

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: 2001-F204 **Short Proposal Title:** Monitoring and Assessing the Ecosystem

1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region. Proposal states applicability to Goals 4 (Habitats) and 6 (Water Quality). However the project is probably most useful for assessing ecological conditions of terrestrial environment and wetlands (biomass, vegetation density) -Goal 4. This project could be an important step in developing spatial and temporal information in trends in wetland plant communities; however its direct applicability to water quality, beyond estimates of sediment and productivity, would be minimal. (See 3 below)

2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region. The proponent did not do a very good job of linking this work to the previously funded research or restoration projects (even those carried out by UCD researchers), nor was it at all specific about the location of the study. Providing a general map of the CALFED solution area did little to clarify their intent.

3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner. It is unclear from the proposal whether existing data are available to support the analyses proposed. Because the applicant proposed to use existing data, the data will dictate the success of the project. Consequently, the proponent should demonstrate that the necessary data is available before the project is funded. As noted by an individual review, there are three concerns that should be addressed: 1) the spatial resolution of the remote sensing images; 2) timely availability of the remote sensing images; 3) concurrent timing of field data and remote sensing data.

4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project. All applicants are well qualified, but the duties of several team members and collaborators were not described. Additional team members who are knowledgeable in water quality, Delta biology and processes would strengthen this proposal.

5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance). Not applicable.

6. Cost. Appears reasonable but vague budget.

7. Cost sharing. None.

8. Additional comments. The spatial scope is overly ambitious.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Medium low

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: Remote sensing approaches have enormous potential. The proposal was strong on describing methods but weak on presenting a conceptual model that explained the connection of this work to CALFED management. The panel echoes the sentiment of the TARP, “ this approach could be useful, but specific detail using the ground truth methodology was not included, an essential component in evaluating the utility of this technique.” The group should be encouraged to resubmit after better focusing their approach and proposal.