

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H212-2 **Short Proposal Title: Marsh Creek Watershed**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Wetlands restoration for pollutant filtration; water quality protection using a buffer zone; mercury mine remediation for possible contaminant control. Watershed science program for education and public outreach.

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

Model being used is based on well documented processes.

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

Approach to the efforts identified in 1a seem well designed and thought out; appropriate for what they want to accomplish.

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

The mine remediation proposal needs to be fleshed out, which will be done with this funding source. The wetlands restoration work for detention of storm water is appropriate and widely used in other applications.

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

Water quality information and mercury remediation work will likely be used for future decisions.

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

Some detail but a little weak in the monitoring information.

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

The worked is well mapped out, some details to be developed later with funding from this proposal.

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

Much of the activities identified are well documented and currently in use in a variety of settings. Wetlands for filtration and the use of buffers for protection of water quality. The science center for education and outreach to the community will also likely be technically feasible.

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

Impressive cast of players; very strong technical people in a variety of fields.

Miscellaneous comments

SUMMARY—I recommend funding this proposal. Lots of cost share \$. Half the cost is for land acquisition, which was pointed out that it is a high priority for Ecosystem protection under CALFED. This effort is worthwhile for protection of T&E species, and a buffer from direct impacts to nearby development.

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