Cosumnes River Passage Improvement Monitoring Program

Trevor A Kennedy

Initial Selection Panel Review

Not Recommended

Amount Sought: **$**251,647

Fund This Amount: $**0**

Brief explanation of rating:

Baed in large part on the "inadequate" rating by the Technical Paenl, the Selection Panel does not recommend this proposal. All reviewers noted a distinct lack of detail regarding methodologies, with minimal technical presentation of needed information. Assumptions are made and depended on without support or justification. Usefulness and delivery of the data is unclear. The proposal noticeably lacks literature citations. The restoration strategy of fish passage is documented, so continued monitoring of passage has limited utility (monitoring what we already know by overall escapement surveys). This could have been enhanced by including other environmental variables such as temperature and flow for a more system-assessment monitoring strategy.

Concerns were expressed questioning how accurate the data would be, given the dependence on unproven assumptions. Integration with other Cosumnes River restoration monitoring efforts would have strengthened a collaborative approach. The Selection Panel believes thaht that is a more significant issue for successful fish passage is ground water withdrawl and its effects on the lower river.

Technical Panel Review

Technical Review Panel's Overall Evaluation Rating:
Inadequate

Explanation Of Summary Rating

The Techical Review Panel found that this proposal lacked sufficient detail to conclude that it is adequate. For example, the proposal lacks methodological detail describing how delays and other critical responses will be quantified. Further, it is unlikely that assumptions required for Petersen estimation can be met. Double tagging would enable estimation of tag loss rates. The monitoring of downstream passage of juveniles merits greater attention.

Goals And Justification

The proposal clearly identifies restoration actions whose outcomes will be monitored, and provides a clear and internally consistent statement of the goals and objectives of those restoration actions. The proposal includes a coherent conceptual model. The hypotheses for the proposed monitoring are clearly stated. There are weaknesses in the justifications for the hypotheses. For example, one technical reviewer correctly noted that “There is considerable discussion of ‘improved run timing’ without any definition of what is meant by 'improved' and any discussion of how management activities such as installing fish passage structures will affect run timing. There must be many examples in the primary and gray literature about how variables such as fish passage, delay, stranding, productivity to escapement ratios, etc., respond to installation of fish passage structures – yet no such citations are included in this proposal. I assume that the authors are familiar with this literature, yet outwardly the proposal appears to have been written in a vacuum.” Still, the restoration and monitoring goals and monitoring hypotheses

seem generally appropriate for the Cosumnes River.

Approach

Conceptually, the approach is reasonable and relevant to the project's objectives. However, there is too little detail about any of the methods. This lack of detail left the external technical reviewers with considerable uncertainty about the approach. Important unresolved issues include: 1. Although assumptions of Petersen estimation are listed, it is not clear whether ANY of them can be reasonably satisfied. For example, the assumption of zero tag loss from decomposing carcasses seems unreasonable. A reasonable solution is to double−tag carcasses in order to estimate rates of tag loss. 2. The proposal does not describe how migration delays will be quantified. 3. The rationale for conducting visual observations at selected weirs rather than at the migration barriers is unclear. 4. The description of survey methods is inadequate. What are the specific survey protocols? What is the justification for the expansion factor of 2.5 for redd counts? 5. “Acceptable” fry and smolt emigration is undefined. 6. Sampling efficiency may be a decreasing function of flow and, if so, that pattern would bias the results. It is important to address this issue. 7. Details of the estimation of trap efficiency are lacking. 8. The proposal seeks to improve passage by removing barriers. It is unclear how that will be measured. Historic pre−removal data on timing of upstream migration will be critical to identification of any improvement. 9. The Technical Review Panel believes that increased attention to juvenile outmigration is warranted. The single screw trap is likely inadequate and several traps may be needed to adequately monitor outmigration. 10. The proposal ignores possible influences of environmental variables other than flow. For example, temperature influences behavior, growth, mortality and et cetera yet is not addressed in this proposal.

Feasibility And Likelihood Of Success

The project is, in theory, technically feasible. However, the lack of detail to methodological issues makes it difficult for

the Technical Review Panel to assess the practical feasibility of the project. As a result, the proposal leaves considerable uncertainty about whether the proposed monitoring would produce useful data.

Performance Measures

The data from the proposed monitoring would allow evaluation of the cited restoration actions. There is no explicit description of performance measures, but the performance measures are qualitatively described with the objectives and approach. The rationale for the performance measures is demonstrated. The resulting data and performance measures would allow evaluation of the conceptual model. The plan lacks methodological detail to fully assess the potential value of the performance measures to assessment of restoration efforts.

