

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H212-1

Short Proposal Title: A project to protect water quality in the Western Delta

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. The objectives are clearly described in section C.1.A.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. The conceptual model is described on pages 1-4 of the proposal.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. It is obvious that a great deal of thought went into the design and appropriateness of the project and tasks. If the tasks described can be completed successfully the approach should meet the objectives of the project.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. Most of the justification appears in the conceptual model description.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. Information gained through the implementation of this project will be extremely useful for future decision making and watershed restoration project planning.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Unable to determine. The project proposal is seeking funds to develop a detailed monitoring program as part of the watershed science programs and design phase of the individual channel restoration projects. Until this is completed can not determine if it will be adequate.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. The proposed work, approach and tasks to be accomplished described on pages 5 – 7 are well thought out and described.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. Based on the information provided in the proposal the proposed work appears to be technically feasible.

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

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. The project team and their individual qualifications are described on pages 11 – 12. All are well know and experienced experts in the areas where they will be involved in this project.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

OVERALL SUMMARY RATING: Very Good

Rated Very Good instead of Excellent because of the lack of a monitoring and information assessment plan in the proposal (these will be developed as a product of the project).
