Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H209-1   **Short Proposal Title: Digital Soil Survey Mapping**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

.Objectives are clear—provide funding for NRCS staff and contractors to digitize existing soil maps in counties within the CALFED sphere of influence. The hypothesis, however is somewhat flawed, that is that the soils information now only available in hardcopy is not used very much and would be used more widely to make resource management decisions. Applicant places too much emphasis on soils-based information being the critical component of restoration activities etc.

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

The conceptual model identified does not justify this project. Soils are definitely a resource to be considered when making management decisions, but any good biologist knows where to get the information and just because it is in books and files, doesn't make it inaccessible.

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

The approach to digitize soil maps is probably very appropriate.

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

I don't believe that that applicant has justified the need to spend over $1 million to digitize existing information for a small part of the state.

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

Yes, without a doubt, the digitized info will be used to help make future decisions.

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

N/A

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

Data management and reporting are the crux of this proposal; making this digitized soils info available to all who might need it for making resource management decisions. They are well described and would likely meet proposed objectives.

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

The work described seems to be technically feasible.

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

No persons were identified specifically to do the work, other than NRCS. Can't determine if team is qualified or not.

Miscellaneous comments

I don't think this proposal should be funded by CALFED. This proposal would merely bring NRCS into the electronic data world using someone else's $. Why aren't they funding it themselves rather that only a small portion. No new information would be generated from this project, no outreach education, etc. The idea is good, but let someone else pay for it. What is a pedologist? (page where E. Qualifications is).

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Fair x Poor	See Summary above in Misc. Comments