



2440 Main Street  
Red Bluff, Ca. 96080  
T.530-528.7411  
F.530.528.7422

[www.sacramentoriver.ca.gov](http://www.sacramentoriver.ca.gov)

March 23, 2005

Daniel Efseaff,  
River Partners  
Re: CALFED Monitoring PSP

Dear Mr. Efseaff:

The Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum welcomes the opportunity to comment regarding your CALFED Monitoring PSP that recently came before our organization. The project involves a Vegetation and Wildlife Response to Native Grass Restoration monitoring activity between Sacramento River Miles 182 and 184 on the Llano Seco Unit in Butte County. This project is listed as Project # 52 in the "Project Tracker" system on our website at: [www.sacramentoriver.ca.gov](http://www.sacramentoriver.ca.gov). Please keep this project updated as it progresses.

On February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005, you presented this project to our Technical Advisory Committee for review and comment. The project was determined to be consistent with the principles and guidelines of the SRCA Forum Handbook and was forwarded to the SRCAF Board of Directors with that recommendation.

On March 17, 2005, the project was presented to the SRCA Forum Board of Directors and was found to be consistent with the principles and guidelines of the SRCA Forum Handbook with no objections noted at this time.

We appreciate the effort your organization has made in bringing these projects to the Forum and your recognition of the value of the principles and guidelines of the Handbook. We look forward to your continued coordination with SRCAF and the local contacts on this project as well as any future project proposals.

Sincerely,

Burt Bundy, Manager  
SRCA Forum

Cc: CALFED ERP Monitoring PSP

**Vegetation and Wildlife Response to Native  
Grass Restoration on the Llano Seco Unit,  
Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge**

**Michelle K Cederborg**

# Initial Selection Panel Review

Not Recommended

*Amount Sought:* \$372,100

*Fund This Amount:* \$0

Brief explanation of rating:

This project proposes to examine the performance of riparian savanna and grassland restoration on 206 acres of the Llano Seco Unit of the Sacramento River NWR. The project will focus on wildlife (bird) and vegetation responses. The project would be able to capitalize on several unique features, including: (1) native grass planting designed as a multifactorial experiment to examine the effects of planting density, interspecies competition (separate and mixed seeding) and fertilizer application; (2) the restored plant communities were established on a grid cell pattern that allows examination of spatial wildlife use patterns; and (3) baseline data on both vegetation and bird responses have been collected from 2001 to 2003, providing an opportunity for longitudinal comparisons.

The Selection Panel recognizes the excellent opportunity to use this management experiment to evaluate effective restoration practices. Such a priori designs are relatively rare and offer great potential to learn and adjust management rapidly (adaptive management). The project team is strong and the budget for the project is reasonable given the scope of the project. However, the Selection Panel agrees with the Technical Review Panel that many elements of the proposed design lack sufficient detail, rendering it difficult to assess the potential for success. Of particular concern, the Technical Panel and External Reviewers noted the following issues: (1) a lack of explicit, testable hypotheses (the hypotheses that were posed were thought to be vague or too general), (2) serious technical problems in a paucity of detail on the number and distribution of samples, or evaluation of the statistical power to be able to detect

#0114: Vegetation and Wildlife Response to Native Grass Restoration on the Ll...

## Initial Selection Panel Review

effects of the restoration treatments, (3) a narrow focus on only avian species of wildlife, which are not high priorities for this PSP, (4) potential problems with the design of some of the proposed experimental treatments (burning, grazing), (5) uncertainty over performance measures and (6) deficiencies in the outreach component. The Selection Panel felt that many of these issues could be addressed by a more careful and detailed description of the project methodology. However, concerns remain as to whether the data collected at the scale of the experimental plots (especially on avian responses) would be sufficient to detect the effects of the management treatments. Additional focus on the conceptual model & hypotheses, sampling methods, performance measures and outreach activities would have allowed the team to capitalize on the positive elements of the experimental approach being used to evaluate grassland restoration efforts.

