

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

Proposal number: 2001-H212

Short Proposal Title: _Marsh Creek Watershed

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers agree that this proposal does a good job in identifying the objectives and hypotheses.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees the objectives and hypotheses are clearly identified.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers believe that the conceptual model is well developed, but one indicated a stronger correlation between public involvement and scientific conceptual models is needed.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewers, and believes the National Heritage Institute strengthens the potential for success.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers agree that the approach is basically good. However, one reviewer had concern that the objectives were developed without community involvement and questions if the community believes in the process and objectives. Is there clear science for the objectives or is it a place to start? The reviewer also indicated there was a need for a plan.

Panel Summary:

There was concern that the work on the mine remediation was not correlated to if there was a real problem of mercury and the wetlands. A suggestion was made that planning and implementation was mixed together in the proposal and they need to remove the implementation and complete the planning first to better justify the mining remediation and land acquisition.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers believe this project is none of the above. There was some belief that the demonstration projects are appropriate.

Panel Summary:

This is a watershed planning project. They have mixed planning and implementation and need to write a plan then work to implement that plan.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The water and mercury remediation, and flood plan restoration information could be used in the future.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewers if they completed a community consensus based watershed plan they would be able to gather data that is usable in the future.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers agree that there is not a monitoring plan described in the proposal.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewers and the proposers should address the monitoring of the projects in the community consensus based watershed plan.

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:

The reviewers agree that the basic data collection has been thought out, but that the analytical methodology is not clear and needs to be flushed out.

Panel Summary:

The panel concurs with the reviewers and believe the details can be further described in the plan.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

The reviewers believe most of the tasks in this proposal are technically feasible, however there was concern for the mercury remediation task. Overall, the project appears to be feasible.

Panel Summary:

What they have proposed is technically feasible but it hasn't been proven to be technically appropriate. A watershed plan could justify the actions and places the projects within the context of the entire Marsh Creek watershed.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

There is strong agreement that the project team is nice mix of science and technical professionals qualified for project completion with success. One reviewer believed the inclusion of the design firm will benefit the interface between science and social elements.

Panel Summary:

The panel agrees with the reviewers in regard to the mix of qualified personnel. We believe this group is more than adequate to develop a community consensus based watershed plan.

5)Other comments

Reviewer comments:

This proposal has a superior development of hypothesis, especially for the watershed plan. There appears to be local agency support for this proposal, but 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.

The other reviewer recommended funding this proposal. Lots of cost share money. Half of 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.

The reviewer rankings ranged between good and very good.

Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS

This should be a phased project, fund and complete Task 1. Then once Task 1 is completed, revise Task 2,3,and 4. The panel recommends paying for task 1 first then contingent on the completion of the community consensus watershed plan developed under task 1, paying for task 2,3,and 4.

This was a good application that shows there is a clear enthusiasm for the restoration of the Marsh Creek watershed. With the development of the community consensus based watershed plan, this project could be ranked very good.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: GOOD