Products

The products are white papers, memos, notes, quarterly reports and a final report. Given that the Cosumnes River is the last free−flowing tributary, there should be a reasonable expectation that the study will produce results that are publishable in the open peer−reviewed scientific literature, particularly if they can be compared with juvenile production in regulated tributaries. Only publication in the scientific literature registers the results in our collective permanent knowledge base and insures that the work passes the scrutiny of the scientific community.

Capabilities

The project team appears to be very capable of performing the monitoring and reporting.

Budget

The budget appears reasonable and modest to the scientists who reviewed this proposal.

Regional Review

This proposal received a “high” ranking in the regional review. The regional panel believes the proposal will meet high priorities of PSP, CALFED and CVPIA. That review found that: “This project is linked to other AFRP funded projects that have funded additional passage improvements at eight project sites… This project monitors the results of several CVPIA actions using CAMP… The methods and perfomance measures used could be applied to other monitoring on Central Valley tributaries (e.g., Calaveras River)… This project is likely to benefit other projects on the Cosumnes River that improve riparian and floodplain habitat and channel morphology downstream on the 50,000 acre Nature Conservancy Preserve.” The regional panel expressed understandable concern about how information would be delivered to the public.

Administrative Review

The Budget reviewer found the proposed budget to be satisfactory and without significant problem. There is prospect for cost sharing and the budget reviewer would like to see a final budget after all relevant grant funds have been awarded. That reviewer would also like to see “Additional detailed information is required for all work including each specific task, services, and work to be performed with the appropriate and corresponding deliverable or end product for each task(s) and/or sub−task(s).” The Environmental Compliance review indicated that all relevant compliance issues have been adequately addressed in the proposal. The Prior Phase reviewer found the project progress to be entirely satisfactory.

Additional Comments

Delta Regional Review

Delta Regional Panel's Overall Ranking:
High

Summary:

The proposed monitoring project meets the PSP priorities by providing performance measures based on previously funded CALFED and CVPIA projects using fall-run Chinook salmon, and possibly steelhead, to compare to pre-project levels. The project area is within a high priority area identified by the CALFED ERP for restoration and floodplain function. Examples of ERP objectives met by this project are enhanced connectivity of instream aquatic habitats and greater access to upstream spawning and rearing habitat. The project uses standard assessment methods to develop useful management recommendations, such as minimum flow requirements, that minimize the primary stressors. The proposal assesses the cumulative responses of resolving several different types of barriers. One weakness of the proposal is how findings will be disseminated to stakeholders and interested parties(i.e., through public forums, meetings, websites).

1. Applicability To ERP Goals And Regional Priorities.

The proposed continued three-year monitoring of the Cosumnes River Salmonid Barrier Improvement Project will meet the PSP priorities by providing performance measures on previously funded CALFED and CVPIA projects using fall-run Chinook salmon, and possibly steelhead, to compare to pre-project levels. This information will be used to evaluate passage improvements at small dams and crossings funded by the ERP and the AFRP. The improvements made for fish passage meet high-priority goals of both CALFED and the CVPIA. In addition, the Cosumnes River is identified by CALFED as a high priority area for restoration and study of functional floodplain. The proposal uses standard assessment methodology developed for CAMP, the monitoring program established by the CVPIA, Section

3406. Examples of ERP objectives met by this project are enhanced connectivity of instream aquatic habitats and greater access to upstream spawning and rearing habitat.

2. Links With Other Restoration Actions.

This project is linked to other AFRP funded projects that have funded additional passage improvements at eight project sites. Continued monitoring has uncovered other areas of concern, such as fish stranding at two sites, that have been addressed and successfully overcome in the monitoring process. One improvement project still remains to be completed in 2005 (i.e., a boulder weir at Rooney Dam) that has not yet been assessed. In addition, the AFRP had funded a $99,000 pilot study to determine the instream flow needs for salmonids relative to the improvements made by CALFED.

This project monitors the results of several CVPIA actions using CAMP. The methods and perfomance measures used could be applied to other monitoring on Central Valley tributaries (e.g., Calaveras River). The proposal does assess cumulative responses of related restoration actions such as improved instream flows, fall attraction flows, floodplain connectivity, increased spawning and rearing habitat, and increased juvenile production. This project is likely to benefit other projects on the Cosumnes River that improve riparian and floodplain habitat and channel morphology downstream on the 50,000 acre Nature Conservancy Preserve.

