i. Proposal number.# 2001-C204*
ii. Short proposal title .# Sedimentation in the Delta and Suisun Bay*

APPLICABILITY TO CALFED ERP GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
1a1. Link to ERP Strategic Goals : What Strategic Goal(s) is /are addressed
by this proposal? List the letter(s) of all that apply.

A. At-risk species
B. Rehabilitate natural processes
C. Maintain harvested species
D. Protect-restore functional habitats
E. Prevent non-native species and reduce impacts
F. Improve and maintain water quality# The proposed project would contribute
most to Goal 2 (rehabilitate natural processes). It would also make
incremental contributions to Goal 4 (protect/restore habitats), and only
minor contributions to Goal 1 (at-risk species), Goal 3 (harvested species)
and Goal 5 (non-native invasive species).*

1a2. Describe the degree to which the proposal will contribute to the
relevant goal. Quantify your assessment and identify the contribution to
ERP targets, when possible .# 7 pts. Continuation of sedimentation monitoring
could provide valuable data for understanding sediment fluxes. Such data
could inform decisions about where to locate restored wetlands in the Delta
so that they are more sustainable.*

1b. Objectives: What Strategic Objective(s) is/are addressed by this
proposal? List Objective (from the table of 32 objectives) and describe
potential contribution to ERP Goals. Quantify your assessment, when
possible .# 7 pts. The proposed project would make its greatest contribution
to process-oriented objectives (2-3) by describing the movement of sediment
into and through the Delta. Such informatoin would make incremental
contributions to habitat objectives (4-1) by providing a better
understanding of how restored wetland habitats are likely to accrete or
erode.*

1c. Restoration Actions: Does the proposal address a Restoration Action
identified in Section 3.5 of the PSP? Identify the action and describe how
well the proposed action relates to the identified Restoration Action.# 5
pts. The proposed project does not directly address any restoration action
identified in the PSP, but it represents a project that is complementary to
several of the 12 uncertainties.*

1d. Stage 1 Actions: Is the proposal linked directly, indirectly or not linked to proposed
Stage 1 Actions? If linked, describe how the proposal will contribute to ERP actions during
Stage 1.# 6pts. The proposed project does address a Stage 1 action identified in the Integrated Water Management Bundle: Action 53.2--supplement existing monitoring programs.*

1e. MSCS: Describe how the proposal is linked to the Multi-Species Conservation Strategy and if it's consistent with the MSCS Conservation measures. Identify the species addressed and whether the proposal will "recover", "contribute to recovery" or "maintain" each species.# 3 pts. The proposed project would not make a direct contribution to sensitive species, but the data provided by the proposed monitoring could make an indirect contribution to sensitive species.*

1f. Information Richness/Adaptive Probing related to the proposal: Describe the degree to which the proposal provides information to resolve one of the 12 scientific uncertainties (Section 3.3 of the PSP), and whether the proposal offers a prudent approach to answer these uncertainties.# 7 pts. As a monitoring project, the proposal would yield basic data to improve our understanding of an important ecological process--the flux of sediment into and through the Delta.*

1g. Summarize comments from section 1a through 1f related to applicability to CALFED goals and priorities. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# 7 pts. Continuation of the proposed monitoring would likely produce valuable data and help us gain a better understanding of sedimentation processes, and how they affect, and are affected by, restored wetland habitats. The proposal is not clear enough in describing exactly what the monitoring is aiming at--project proponents should be encouraged to clarify the real target of the monitoring. My principal reservation about this project is whether restoration funds should be dedicated to expand regional monitoring, or if such monitoring should be funded by, and coordinated with, the Science Program.*

APPLICABILITY TO CVPIA PRIORITIES
1i. Describe the expected contribution to natural production of anadromous
fish. Specifically identify the species and races of anadromous fish that
are expected to benefit from the project, the expected magnitude of the
contribution to natural production for each species and race of anadromous
fish, the certainty of the expected benefits, and the immediacy and duration
of the expected contribution. Provide quantitative support where available
(for example, expected increases in population indices, cohort replacement
rates, or reductions in mortality rates).# All races of chinook salmon, steelhead trout, American shad, striped bass and green and white sturgeon could eventually benefit from the improved understanding of sediment transport and deposition in the Delta that might stem from the proposed project. Improved understanding is an immediate long term benefit.*

1j. List the threatened or endangered species that are expected to benefit
from the project. Specifically identify the status of the species and races
of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, any other
special-status species that are expected to benefit, and the ecological
community or multiple-species benefits that are expected to occur as a
result of implementing the project.# Winter run (endangered), spring run (threatened), fall and late-fall run chinook salmon (candidate); steelhead trout (threatened); Delta smelt and splittail (threatened) and possibly green sturgeon (California species of concern). Improved understanding of sediment transport and deposition processes in the Delta would benefit all habitat restoration actions in the Delta and thus all species.*

1k. Identify if and describe how the project protects and restores natural
channel and riparian habitat values. Specifically address whether the
project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values,
whether the project promotes natural processes, and the immediacy and
duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values.# The project would document and analyze suspended sediment and bedload transport under a variety of channel morphometric and hydrologic conditions. This information would be important in efforts to protect or restore these conditions throughout the Delta.*

1l. Identify if and how the project contributes to efforts to modify CVP
operations. Identify the effort(s) to modify CVP operations to which the
proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Efforts to modify CVP
operations include modifications to provide flows of suitable quality,
quantity, and timing to protect all life stages of anadromous fish as
directed by Section 3406 (b)(1)(B) of the CVPIA, including flows provided
through management of water dedicated under Section 3406(b)(2) and water
acquired pursuant to Section 3406(b)(3).# Study findings could conceivably result in changes to timing or location of b(2) releases.*

1m. Identify if and how the project contributes to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA. Identify the supporting measure(s) to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Supporting measures include the Water Acquisition Program, the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, and others.# Project would contribute to 3406(g) modeling effort.*

1n. Summarize comments from section 1i through 1m related to applicability to CVPIA priorities (if applicable, identify the CVPIA program appropriate to consider as the source of CVPIA funding [for example, the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Habitat Restoration Program, Water Acquisition Program, Tracy Pumping Plant Mitigation Program, Clear Creek Restoration Program, Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, and Anadromous Fish Screen Program]). Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# The project would continue to quantify and analyze suspended sediment and bedload transport processes in the Delta. Improved understanding of sediment transport and storage would benefit efforts to protect or restore natural channel and riparian processes in areas of the Delta where juvenile salmonids rear or through which all life stages migrate. The project would thus contribute to efforts to double natural production of Central Valley anadromous fish populations and qualify for consideration under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program.*

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS
2a. Did the applicant explain how the proposed project relates to other past and future ecosystem restoration projects, as required on page 57 in the PSP? Type in yes or no.#yes.*

2b. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on other information on restoration projects available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, describe how the proposed project complements other ecosystem restoration projects, including CALFED and CVPIA. Identify projects or types of projects that the proposed project would complement, now or in the future. Identify source of information.#Continuation of project to measure and analyze sediment transport. Information from this project relates to other sediment and dissolved carbon water quality projects funded by CALFED, particularly for modeling mercury and selenium transport. This project fills in identified data gaps of CALFED, IEP, and RMP projects that sample less frequently.*

RESULTS AND PROGRESS ON PREVIOUSLY FUNDED CALFED AND CVPIA PROJECTS, INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING
3a1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project

reports and data available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, has the applicant previously received CALFED or CVPIA funding? Type CALFED, CVPIA, both, or none .#CALFED*

3a2. If the answer is yes, list the project number(s), project name(s) and whether CALFED or CVPIA funding. If the answer is none, move on to item 4.#97B02 Sediment Movement and availability and monitoring in the Delta.*

3b1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, did the applicant accurately state the current status of the project(s) and the progress and accomplishments of the project(s) to date? Type yes or no.#yes*

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#yes*

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#The first phase of this project is progressing well. Source: quarterly reports, CALFED tracking table.*

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4.#97B02.*

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or no.#yes*

3e2. Based on the information presented in the summary and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, is the project ready for next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#yes*

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#The first phase is progressing well and they are ready for the next phase funding. Source: Proposal, CALFED tracking table.*

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT
4a. Does the proposal describe a plan for public outreach, as required on page 61 of the PSP? Type yes or no.# No.*

4b. Based on the information in the proposal, highlight outstanding issues related to support or opposition for the project by local entities including

watershed groups and local governments, and the expected magnitude of any potential third-party impacts.# No apparent opposition or third party impacts; this is the continuation of an existing study.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Project proponent should consider seeking permission to attach the scientific devices to existing structures and platforms. Most of the structures and platforms in the Delta and Suisun Bay are private property and as such will require that permission be obtained from the owner.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# No Comment*

COST

5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.#Yes*

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.#Yes*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#Yes, overhead rate is 89.25% of costs*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.#No line item-costs are small and built in to each task*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.#Project management costs need to be clearly identified*

COST SHARING

6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.#No*

6b. Are applicants specifically requesting either state or federal cost share dollars? Type state, federal, or doesn't matter.#Doesn't matter*

6c. List cost share given in proposal and note whether listed cost share is

identified (in hand) or proposed.

6c1. In-kind:#n/a*

6c2. Matching funds:#n/a*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#n/a*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# n/a*