

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H210-2 Short Proposal Title: Lower American River Science Based Adaptive Management

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Objectives and corresponding hypotheses are well defined, but connection to the proposal is not.

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

Scant models illustrate need/basis for the work, however, unclear about the roles of how these “tests” are to be accomplished.

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

Not clear how the group will achieve the flow augmentation test. Seems to me, the USBR would have to be on board and agree upfront to modify flows for some experimenting, but nowhere is it apparent that the USBR is in the mix, except for a staff person on something called the FISH Group.

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

The proposal identifies the need, shows the decline in fish numbers; guessing on the hypothesis.

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

Yes, some information collected could be used to modify flow regimes in the Lower American River to the benefit of fish and other aquatic species and possibly be used in similar systems.

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

No monitoring information provided; to be developed under funding from this proposal.

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

Again, no information is provided on data collection, other than the monitoring and collection protocols will be developed by CDFG, with input from the technical committee. No information on wetlands, monitoring...etc.

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

Based on the information provided, it is impossible to determine if the project is technically feasible.

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

Relying on DFG staff to do monitoring. The consultants identified all well know and can likely provide good assistance. Many tem members on the FISH Group are well known and respected in their field. Water Forum Executive Director has left; not sure who will take over that role and move this project forward, if funded. I have some reservations about that issue.

Miscellaneous comments

SUMMARY--Great cost-sharing, with large amounts from SAFCA (\$5.6 million) and the Water Forum (\$1 million). There has been earlier work completed, such as a bibliography, and an outline for Baseline Report. It is not clear hoe the hypothesis will be carried out, and no info on whether or not USBR will cooperate on flow regime. No details on monitoring, etc.

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