3. Local Circumstances.

Due to previous involvement with local property owners and water rights districts there are no constraints on access to sites or the project's ability to move forward. This project is feasible and appropriate to the project site, uses established protocols and methods, makes realistic assumptions, and operates within environmental permits.

4. Local Involvement.

The applicant has been working closely for the last three years with CDFG, the USFWS (i.e. AFRP projects), The Nature Conservancy, Rancho Murieta Community Services District, local water districts, the Resource Conservation District and private landowners adjacent to the Consumnes River. The applicant will continue to coordinate with these groups throughout the monitoring process. All involved parties have been contacted in 2004 and have enthusiastically agreed to grant access for future monitoring activities. The project involves public agencies and local non−profit organizations, like the Cosumnes River Preserve, which are active in the restoration of the region's ecosystem. The project will ensure that the local partnerships already established will continue in the long−term to provide research and habitat improvements.

One weakness of the proposal is the dissemination of information to stakeholders so they can be informed of monitoring activities and findings (i.e. public forums, meetings, website info.). It is unclear from the proposal how the FFC plans to make data available to the public. No mention is given of where reports can be found, who they will be submitted to, if they will be peer reviewed, or in what media they will reported.

5. Local Value.

The value of continuing this monitoring for another three years is in the quantification of benefits to fall−run Chinook salmon population, and possibly steelhead, in the Cosumnes River. The project will synthesize escapement and outmigrant data, draw conclusions on population level effects, and recommend actions (i.e., minimum flows) useful in management decisions. In addition, the project will link private and public groups in a stong partnership dedicated to the restoration of not just a river, but an entire watershed. The proposal will monitor existing passage improvements at small dams and low flow barriers that will increase minimum flow requirements necessary for connecting the upstream spawning and rearing areas with the downstream floodplain restoration.

This project is like a stepping stone to multiple projects contemplated by other programs. The only adjustments needed are a wider distribution to the public of monitoring updates through a university or IEP website. The studies provide an example of a collaborative approach to monitoring and can be used at various regional scales.

6. Other Comments:

Documentation of the use of escapement and juvenile production to evaluate passage improvements (i.e., literature citations) would be appropriate, as well as peer review of white papers and final reports produced by the study.

External Technical Review #1

Goals And Justification

Yes to all these questions. The fish passage restorations at six structures in the Cosumnes River were clearly described. The objectives of the 3–year monitoring program are stated, and support the goals of the CALFED. Monitoring is based on a series of testable hypotheses that will help determine success of the restoration, or will point out areas that need additional improvement.

Approach

The proposal builds on previous studies and monitoring of fish passage in the Cosumnes River. The proposed monitoring will use techniques consistent with these previous studies. It is adequate to test the hypotheses advanced about improved upstream fish passage and increased Chinook salmon production in the river resulting from the restoration.

Technical Feasibility

Yes, the proposed activities would use standard techniques for field monitoring and analyzing data, and are sufficient to accomplish the objectives.

Performance Measures

Yes, the field observations will allow judgments to be made about whether the fish passage restoration that has occurred at these 6 structures will reduce/eliminate spawning delays and stranding, will make higher quality spawning habitat upstream from the structures available to more salmon, and will result in the production of more outmigrating juveniles. There are no plans to monitor other factors that might limit salmon production in the river, such as degraded water quality and water temperatures or degraded habitat from water withdrawals or use by cattle. The proposers recognize these factors (and intend to be involved in future restoration

related to these possible impacts). Presumably these other factors will be monitored incidentally as a part of the proposed monitoring of fish passage in the river and near the fish passage structures.

Products

Yes. Memos, notes, white papers, quarterly reports, and a final report will be issued. Data will be held securely for five years after completion of the project in FFC offices. I didn't see any statements about making these data available to others, but the investigators seem to be part of an ongoing, open process of information and resource sharing among stakeholders in the basin.

Capabilities

Yes, the project team is experienced and capable of carrying out the monitoring.

Budget

Yes, the budget is reasonable.

Additional Comments

It is rare to see performance monitoring of fish passage structures. Most often, they are installed and operated, and the assumption is made that they are working as hoped. This proposal is a good example of adaptive management – focused monitoring to determine whether the fish passage structures have had the desired effect of restoring the Chinook salmon population to the Cosumnes River. If not, the proposed monitoring will help determine the specific actions that need to be taken at which structures to improve the benefits.

