

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

**Proposal number: 2001-H211**

**Short Proposal Title: Willow Slough**

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

The objectives and hypotheses are clearly stated. They are summarized clearly and have adequate supporting text.

*Panel Summary:*

The panel agrees with the reviewers. The objectives are clearly stated, and the hypotheses clearly connected to the objectives.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Reviewers felt that the Tenets listed under the conceptual model section were clearly stated and provided a basis for the proposed work.

*Panel Summary:*

The conceptual model is clearly stated, but seems too general. The model does seem to have direct relationships described with the hypotheses presented. The model appears to be too simplistic for the complex array of tasks outlined. It is not obvious how the conceptual model has prompted the selection of hypotheses and tasks.

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

*Summary of Reviewers comments:*

Reviewers agreed that the approach is well designed and likely to meet the project objectives.

*Panel Summary:*

The approach is well designed and clearly laid out. It appears likely that the approach and design will be appropriate in meeting the listed objectives.

**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 noted that the project was "none of the above," reflecting confusion about this response form, which does not include "watershed stewardship" or "education" in the question (1c1). The other review felt the justification was sound.

***Panel Summary:***

This project is well justified as a pilot and/or demonstration project.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Reviewers unanimously felt that this project will generate useful information for decisions within the watershed, and in other watersheds, as well.

***Panel Summary:***

The panel agrees with the reviewers comments. The intent of the program in large part is to develop a basis for improved decision making in the watershed.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Tasks 3 and 4 appear to contain sufficient and varied monitoring to assess the outcomes of the proposed project.

***Panel Summary:***

The panel agrees that the project contains adequate plans to provide project outcome assessment.

**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:***

***Panel Summary:***

Yes, the plan outlines these issues thoroughly and clearly. The panel would like to emphasize the need to monitor alternatives to task methods (particularly in tasks 2.1 and 2.2) in order to adequately assess original assumptions.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

Yes, proposed work is well founded and technically feasible.

***Panel Summary:***

The proposed work is technically feasible.

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

***Summary of Reviewers comments:***

The reviewers felt that the team is well qualified to carry out the elements of the proposal.

***Panel Summary:***

The panel agrees with the reviewers confidence in the proposed team. There is some concern, however, that the range management and practice expertise should be strengthened.

**5) Other comments**

***Reviewer Summary Comments:***

"Looks ready to go." The proposal has some lack of clarity in describing distribution of cost share.

Overall, this project is likely to generate useful information for this watershed and others.

"Improvements to the Willow Slough watershed will provide benefits downstream to valuable native fish habitat and water quality."

**Overall Evaluation  
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

This is a very good proposal that follows the PSP well. As requested by the PSP, many tasks are separable in the event full funding is not available. There is some concern about the management difficulty of implementing such a diversity of proposed tasks. The tasks are well planned and clearly described, however, which should make management easier and more effective.

Summary Rating

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD