

## Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

**Proposal number:** 2001-E210

**Short Proposal Title:** Sun River Restoration

**1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** Applicability to both ERP goals and CVPIA priorities as they relate to terrestrial priorities are clearly described. Consistent with CALFED’s vision for the north delta habitat corridor.

**2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** Linkages to several large-scale Central Valley/Bay-Delta plans are identified. The panel sees no conflicts with other projects.

**3. Feasibility, especially the project’s ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** This proposal seeks funding for seven months of final design/site construction, and two out of five years of maintenance/monitoring. The panel concurs with the TARP comments that technical feasibility is high as there appears to be no contingencies or requirements to hinder the proposed work schedule. We see no conditions that would prevent the proposed project from meeting the three-year timeline. We do have a concern with the current lack of funding for the other three years of maintenance/ monitoring. If not subsequently secured, that leaves the proposed project with an inadequate two-year monitoring program.

**4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Concur with TARP summary that qualifications are adequate.

**5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** The Refuge has made many contacts, and broad support has been expressed. FWS assuring no long-term loss in tax revenue through PILT payments is questionable, as PILT funding depends upon Congressional appropriation.

**6. Cost.** Cost for this project is \$2.2 million to convert 207 acres of existing grazing land to marsh, riparian, and other aquatic habitats.

\$800,000 (which is 37% of the total project cost) is expected to be raised from “other sources.” This significant amount of additional funding is in no way assured, thus there is a question of project completion as proposed.

**7. Cost sharing.** \$831,987 will be pursued from “other” (non-CALFED) sources.

**8. Additional comments.** No guarantee that complete project will be funded due to cost sharing needs.

Panel noted that the hypothesis section weak as it simply describes CALFED goals and further project description.

---

## **Regional Ranking**

**Panel Ranking:** Medium

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** Although individual reviews were GOOD and EXCELLENT, we concur with the TARP rating of FAIR, and have assigned the corresponding rank of MEDIUM.

From a regional perspective, there are some benefits to at-risk terrestrial species and project is adjacent to a large freshwater lake and will provide freshwater marsh and seasonal wetlands. These habitats are not common to this area.