

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-G202-1

Short Proposal Title: Staten Island Acquisition

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. The objectives are to protect and restore wetlands, expand the habitat corridor along the Cosumnes and Mokelumne Rivers, and to benefit target wildlife populations of the East Delta.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. The conceptual model is a clear, detailed, and comprehensive flow chart that adequately addresses the underlying basis of the proposed project.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. This is a straightforward acquisition request.

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

Yes. Given the experience and proven track record of the Cosumnes River Preserve the choice of a full-scale implementation project is reasonable.

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

Yes. Land managers will be interested in the economic viability of wildlife-friendly farming practices and natural resource specialists will focus on water quality assessments and waterfowl habitat improvement.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

No. The primary biological/ecological objectives listed on page one of this proposal will not be adequately addressed by monitoring the number and diversity of bird species in the fields between September and March.

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

No. The monitoring and data collection sections in this proposal reference BLM's proposal #G-201 (Phase I). It is not clearly stated what data this proposal will collect if Phase I is not funded.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Unknown. The Proposal Solicitation Package asks applicants to "provide brief biographical sketches of the principal participants that identify qualifications". No individuals are identified as members of the project team in this proposal.

Miscellaneous comments

H. Compliance with Standard Terms and Conditions – the applicant has requested several changes and did not indicate a willingness to comply with state and federal standard terms.

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

This will be an excellent project when fully developed. My understanding is that the applicant and landowners are in the early stages of negotiating a deal. As previous CALFED awards have shown unexpected and unforeseen hurdles can derail promising real estate transactions. Committing \$35,000,000, for three years, to a land deal that does not have a signed purchase agreement is premature. However, CALFED could award the \$80,000 requested for due diligence in this funding cycle to support this potential acquisition.