Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-K200-1 **Short Proposal Title: Mill Creek Adaptive Management**

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 hypothesis and objectives are clearly stated. Although the hypothesis of supplemental flows leading to suitable fish passage is clear enough, this addresses the project at its simplest level. That there exists some optimal flow for fish passage is self-evident. The more interesting hypothesis embodied by the proposal is whether responsible agencies, a local water company, a watershed conservancy, and other interested parties to this project can actually agree to implement flow releases within an adaptive management framework.

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]
The conceptual model, as stated, is really a restatement of the individual components of the overall proposal. The concept of the proposal, as I understand it, is probably stated better under the heading of Adaptive Management. Under this heading is the description of a process to refine fish transport flows based on an adaptive management framework of observation, investigation, and balancing of benefits (tradeoffs) resulting in workable flow management decisions. Using the adaptive management model as a means of arriving at agency and community supported solutions is the heart 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]
Each of the project components appears to be adequately justified. How the project will all come together in the end is not absolutely clear. There is tremendous responsibility on the project managers to coordinate with both the responsible agencies and the community in a number of sensitive areas. Moving from studies to implementation will be difficult. However, the fact that this proposal is rooted in an already established, locally supported effort is extremely encouraging.

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]
Although I could not find it specifically stated, this is a pilot project. Really, an expansion and enhancement of an existing successful pilot project.

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]
Once again, it is not so much the science that is new or interesting, but the community involvement in an adaptive management decision making process that has important implications. The success or failure of a community based (supported) instream flow experiment would reflect on the entire approach to restoration under the ERPP.

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]
In general yes, with one exception. The proposal understates the importance of reestablishing an electronic fish counter on Mill Creek. It is hard to imagine how one is to collect the data necessary to establish cause

and effect of varying flows on fish passage without reliable data. I suspect that extraordinary efforts may be needed to install such a device. The project proponents and funding agency should be prepared to expend significant effort and funding to complete this element of the monitoring scheme. Because of its naturally high levels of turbidity, all other methods of collecting population data on Mill Creek are suspect to useless. Other data can verify but not replace information collected from an appropriately monitored fish counting station.

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]
Provided that there is adequate coordination and peer review as stated in the proposal, I would not anticipate any problems with data acquisition, management, or reporting.

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]
As stated above, reliability of fishery data on Mill Creek can be suspect without adequate monitoring facilities. All other aspects appear doable.

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, with one exception. The fisheries biologist has not yet been selected. This will be a key individual in the success of this project. In addition to scientific credentials, the individual in this position will need to maintain a positive relationship with the responsible agencies and communicate scientific and technical information to the public in an effective manner. If appropriate, I would recommend consultation with the responsible agencies in selecting this individual.

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

Overall Evaluation **Summary Rating** ☐ Excellent XX ☐ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating This is a potentially important project on a exceedingly important tributary to the Sacramento River. It represents an expansion of an existing successful cooperative effort, embraces the adaptive management process, and is supported by the local community.