External Technical Review #2

Goals And Justification

The proposal, "Cosumnes River passage improvement monitoring program" is the second phase of a restoration program wherein six structures on the Cosumnes River were modified to improve passage of Chinook salmon. The goal of the current proposal is to continue monitoring the impacts of the improved structures by evaluating the response of the salmon population in terms of migration timing, spawning locations, and smolt production. This goal is clearly stated and referred to consistently throughout the proposal. The conceptual model (page 11) is quite clear, but it does omit water temperature, a critically important controlling variable. I acknowledge that water temperature is affected by streamflow (a controlling process that was included in the model), but was surprised that it was omitted, as it has direct bearing on all of the life history requirements. The hypotheses are fairly clear, though whether they are completely justified relative to existing knowledge is debatable. For the most part, the hypotheses provide reasonable, testable statements, but it is not clear whether the planned monitoring will collect enough information to be able to equivocally support or reject the hypotheses (i.e., the reason run timing, escapement, spawning distribution is because of the improvements to fish passage structures), because the investigators are not considering some of the other salient factors, like temperature.

Approach

The approach appears to show careful consideration of the project objectives, but the description often lacked the detail to fully evaluate the monitoring approach. There was some concern regarding the application of the Petersen estimator. The approach in itself is sound, and commonly used in fisheries biology but again some of the specific details were lacking. How are they being marked, and do the investigators have some idea of what the rate of tag/mark loss will be? Can the investigators assume that the population is

truly closed? The approach does seem to integrate well with prior work funded by CalFed and AFRP, though it would have been nice to see some more incorporation of the data from that work (e.g., from the snorkel surveys and rotary screw trap) in the current design. One final criticism of the approach is that the expected products and results do not include a peer−reviewed publication submitted to a scientific journal like the North American Journal of Fisheries Management. If the project (both this portion and the previously−funded restoration activities) are truly well designed, then the data collected should be of sufficient quality for publication. It would definitely be a benefit to the fisheries profession if reports of studies of this type were published, providing managers with a better concept of the various approaches for solving fish passage issues.

Technical Feasibility

The project, on a whole is technically feasible and doesn't present any novel challenges. The lack of detail in some of the explanations does make it hard to evaluate whether the investigators have fully addressed the technical aspects of the project (I suspect they have, but cannot say so based on the lack of some information). For example, on p. 13 the investigators mention that they will conduct visual observations of migrating salmon behavior at selected weirs, yet provide no information on which weirs will be used, what times of day the observations will be carried out under or whether any sort of back−up observation system (e.g., video cameras) will be used for QAQC activities. The trap efficiency tests using marked fish are another area of concern. No details are provided on the source of the fish – are they wild fish caught upstream, or hatchery−reared fish raised specifically for this project? If the latter, will the sample's size structure match that of the outmigrating salmon? How many marked fish will be released? Unlike many proposed projects, this one does appear to have the full cooperation of all the key stakeholders, and despite some "interesting" language in the feasibility section, it appears that if funded, the investigators should not encounter obstacles with gaining access to the study area.

Performance Measures

As mentioned before, the data being collected will allow the investigators to determine whether the restoration actions on the six sites on Cosumnes River have had a positive effect on the salmon population. What the currently proposed project will not do is allow the investigators to say that the population responded in manner X solely because of factor Y. However, provided that the funding agency is solely interested in the result (a healthier salmon population) and not necessarily the mechanisms underlying the result, this should not present a problem. The monitoring plan is fairly specific about how they will evaluate whether the improved fish passage has allowed for earlier migration of adult salmon to superior spawning habitat, and hence greater production of juveniles and earlier migration of those juveniles out of the system.

Products

In addition to the criticism regarding the exclusion of a peer−reviewed scientific manuscript as one of the products, it appears that this project is not designed to provide easy access to project data, exclusive of that provided in reports and white papers. The data handling and storage measures appear adequate, but the data dissemination efforts could be improved. Possible methods of improving them include, but are not limited to: a website where regular updates on project status (e.g., salmon numbers) could be posted, along with links to archived data; the peer−reviewed article in a tier−1 journal, and; some mechanism whereby any interested party has access to the project data. Though I suspect that the project could produce data that will stand up to scrutiny by a scientific peer−review panel, there is not enough detail in the description of the data collection and analyses to say so without hesitation.

Capabilities

The capabilities of the project team should allow them to successfully complete the work, and their past performance with the restoration activities certainly suggests that they

have the ability to deliver on project objectives in a timely manner.

