

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: 2001-C203 **Short Proposal Title:** Restoration of Delta Terraces Through Bioengineering

1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region. ERP Goals 1, 2, 4, and 6 are applicable to proposal. This proposal would support the CVPIA AFRP plan alternative 4 (high priority) and Alternative 6 (high priority).

2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region. This is the applicant's third CALFED application and is apparently similar to the first two. Effectiveness of the previous bank stabilization efforts are unknown. See comment on monitoring in additional comments.

3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner. Project implementation is feasible but what constitutes long-term project success is difficult to ascertain. "Success" criteria not well defined as to measurability. See comment on monitoring in additional comments.

4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project. Applicants and subs are qualified to carry out proposal based on two similar previous CALFED projects. It is unknown if a fisheries biologist is included in this proposal, suggest staff include a fisheries biologist.

5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance). Local support for work on private property and reclamation district lands. Reclamation district is lead CEQA agency. Categorical exemption expected.

6. Cost. Cost would be reasonable if they include an extensive monitoring effort.

7. Cost sharing. No local financial support. Applicant should investigate funding from AB360 (Delta Flood Protection Program) and other local entities related to levee protection.

8. Additional comments. Difficult to assess cost/benefit of proposal. Efficacy questioned by science panel.

Concur with the TARP that monitoring and post implementation evaluation for effectiveness is poor. One strength of this proposal is to encourage use of soft engineering alternatives and the information it provides to reclamation districts. The proposal lacks a clear explanation as to how improvements in the reduction in wave scouring is defined and measured, particularly over time. It appears more designed to take advantage of opportunities to test various biotechnical bank stabilization techniques.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Medium

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: The proposal is important in that it establishes the soft fixes but the panel would like to see better biological monitoring to facilitate adaptive management.