

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H208-2 **Short Proposal Title: Kirker Creek WS CRMP**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Objective to for a CRMP for the purposes of involving stakeholders and managing the Kirker watershed spelled out clearly. The standard CRMP hypothesis is clearly identified.

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

The model being used for this proposal is the widely used CRMP.

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

The approach for using the CRMP is well designed for this application, including use of regular meetings and a newsletter for outreach and education of stakeholders.

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

CRMP is a well documented, widely used program for watershed management that encourages public participation, working with stakeholders including locals, agencies and others to identify problems and come up with solutions. The use of CRMP here is very appropriate.

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

The inventory of natural and cultural resources will be used for future decisions in the watershed., as will the GIS data generated and Watershed Plan. All of the above info could be used for future projects, funding opportunities and identify the general direction of the Management Plan.

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

The monitoring plan and information assessment will be developed under this funding request.

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

Reporting plans are adequate for this proposed effort. Data preparation, including GIS, using 2 GIS models somewhat weak on Water Quality monitoring plan—not well defined.

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

Use of CRMP is well documented and has been used successfully. Should be technically feasible.

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

CCRC staff identified appears to be qualified to be the coordinator, although the proposal did not implicitly identify her as the major player.

Miscellaneous comments

SUMMARY—well written good presentation of problem, connection to CALFED area of concern. Staff understand the need for establishing credible watershed coordination and use of CRMP is a good model, especially if it is working on a close by area, Alhambra Creek WS. Budget info clear, with lots of cost share, more than the requested CALFED grant—a good sign of stakeholder participation.

<p>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	<p>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</p> <p>See SUMMARY above in misc. comments.</p>
---	--
