

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: H203 Short Title: Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy

Based on the knowledge and experience of the panel members, please add to or comment on the information in the Scientific and Technical or Staff reviews regarding the following:

1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.

Applies to recovery of at-risk species (primarily steelhead), and ecosystem processes within the 170 square mile Sonoma Creek Watershed which is in the Suisun Marsh/San Francisco Bay Ecozone. The proposal's area of focus is not within the CVPIA implementation region.

2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.

Very strong linkages . This proposal is linked to two previous non-CALFED studies involving Sonoma Creek (see page 10), two current non-CALFED projects (CDFG and Sonoma County Water Agency), and two previous CALFED funded projects within the watershed ((1998-E02 and 2000-E04). Project status for the two CALFED funded projects is detailed in an application appendix. Connections are also made to planned future efforts.

3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.

Technical feasibility has been previously demonstrated. The Schedule is specified by the proposed 14 tasks, and is clear and concise. The SCWC has developed a track record through first phase funding (1998-E02) with significant progress documented on pages 17 and 18 of the proposal.

4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.

The team is qualified to perform the work. Most technical tasks are specified by team member. A potential concern is that the project will be managed by an "unnamed" Watershed Coordinator at SSCRCD.

5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).

Local involvement is high as the applicant is a local Watershed Conservancy which consists of a partnership of local stakeholders. Collaborators are extensive, many have

sent letters of support, including a local Congressional member. There are no identified third-party impacts.

6. Cost.

Costs are broken down by task, classification, and hours. We concur with the previous Panel Summary comment that “Monitoring description and detail insufficient to assess appropriateness of budget. Should complete QA/QC and then review budget.”

7. Cost sharing.

This is a major strength in the proposal. The requested amount of \$545,170 is matched by \$1,297,000 in other funding sources and in-kind contributions, of which \$733,000 will be available at the start date of the proposed project.

8. Additional comments.

We concur with the previous panel summary comment 1b2 that vegetation conditions should be included under the Watershed Conditions section of the proposal, and with comment 2a that existing monitoring elements are insufficiently described to adequately assess the outcome of the project.

Regional Ranking : Medium

Panel Ranking: Medium

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking

The previous Individual Reviews were “GOOD” “VERY GOOD” and “VERY GOOD”, while the overall evaluation from the previous Panel Summary was “GOOD.” Our Panel rating of “MEDIUM” for this project reflects the high feasibility and high value of watershed collaboration, but questionable nature of the monitoring program.