

Comments on ERPP by Wendy Halverson Martin, 3/3/97

General Comment:

Generally the ERPP is a well done, comprehensive document. I found only a few technical errors, problems or questions, none of which were huge, but all could be important. The document generally has an appropriate level of detail for a program level analysis. There needs to be a section in the very beginning on how the document is organized and how to use the document.

Specific Comments:

- The single biggest problem with the document is organization and editing. The zones and visions are inconsistent in their organization which is confusing to the reader, and gives the impression of incompleteness in some sections.
- The format used varies inconsistently between two column and full page. There are many editing errors.
- The format of the tables and score cards varies, and should be consistent.
- The unit of measure varies between American standard and metric.
- Physical processes are presented inconsistently and sometime incorrectly. For example in one zone gravel recruitment is a primary physical process and in another it is a secondary ecological function.
- Justification needs to be provided for all targets and actions. An explanation of how "grades" were assigned needs to be included.
- Where short term and long term targets are presented the acreage presented in the long term targets should always have the same relationship to the short term targets. For example: the long term target would include an additional 1,000 acres of something instead of saying the long term target is 3,000 acres which includes the short term target (2,000 acres).
- The Reclamation Board of the State of California is major jurisdictional agency for the State and federal flood control project, separate from the Corps. They are not discussed in this document.
- Need to expand the definition of terms particularly need to define ecosystem process, ecosystem function and ecosystem stressor. Acronyms, especially those which are uncommon need to be spelled out the first time used in the text.
- There is a fair amount of discussion of restoration of upper watersheds, above the dams. This leads the reader to believe we will be doing quite a bit in these areas. This could be inconsistent with the watershed management policy that is being developed.