

Technical Oversight Team Comments

2nd Quarterly Report, 2013 – U.S. Forest Service, Riparian Restoration to Promote Climate Change

Reviewer #1 - Looks like this project focuses on only the lower order streams and its application to brook trout management. Although controlling temperature for these headwater system is important in the management of brooktrout, I'm wondering about the utility to higher order streams. For instance, sedimentation and stream instability are major issues in warm water streams and seem to be of greater importance for prioritizing where projects occur. Flashy precipitation events as a result of climate change may add insult to injury, exasperating stream instability and bedload movement, and ultimately impacts to habitat. For this project, I suggest more clarity on the targets and utility. My fear is that areas that do not fit the model will be considered of low priority. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Reviewer #2 - It's unclear to me if this is the 1st or 2nd quarterly report. You state it's the 2nd and the report has the 1st bolded and nothing is circled as stated in the instructions. Either way Keith states they will complete Task 1, which was due June 15th, by the next report. I understand the start of the contract was delayed. Seems like the due dates for the tasks should be revised but perhaps this is a non-issue overall.

What is the definition of resiliency with respect to this work? Perhaps the tool could be refined to include those elements of most concern to the user (sedimentation, temperature, channel stability, etc.) to see how the prioritization outcomes would change. Otherwise everything appears in order and I do not have any additional comments.

Reviewer #3 - Just wondering from the progress report why Task 4 will not be dealt with in this current quarter? Although Task 4 occurs in the next quarter, planning and date selection should probably begin now. Not sure that I will be able to attend a face-to-face meeting in October (trip for a couple of weeks), but I might be able to call-in to a conference call if I know well enough ahead of time.

Also, out of curiosity, I wonder which are the six missing data layers from the EBTJV? Don't want to bog down the process, so if answering this question will take time away from the grantees, I certainly don't have to know. Excellent idea to add impervious surface data layer.

Reviewer #4 - I understand that contracting and startup has delayed the timeframes for the project, but anticipate the overall project completion will not be affected since nothing was mentioned in the report. The P.I. does acknowledge the startup issues in the 1st quarterly report, but reports progress since then on at least a couple of tasks. That is fine. He also reports that this quarter the team expects to complete the Tasks 1,2,3 and begin on Task 5. The report does not explicitly describe a projected date for scheduling Task 4, but that may need to get on the calendar soon, especially if it will still occur during October, as originally proposed. Even if done by Webinar, and not in person, this needs to be scheduled at least 30 days in advance.

I expect the project will show rapid progress over the next few months in order to meet the scheduled completion of Jan 2014. I look forward to review of the draft tool and its results. I have no serious concerns about the progress to date, but certainly would like to hear from the P.I. if there are any technical difficulties or issues pulling together data or computational models that might affect the final completion date, the scope of the data, or the functionality of the RPCCR tool. Some details or a draft web tool probably need to come to the Technical Oversight Team sooner than later if possible.