" but it is not clear (without a conceptual model) if the proposed tasks are the next logical steps and it is not clear if the proposed data compilation and outreach fit into the larger program.

Panel Summary:

We agree with the reviewers. There is no conceptual model and the lack thereof makes it difficult to determine if the proposed tasks are logically conceived. The PSP specifically asks for a conceptual model.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers gave a mixed response. Two said yes and the third reserved judgment because of the lack of defined objectives and lack of a contextual conceptual model

Panel Summary:

No, it is not stated what the main objective is. There are a number of tasks but what is the over-arching objective? So we cannot be sure that the approach is well designed.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes this is a planning proposal.

Panel Summary:

Yes

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, as outreach expands, public acceptance should be evident and therefore decisions will be supported by those involved. All three primary tasks will generate information.

Panel Summary:

Yes, it could potentially but the project proposal is unclear. We can't tell if the information generated be useful without seeing a stated clear and focused objective.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Two reviewers note that there are no monitoring plans presented for assessing the outcomes of the project. The PSP implies that they may not be required for watershed planning proposals.

Panel Summary:

We agree with the reviewers. There is no post project assessment described however we would like it to be addressed if possible.

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:

Yes, however the project is heavily reliant on KRIS described in the proposal as "an electronic watershed information integration tool". Without experience with that system one reviewer suggests uncertainty of its soundness. One reviewer suggests that the applicant comment on this issue. Another reviewer stated that there is insufficient information provided but since similar watershed assessments have been done on other creeks that are well described, scientifically sound and adequate then this one is likely to be too.

Panel Summary:

There is no information provided in the proposal that tells us what methods will be used to monitor and assess. While the project may provide for data management, analysis, and reporting, it is not evident from the report. There is no evidence provided in the proposal that KRIS, developed in the north coast forests, is applicable in this area.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, no new ground is being broken here. The work is technically feasible and likely to be done in the time frame proposed.

Panel Summary:

Yes, Kris will be technically feasible but there is a question if it is applicable in this regional setting. The proposal does not demonstrate this and therefore the project will be somewhat experimental- perhaps a good hypothesis to test.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, but one reviewer reserved some comments on the lack of clarity of the distribution of the workload.

Panel Summary:

Yes we agree with the reviewers. It seems that the work team is well qualified but the proposal lacks clear description on who will be carrying out each activity.

5)Other comments

Reviewers suggest is have strong public out reach, good cost share. The viability of KRIS to Battle Creek is the key to this proposal. This reviewers rating was cautious as a result. Another reviewers comments followed ours in relation to the non-adherence to the PSP and the associated poor clarity. Without clear hypothesis and conceptual model development there is a lack of critical understanding on how the proposed tasks fit into the other all watershed strategy. The reviewers gave this project a mixed rating ranging from fair to very good.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel Summary: Much of the content and tasks of the proposal has merit however because the PSP was not followed it made it very difficult for both the reviewers and this panel to review and

discern the required information. We feel it would be ranked higher if the PSP had been followed closely. It remains unclear how the proposed project will actually “assure” the success of the Battle Creek restoration project. We note that the reviewers’ rankings varied widely. The divergence from the PSP may have caused this.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: FAIR