

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: 2001-B203

Short Proposal Title: Invasive Spartina Project

1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region. This project is highly compatible to ERP Goals and regional goals.

D. Habitats, Objectives 1,3

E. Invasive Species Objectives 5,7

2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region. The problem is linked to nearly all tidal marsh restoration projects in the Suisun and San Pablo regions, *S. alterniflora* may affect the success of future restoration efforts in these areas. The information learned from the proposed research will likely assist in planning and implementing future restoration and eradication efforts. However, this project is not well linked to ongoing efforts. The proposal does not explain the proposed research in a way that facilitates one to clearly delineate the linkages between research and management and existing projects.

3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner. The objectives are clearly presented; however, the proposal does not outline clearly how these objectives will be reached. Furthermore, the proposal didn't illustrate in a clear manner, a logical progression of tasks. This made it difficult to assess the feasibility of many of the objectives and the project as a whole. Of particular concern is whether the web database portion of the proposal is necessary. On the positive side, reference was made regarding the feasibility of control efforts in Washington and preliminary control efforts in SF Bay.

Also the effectiveness of removal efforts will be difficult to measure except if carried out in a highly experimental fashion (ie., stratified in some way regionally with control sites - the proposal does not address this.)

4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project. Coastal Conservancy has a good record with CALFED (see Staff comments). The team of researchers is well qualified to perform the research indicated.

5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance). The Coastal Conservancy has a good record of involving local entities and all of the necessary paperwork appears in order, notification letters, etc. Currently developing EIR.

6. Cost. The budget is extremely difficult to follow in its present form. It should be divided by task, particularly so portions of the project can be scaled down, i.e., the website database. CALFED staff noted the need to clarify project management costs and ensure totals are accurate. Costs seemed excessive.

7. Cost sharing. Match is provided by Coastal Conservancy and other entities – seems appropriate, but a simpler budget would make this easier to assess.

8. Additional comments. The TARP felt that some components of the proposal were very strong and should be supported, while other components of the proposal were weak and not justified. Given this, they recommended a particular order which the panel has modified based on our consideration of regional restoration priorities.

Excellent - genetics

Very good - alternative control experiments

Good - North Bay control efforts, shorebird research

Fair - mapping with GPS to verify locations for control, education and outreach

Poor - database development and extensive website development - should be removed for cost feasibility

Education and outreach is an important element that wasn't well articulated but is important to project development for scientific community as well as the public.

The shorebird research has been moved to a higher ranking because it is one of the key reasons for concern however if this proposal is funded, the applicant needs to ensure analysis of existing data will occur relative to *Spartina a.* distribution. The mapping is very important to track potential control sites and areas of control.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Medium

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: High in importance, but the proposal was poorly written. Recommend partial funding for important components identified above.