

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

Proposal number: 2001- I201

**Short Proposal Title: Watershed Education –
Headwaters to Ocean**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of reviewer comments:

Yes, the objectives build on previously funded programs that are components of the high school/college intern program. The 5 projects are clearly outlined and represent a complement of environmental projects that link people to the environment.

Panel summary:

The panel saw this proposal as clear, service oriented, and with specific objectives.

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

Summary of reviewer comments:

The proposal underscores the relationship between healthy water systems and an informed citizenry and that educational programs are central to the public's ability to make informed decisions regarding water resources. The 5 projects represent important aspects of a healthy watershed and serve to reinforce this relationship.

Panel summary:

Panel agrees with above review.

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

Summary of reviewers comments:

The multi-dimensional approach supports the model that there are many environmental indicators in maintaining a viable watershed. The appropriate use of partners (example: Point Reyes Bird Observatory for birdwatching, Mendocino National Forest for star thistle control) and the variety of projects enhances the proposal's relevancy to the larger watershed picture.

Panel summary:

Panel agrees with above review.

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

Summary of reviewer comments:

In this instance, the applicant is building on previous work (example: expanding their high school academy and adult volunteer training program) in 3 of their projects. Producing two educational videos (Task 5), however, comes across rather weak in specifics vs. how many people it is projected to touch.

Panel summary:

Panel felt the selection of the projects were well justified as representative aspects of watershed complexity.

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

Summary of reviewers comments:

The relationship between an informed citizenry and a healthy watershed is clearly stated. The proposals also strike a balance between scientific data collecting, hands on experiences, students, volunteers, and agencies.

Panel summary:

Yes, panel felt these projects would have lasting effects, particularly if the high school initiated project (Task 4) was actually implemented within the 3 years.

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

Summary of reviewers comments:

It was felt that Task 4 (given its budget, donated GPS equipment, plants populations, and 3 year timeline) was more than adequate in the realm of “planning” and could be stronger in the realm of implementation. More detail could have been provided regarding Task 2 as well. For example, what were the lessons learned from previous work? It seems to me this would be a good place to showcase adaptive monitoring and adaptive management

Panel summary:

Panel agrees with above comments.

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 scientific soundness comes through in the credibility of various partnerships as well as the previous accomplishments of SRDC, however, the proposal varies in its descriptions of data collection and management. Task 5, for example is somewhat nebulous compared to Task 3, which is straightforward in its details.

Panel summary:

Panel agrees

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

Summary of reviewers comments:

Yes, SRDC appears to be expanding due to raising public awareness. I like the way it capitalizes on earlier projects while adding two new ones, thus maintaining project feasibility without getting spread out too thin and underdelivering.

Panel summary:

Panel agrees

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

Summary of reviewers comments:

SRDC seems very qualified. Since curriculum is service oriented, more details could have been provided on the center's training programs, and support staff in addition to the well qualified director.

Panel summary:

Panel agrees

5)Other comments

One of the most interesting components of this proposal is that the invasive weed eradication task was developed by the students in the program in consultation with agency reps. This program also has a very strong cooperative funds component that shows high levels of support from others.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Task Priority for funding: Panel was ambivalent about funding Task 5 (video development), if there was plenty of funding, it would be a worthwhile project but its not a high priority.

There was some concern that Task 4 (mapping and eradication of invasive weeds) was largely planning and not implementation. There may need to be more coordination to begin eradication before three years. Also the TARP noted that the budget for Task 4 could be excessive for the product, especially costs for aerial photos. Need to ensure proponent has a good idea of what agencies may be able to cost share for this task.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: **VERY GOOD**