

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

Proposal number: 2001-H208

Short Proposal Title: Kirker Creek

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated. Follows standard CRMP procedures.

Panel Summary:

Yes. The committee agrees with the reviewers#

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the CRMP planning model widely used to develop watershed plans.

Panel Summary:

Yes, the proposal follows CRMP process and we concur with the reviewers.#

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the approach uses the CRMP model and is well thought out.

Panel Summary:

Yes, the panel agrees with the reviewers that the CRMP approach is appropriate for meeting the objectives of this planning project.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One reviewer commented that CRMP is a well-documented widely used program for watershed management that encourages public participation. A second reviewer could not find a discussion/justification of the need for a watershed plan.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees that that the proposal documents stressors in the watershed that that result in reduced water quality that could be addressed with a watershed level plan. Presence of these stressors justifies a watershed level plan and eventual applications of management practices to reduce or mitigate these stressors.#

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, the planning process will generate information that can be used to inform the public and decision makers.

Panel Summary:

Yes, the panel concurs with the reviewers. The proposed planning project is likely to provide information that will be the basis for implementing practices to manage or eliminate stressors in the watershed.#

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The monitoring component is weak and needs to be clarified.

Panel Summary:

Panel agrees with reviewers. Proposal needs to describe the monitoring component more thoroughly. What, when and where of monitoring needs to be addressed. Monitoring needs to document project performance and progress towards objectives.#

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:

Both reviewers indicate that this section is somewhat weak. One reviewer was uncertain from the proposal whether data questions were adequately addressed.

Panel Summary:

Panel concurs with reviewers recommends that monitoring elements and data elements be addressed thoroughly when they develop their QA/QC Plan. CALFED should provide oversight on QA/QC. #

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, developing a watershed plan using CRMP procedures is technically feasible.

Panel Summary:

The panel concurs with reviewers.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

One reviewer felt that the Contra Costa RCD was capable of implementing the proposed project. One reviewer could not determine if the staff was adequate because the proposal did not document their training and experience.

Panel Summary:

The panel feels that the RCD is capable of completing the project but it is unclear whether the RCD has the technical capacity to complete the process. As is often the case they may subcontract to parties who possess the technical capacity they do not currently possess. USDA NRCS may augment the technical capacity of the RCD. #

5) Other comments

This is one of the most well written and clear proposals that the panel reviewed. The proposal is well organized and follows the CALFED format making the review much easier.#

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

We judge this project to be very good if the monitoring component is improved. The well organized and succinct proposal contributed to it's high rating. Reviewers indicate that proposal is well written and strongly connected to a CALFED area of concern. Project staff understand the need for watershed coordination provided by the CRMP model. Reviewer says budget is clear, appropriate and likes the level of cost share.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD