

Draft Individual Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: 2001-H212-3

Short Proposal Title: Marsh Creek
stewardship.

Explain connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection): None

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Yes. Watershed Stewardship proposals typically have difficulty articulating hypotheses, perhaps because these proposals serve to develop a nexus between scientific concepts and social parameters. This proposal did an exceptional job defining hypotheses that addressed both the scientific evaluations and the social process in a defined and measurable manner.

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

The scientific conceptual model is well developed. Could be stronger correlation between community involvement model and scientific/technical conceptual model.

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

On a task by task basis, the tasks are well designed for meeting the stated objectives relating to that task. The primary question regarding the appropriateness of the proposal objectives in the context of a watershed stewardship proposal is, "what was the process used to develop these proposal objectives?" Are they based on scientific evaluations only? Was there community involvement in development of these objectives? Does the community support these objectives as a priority in the larger watershed context? It is clear that there is support from local agencies, but not clear whether there is a larger plan or strategy, including priorities, which has been developed with community involvement.

For example, mercury is a compound that elicits appropriate concern. Per the problem statement, water quality is identified as an issue, but the presence of past mercury mining is a complicating factor; not necessarily causal. The proposal has selected mercury as the focus of their investigation, but it is not clear that this element is the most pressing component of the water quality problems at the marsh. With respect to land acquisition in the watershed, is there an overall conceptual protection strategy that would position the Griffith parcel as the logical starting point?

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

This proposal is none of the above types of projects.

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

The watershed monitoring program, mercury investigations and floodplain restoration design can generate information that may be used to inform local decisions regarding water quality and habitat design issues.

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

Monitoring plans are not presented that relate to measuring results associated with testing their hypotheses. The proposal only addresses the process for subsequently developing a monitoring program to assess the restoration project as an adaptive management process.

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

Protocols for data collection are generally identified. Data management is adequately described. Analytical methodology is not well described, thus cannot be evaluated.

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

All tasks likely are feasible, although there is greater uncertainty in the outcome of Mercury remediation task 2.

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

The proposed project team includes a nice mix of science and technical expertise and entities with an established history of community interface. The inclusion of the design firm is an insightful addition to the team and likely a highly beneficial component to the interface between the scientific and social elements of this proposal.

Miscellaneous comments

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent XX Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	This proposal has a superior development of hypotheses, especially for a watershed stewardship proposal. There appears to be local agency support for this proposal, but it is not clear that all the tasks identified for funding have been identified as priorities in the local communities or in a larger watershed strategy. Project team is advantageously diverse in expertise and ability.