# Technical Panel Review

*Technical Review Panel's Overall Evaluation Rating:*

Inadequate

## Explanation Of Summary Rating

The Technical Panel agreed that the proposal had good ideas, but that it needed further work, perhaps in a resubmission. The lack of information on previous restoration design and the lack of a rigorous monitoring approach were weaknesses. The conceptual model lacked appropriate detail to guide the research. Little emphasis is given to peer-review publications.

## Goals And Justification

The proposal identifies restoration actions whose effects will be monitored by measurements of bird abundance, community composition, and species distribution and trends in native grass composition and succession. However, one external reviewer found that the proposal lacked a synopsis of treatments applied in the earlier project. The proposal did present several figures describing the previous experimental design, but much detail was missing. Goals were clearly stated. The already-established treatments (planting density, fertilization) provide an excellent base for the establishment of the proposed new treatments to test the effects of grazing and fire on bird abundance and native grass establishment.

External reviewers made positive comments about the conceptual model. However, upon closer examination, what was assumed to be a conceptual model is in fact an overview of the monitoring approach, one of whose steps is to develop a conceptual model. Although repeated references are made to a conceptual model developed in the restoration phase, the model is never presented.

## Technical Panel Review

The proposal suffers somewhat from the lack of testable hypotheses. Some of the proposed hypotheses are simply statements, while others are too vague.

### Approach

The approach takes advantage of an established framework to propose monitoring for existing and new treatments. External reviewers agreed that the lack of a rigorous approach to the number and distribution of samples was a serious technical problem, and that one possible remedy was a power analysis or alternatively estimation of sample sizes needed to estimate effect with some specified precision. The inclusion of a professional statistician familiar with sampling protocols would provide the expertise to determine the sample sizes required to detect statistical differences if they actually exist among the several treatments.

One external reviewer suggested improvements to the sampling scheme for birds that suggest that the proposed methods are not state-of-the-art. This reviewer suggested that refinements in the protocol for points counts and in the methods for estimating species likelihood of occurrence in samples should be implemented. The same reviewer suggested that additional data on actual breeding activity should be collected during the course of point counts. This information will substantiate actual use of the study sites during the breeding season.

External reviewers suggested that the focus on birds was too narrow given the statement that "wildlife response" will be assessed. One reviewer recommended that conspicuous invertebrates, including butterflies and foraging, adult odonates be inventoried during bird counts or vegetation sampling activities. Given the excellent opportunity afforded by the existing experimental design, it is disappointing that a more inclusive monitoring effort was not proposed.

One technical reviewer suggested that the proposed abandonment of seed and fertilizer treatments given certain results seemed premature and may miss long-term effects. The Technical Panel was concerned about the small size of the burn boxes, and

## Technical Panel Review

suggested that additional justification should have been provided for this method.

### **Feasibility And Likelihood Of Success**

It is not clear if sample sizes will be sufficient to determine if real, statistical differences do exist among the different treatments. No regional or environmental compliance issues are evident.

### **Performance Measures**

While the data to be collected are appropriate to ascertain the effects of some populations in response to restoration, no specific performance measures are described in the proposal. Given the lack of detail regarding the underlying conceptual model, it is difficult to see how the project will be able to assess the performance of the restoration actions.

### **Products**

The proposal fails to provide clear criteria for deciding which monitoring methods are most appropriate for standardization and application to other restoration sites. In other words, how could a more extensive system of monitoring be derived from this intensive system? Criteria for an improved system should include low cost, repeatability, ease of training, and effectiveness at capturing the bottom-line proofs of success. It is also not clear exactly at what users these standardized techniques are aimed.

External technical reviewers found deficiencies in the outreach component of the proposal. What materials will be provided to participants, and who will the anticipated audience(s) be? How many individuals will be reached and where? What is the potential for the production of materials or protocols that can be used in other contexts in California or elsewhere? A plan for evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed outreach activities should be included.

## Technical Panel Review

The data management plan lacks a clear data accessibility statement. This is worrisome given one reviewer's comment about previous difficulties in obtaining data from project participants.

The plan for dissemination of research results through publication is scanty, and peer-reviewed publication seems to be a low priority.

## Capabilities

Staff appear to be strong in all areas except applied statistics and sampling. A statistician should be added to the team or input solicited from a statistician.

