

Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H208-1

Short Proposal Title: Kirker Creek Watershed
CRMP Program

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. General project objectives are stated within the proposal. The hypothesis being tested is also described .

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The conceptual model description explains the underlying concept for Coordinated Resource Management and Planning. This is the basis for the proposed work.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The approach appears well thought out and appropriate for meeting the objectives as stated within the proposal.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Could not find a discussion/justification anywhere in the proposal.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. The proposal objectives are aimed at informing landowners within the watershed of the intent to develop a watershed management plan, assessing watershed resources, and training and coordination of the planning group. These are important tasks which will facilitate future decision making.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project? Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No. The monitoring and assessment plan section of the proposal describes tasks which will be done but not how the information will be used to 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?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not sure. These elements are discussed in the proposal but it is not entirely clear how the information will be used to meet the project objectives.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. For the most part standard procedures are being applied.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Could not determine. Information regarding the project team, including training and experience, was not provided with proposal.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Overall Summary Rating: **Good**

watershed management plan.

Overall the tasks to be completed through this project will result in a final