Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-D200-3 **Short Proposal Title:_Cosumnes/Mokelumne Floodplain** Acquisitions

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]

Both the objectives are clear and nicely stated. There was really only one working hypothesis for the project, which is a shortcoming of the proposal. Given the conceptual model, the applicants should have listed several more specific hypotheses that address both ecological and hydrological issues.

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]

Yes, the conceptual model seems reasonable. On the whole, it is supported by the cited studies.

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]

Yes. The phasing of the project into land acquisition and restoration components is appropriate. However, I would be more comfortable with the approach if more details were provided about what is proposed for Phase II. Such information would provide a better indication of whether the project is likely to succeed.

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]

To some degree. The proposed sites seem worthy of acquisition. My concern is that the pilot scale existing Cosumnes project is being scaled up dramatically before the major hypotheses have been tested. To fully justify this project, the applicant should provide evidence from their present pilot scale floodplain study that it: 1) successfully promotes habitat values and 2) improves flood management. Based on the proposal, it appears that there is evidence to support the first hypothesis. There were no data or citations to support the second hypothesis, the CALFED topic area that this proposal was submitted under.

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]

Yes. Large scale floodplain restoration projects are a major component of CALFED's program. The Cosumnes/Mokelumne corridor represents one of the best opportunities for this type of project.

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]

The monitoring and information assessment plans are quite sketchy considering the magnitude of this proposal.

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]

Few details were provided about any of these issues, so I cannot determine whether they are scientifically sound or likely to meet the proposed objectives. I have some concerns that the information collected may not be sufficiently well-distributed. The proposal states that some reports will be prepared, but it is unclear how the information will be disseminated. The proposal states that the data will be held by the applicants and only distributed on request. For effective adaptive management, the data must be more accessible through systems such as IEP or proposed CALFED data management. The applicants should have "first rights" to publish the data, the public, stakeholders and regulatory agencies should have better access to data from this (potentially) public-funded project.

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]

I am not qualified to comment on the legal or engineering feasibility of this project. However, it is feasible from and ecological standpoint.

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. The Nature Conservancy has an excellent track record based on their previous project.

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

Floodplain restoration is exceptionally worthy and this seems like a good opportunity. Given sufficient resources, I believe this project should go forward. Numerous information gaps in the proposal resulted in the less-than-perfect score.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ■ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor	[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]