Budget

Overall, the budget looks fine, though it might be better to spend more on labor for escapement and outmigration monitoring, and less on project management.

Additional Comments

N/A

External Technical Review #3

Goals And Justification

The proposal does a good job of describing the restoration actions that have already been put in place as well as justifying why these actions were necessary. The overall need for fish passage structures as well as monitoring their effectiveness is quite clear, and it is exciting to see these restoration actions being implemented and monitored. However, the proposal contains many statements that, while likely accurate, are completely unsupported by any citations from previous work. It would be important to know what the knowledge base is that this work is building upon.

There is considerable discussion of "improved run timing" without any definition of what is meant by "improved" and any discussion of how management activities such as installing fish passage structures will affect run timing. There must be many examples in the primary and gray literature about how variables such as fish passage, delay, stranding, productivity to escapement ratios, etc., respond to installation of fish passage structures – yet no such citations are included in this proposal. I assume that the authors are familiar with this literature, yet outwardly the proposal appears to have been written in a vacuum.

The conceptual model is fairly clear and straightforward. It is clear that stream flow is an important component of salmon recruitment in this river. Since the restoration actions do not directly impact flow, however, I would change the emphasis from flow to fish passage, since that is what is actually being managed and monitored.

The hypotheses to be addressed in the monitoring work are clearly stated and make sense within the framework of the restoration goals. However, the exact responses to be monitored are not stated very quantitatively. They are all stated relative to pre−restoration states, yet it is not clear from the proposal whether pre−restoration data are thorough enough to make these comparisons.

Approach

The proposal provides a reasonably clear overall picture of the monitoring activities to be implemented. However there is very little detail describing any of the methods other than the assumptions behind mark–recapture estimates of population size and screw trap efficiency. This makes the approach very difficult to evaluate and leaves a number of unresolved issues such as:

– How will delay and hindrance at dams be quantified?

– It is stated that visual observations will be conducted at selected weirs. Why not conduct observations at the actual dams (besides Granlees Dam, where observations will be conducted)? If passage at low flow is a problem, it seems like observations directly at the fish passage structures during low flow would be easy to make, and would provide a much better assessment of how well the passage structures are working.

– Will escapement to the Cosumnes River, and in particular the stretches that will be improved by the restoration actions, be quantified relative to the overall escapement in the system? If not, how will we know that increased escapement is a direct effect of the restoration actions, other than some other cause such as better ocean conditions or lower fishing pressure?

– Need to provide better description of carcass surveys, redd counts, etc. There is no actual description of the stream surveying process. What is the assumption behind the 2.5 expansion factor for redd counts? On what data is the assumption based?

– There are a number of statements about good conditions for smolt emigration but no supporting references provided.

– What constitutes “acceptable fry and smolt emigration”?

– A lot of emphasis is placed on the importance of flow, and it is a good idea to try to quantify a number of response

variables as a function of flow. Yet, fish sampling efficiency is highly sensitive to flow – how will the methods account for this?

– These types of restoration actions and monitoring methods have been conducted throughout salmon–producing streams. What has been learned and published, and how will this information be used in this proposal? How will the information learned in this restoration and monitoring project be useful to other projects?

Technical Feasibility

The scale of the project seems to match its objectives well. There is a good description of collaborations between all of the stakeholders in the study area, which gives reason to be optimistic about the political feasibility of the project. However, the lack of detail in the methodology makes it difficult to assess the technical feasibility of the project and leaves me feeling skeptical about whether the proposed monitoring will produce useful data.

Performance Measures

There is insufficient detail in the proposal and no discussion of performance measures.

Products

Given the lack of detail in the methods section of the proposal, it is very hard to know whether this project will produce useful data for the Cosumnes River or for other similar restoration projects. The only products identified are "white papers, memos, notes, and quarterly reports" – not very meaningful. They seem to have a well–established system for handing, storing, and disseminating the data.

Capabilities

I am not familiar with the people and organizations working in this area, so I am not really qualified to comment on this. It

does appear that this organization has a good history of working on this river, its personnel probably have good knowledge about the populations in the river, and they seem to have developed good working relationships with the other organizations and stakeholders. This all gives reason for optimism that the project will be completed. However, the complete lack of technical description of methods, coupled with a lack of any citations regarding fish passage and monitoring activities from other regions, makes me question the organization's qualifications to carry out this project. I am not suggesting explicitly that they are not qualified – they just have not demonstrated that they are.

Budget

The overall budget is quite modest and well justified. Furthermore, they have acquired additional funding from the AFRP.

