

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H207-3_____

Short Proposal Title: Sacramento River Conservation.
Restoration

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

The objectives and hypotheses are clearly stated.

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

The conceptual model is based on implementation of a 1989 Riparian Management Plan. The model does not elaborate on how the plan serves as a framework for site-specific decision making or if the Plan can accommodate additional information learned since 1989.

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

Yes. A locally based Non Profit Organization is necessary to coordinate and manage restoration efforts over a large area. Management and decision-making should benefit from an advisory interdisciplinary technical team.

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

N/a. The proposed project is listed as Watershed Planning.

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. The use of site-specific plans to outline the current condition of sub reaches under consideration to determine realistic restoration choices is a valuable component of the project.

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

The plans appear to be adequate given the conceptual status of the project. The goal is to develop integrated information and monitoring protocols as part of the proposed project. The GIS is a valuable tool. The plan does not discuss identification of data gaps as part of iterative process, and this could limit adaptive management goals.

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

Overall yes. I would recommend adding percentage of impervious surface, land use, and stormwater conveyances (which may or may not be part of the future plans to develop GIS overlays for public and private infrastructure) to the GIS. The proposal does not discuss metadata, data accuracy standards or identifying data gaps as part of the data management, additions that would strengthen data management efforts.

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

In general yes. Some observed gaps include co-ordination with public works and flood management agencies to develop environmentally sound performance based operations and maintenance standards for the riparian corridor. This will increase the likelihood of long range success of the project and help facilitate Task 2 (Project Review and Monitoring Process) , Task 3 (Public Education) and Task 4 (Local Issues, Streamlined Permit Process)

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

The proposed project team is qualified.

Miscellaneous comments

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

Very Good. A high quality project with ambitious goals. With such a large area and goals, the devil will be in moving from a conceptual plan to the details of implementation. I am also concerned about changes since the plan was developed in 1989.

- Excellent
- Very Good**
- Good
- Fair
- Poor