

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: 2001–E207 **Short Proposal Title:** Delta Tules: Assessment of Restoration Opportunities

1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region. The proposal appears to have some potential to protect Delta levees from erosion by reestablishing tule stands. Applicable to Goals 1, 2, 4, and 6. Reference to ERP Strategic Plan objectives.

2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region. Could provide additional information to other shallow water restoration projects in the Delta; not expressed in the proposal. Linkages to two previously-funded CALFED projects, plus applicability to many shallow water restoration efforts within the Delta.

3. Feasibility, especially the project’s ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner. The proposal is presented in such a global manner it’s hard to assess its feasibility. The proposal appears to be an initial attempt to try to establish a scientific basis for widespread replanting of tules in the Delta based on broad and vague assumptions of the importance of tules to salmonids.

With a general monitoring plan, feasibility is difficult to assess.

Panel agrees with TARP concern re GIS feasibility.

4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project. The applicant has experience with replanting of aquatic plants and biotechnical bank protections, including two previous CALFED funded projects.

The stated project team appears to meet qualification requirements.

5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance). Applicant states CEQA categorical exemption. Access permission to channel not needed in first phase. Reclamation district cooperation.

6. Cost. \$1,470,000; vagueness of proposal makes cost as related to benefits difficult to determine.

7. Cost sharing. \$40,000 in-kind services, University of Southern California

8. Additional comments. Panel feels the project could be improved with more detail on the monitoring plan and fisheries sampling plan. Proposal has a lot of potential, but lack of information makes panelists uncomfortable recommending funding at this time.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Medium low

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: The proposal received the lowest ranking of all proposals from the TARP. It includes broad unsupported assumptions that left the science reviewers unable to assess its feasibility. Although it is in need of much more justification and refinement, it could yield potential benefits to future restoration projects.