

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: 2001-E215 **Short Proposal Title:** Biological Restoration, Phase 2.

1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region. Per staff review, this proposal is applicable to ERP Goals 1 (At-Risk Species) and 4 (Habitats). Per the applicant, it is also applicable to Goals 2(Ecosystem Processes), 5 (Invasive Species), and 6 (Water Quality). As this is not a restoration project in the strictest sense, it will not contribute to any of the regional restoration goals for tidal marsh.

Relative to CVPIA priorities, staff review indicated that the project may contribute to implementation of the Habitat Restoration Program and that it supports Delta evaluation 6 (additional shallow-water habitat for anadromous fishes in the Delta). Note that a portion of this project is located in San Pablo Bay, which is outside the CVPIA program boundaries.

2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region. Applicants indicate that this is Phase II of a previously funded CALFED project. Also, all of the marshes included in the proposal are owned by entities that plan some restoration in future, but not necessarily at these sites. Also, Tubbs Island (owned by USFWS) is adjacent to Tolay Creek, where there is ongoing restoration monitoring. As appropriate, applicant should coordinate between this proposed study (or Phase I) and the Tolay Creek monitoring.

3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner. Panel concurs with TARP summary that technical feasibility is high, however, objectives are difficult to evaluate and it is unclear how they will assess the objectives.

Panel also concurs with staff comment that Phase II should not be funded until Phase I is completed and the results analyzed.

4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project. Due to a poorly written proposal and questionable Phase I results, the applicants' qualifications have been questioned by several reviewers.

5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance). Per the staff review, the applicants did not provide complete environmental compliance information.

6. Cost. Unclear objectives make it difficult to assess reasonableness of cost.

7. Cost sharing. Cost-sharing total is \$471,232. Breakdown is: from CSU Hayward, \$328,502 (match faculty release time and a major equipment expense, accept decreased indirect costs), Contra Costa Mosquito and Vector Control, \$140,000 (restoration work), and San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge, \$2,730 (restoration, vegetation transplant,

and bird monitoring at Tubbs Island). The Wildlife Refuge total seems low for what they will contribute.

8. Additional

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Low

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: The applicant needs to build upon Phase I results prior to requesting additional funding. Panel is unsure that the expected products or outcomes will fulfill the project's objectives. Also, concerned that the proposed restoration actions may not be self-sustaining.