Additional Comments

Need to shift the focus of the proposal from describing the restoration actions (which have already been implemented) to describing in much greater detail how the monitoring will actually be conducted.

Budget Review

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of the requested support?
Yes.

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?
Yes.

3. Are project management expenses appropriately budgeted?
Yes.

4. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs? Are indirect rates, if used, appropriately applied?
Yes.

5. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses? Are the labor rates and other charges proposed reasonable in relation to current state rates?
Yes.

6. Are other agencies contributing or likely to contribute a share of the projects costs?
Yes.

If yes, when sufficient information is available, please sum the amount of matching funds likely to be provided:

DFG $15,000; In Kind $5,000; Sac County $50,000; AFRP $120,000– Monitoring $190,000.

Cost Sharing– Recommend that Grantee provide information regarding its financial capability and stability as well as its level of commitment for any proposed cost share funds. A detailed budget of the project's proposed cost share funds should be provided prior to grant funds being awarded. A financial evaluation is recommended for grant agreements that state/claim over 30 % or $250,000 (which ever is less) of matching funds. The evaluation will avoid likelihood of the grantee requesting an amendment to increase project funding due to lack of or miscalculation of matching funds to complete the project.

7. Does the applicant take exception to the standard grant agreement's terms and conditions? If yes, are the approaches the applicant proposes to address these issues a reasonable starting point for negotiating a grant agreement?
Yes.

8. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?
No.

Other comments:

Task and Deliverables –Additional detailed information is required for all work including each specific task, services, and work to be performed with the appropriate and corresponding deliverable or end product for each task(s) and/or sub-task(s). Costs associated with each task and deliverable should be evaluated based on what is considered to be reasonable costs for performing similar services.

Environmental Compliance Review

1. Is compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) required for this project?
No.

2. Is compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required for this project?
No.

3. Does this project qualify for an Exemption or Exclusion under CEQA and NEPA, respectively?
Does not apply.

4. Did the applicant correctly identify if CEQA/NEPA compliance was required?
Yes.

5. Did the applicant correctly identify the correct CEQA/NEPA document required for the project?
Does not apply.

6. Has the CEQA/NEPA document been completed?
Does not apply.

7. If the document has not been completed, did the applicant allot enough time to complete the document before the project start date?
Does not apply.

8. If the document has not been completed, did the applicant allot enough funds to complete it?
Does not apply.

9. Did the applicant adequately identify other legal or regulatory compliance issues (Incidental Take permits, Scientific Collecting permits, etc,) that may affect the project?
Yes.

10. Does the proposal include written permission from the owners of any private property on which project activities are proposed or, if specific locations for project activities are not yet determined, is it likely that permission for access can be obtained?
No.

Comments:

The applicant states that the landowners and local agencies have a good working relationship with them and will grant access to their property but written permission letters from landowners were not attached to the proposal.

11. Do any of these issues affect the project's feasibility due to significant deficiencies in planning and/or budgeting for legal and regulatory compliance or access to property?
No.

Prior−Phase Funding Review

List the CALFED or CVPIA funded phases of this project for which your agency manages contracts:

Project Title	Cosumnes River Salmonid Passage Improvement Project
CALFED Contract Management Agency	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Amount Funded	188255
Date Awarded	1998/01/01
Lead Institution	Fishery Foundation of CA
Project Number	1425−99−FC−20−0027

Project Title	Calaveras River Salmonid Life History Limiting Factors Analysis
CALFED Contract Management Agency	AFRP
Amount Funded	314677
Date Awarded	2001/01/01
Project Number	11332−1−G006

Project Title	Flow Requirements for Salmon Passage in the Cosumnes River
CALFED Contract Management Agency	AFRP
Amount Funded	99460
Date Awarded	2003/01/01
Project Number	113323J008

Project Title	Design, Construct, and Evaluate Fish passage Facilities at the Bellota Weir, Calaveras River, CA
CALFED Contract Management Agency	AFRP
Amount Funded	99937
Date Awarded	2003/01/01
Project Number	113323J009

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this organization proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?
Yes.

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the organization's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated in the proposal?
N/A

5. Has this organization made adequate progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes, without unreasonable divergences from project schedules or poor−quality deliverables?
Yes.

6. Is the applicant's reporting, record keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?
Yes.

7. If this application is for a next phase of a project whose contract your agency currently manages, will the project(s) be ready for next−phase funding to monitor and evaluate project outcomes in fiscal year 2005/6, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?
N/A