## Budget

The amount of cost-sharing from Rancho Llano Seco and the USFWS is not explicitly stated. Otherwise, the budget and budget justification seem reasonable for work of the kind proposed. Enhancements or improvements to the proposed research suggested above should be achieved without adding to the original cost estimate.

## Regional Review

The Sacramento Regional review panel gave this proposal a "High" ranking although the proposal lacked MSCS and Big R criteria. The regional panel found that the proposal was excellent in all other respects, was based on a rigorous experimental design, and monitored the population dynamics of grassland birds (an important group to monitor and recover) in restored ecosystems.

## Administrative Review

Prior-phase funding review mentioned that the feasibility studies and monitoring plan on a previous Agreement have been delayed due to one subcontractor being late with a deliverable. The grantee will determine in early May if an Amendment Request is needed to extend the Agreement term by a



## Technical Panel Review

few months.

There were no significant environmental compliance issues.

No significant budget review issues were raised.

### **Additional Comments**

# Sacramento Regional Review

*Sacramento Regional Panel's Overall Ranking:*

High

## Summary:

The panel ranks this as a quality proposal, but unfortunately lacks MSCS and Big R criteria. The proposal is excellent in all other respects, is based on a rigorous experimental design, and monitors the population dynamics of grassland birds (an important group to monitor and recover) in restored ecosystems.

### 1. Applicability To ERP Goals And Regional Priorities.

This project monitors and evaluates CVPIA actions in Valley Foothill Riparian Communities of the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge. It does not directly contribute to MSCS or Big R species goals, but does evaluate distribution and abundance of grassland birds, an imperiled subgroup.

### 2. Links With Other Restoration Actions.

This project monitors and evaluates outcomes of only a single restoration action. Data will be made available through the River Partners, the Sacramento River website, the Sacramento River Portal websites, and the CSUC-Geographic Information Center. Bird data and resulting reports will be maintained by PRBO, which do not always make data readily available. The project was formulated as a factorial experiment using grid cells, and is based on a conceptual model, testable management hypotheses, and adaptive management, and so has high potential to provide long-term information, to fill knowledge gaps, to inform planning and design, and to create monitoring capacity. Assessment and monitoring of this action has potential to determine trends in native grass composition and succession, to evaluate management hypotheses, add to understanding of ecosystems, and improve restoration implementation and

#0114: Vegetation and Wildlife Response to Native Grass Restoration on the LI...

## Sacramento Regional Review

long-term management of native grass plantings in the region.

### 3. Local Circumstances.

There appear to be no local constraints. The project is feasible and appropriate to project site. Assumptions are realistic. There appear to be no local legal, political, or cultural impediments. Applicant needs Special Use Permit from USFWS, but anticipates no problems obtaining the permit.

### 4. Local Involvement.

The project involves a local research institution (CSUC), nonprofit organizations (River Partners, PRBO), and public agencies (USFWS). Public outreach will consist of 3 workshops, informal mtgs, progress and final reports, and participation in the CALFED Science Conference.

### 5. Local Value.

Because of its experimental design, the project offers high potential for fine resolution of restoration and management actions on grasslands and their wildlife. Proposed 2-way factorial experiment using grazing and fire will provide new, detailed information on ecosystem response to these treatments. Results of investigations should be readily extended at various scales.

# External Technical Review #1

## Goals And Justification

The proposal unambiguously identified those restoration actions which will be monitored. The goals and objectives are unequivocally stated in a consistent manner, in fact, to the point of being repetitive. The conceptual site model is very clear and easy to follow. In fact, both the adaptive management model and the conceptual model are excellent and give guidelines to proposal readers and team members to achieving the goals. The authors very clearly state the hypotheses, and the testing of there hypotheses indeed fills a knowledge gap. The main hypotheses are to use native planting to keep out non-natives, increase wildlife usage as assessed by increased abundance and species richness, observe decline in weed seed bank, improve vegetation structure, diversity, and natural native-plant recruitment.

## Approach

The approach is well designed and meet objectives in that it monitors wildlife usage and grass establishment, and develops techniques usable by other land managers. The project builds on previous monitoring and includes modifications as needed. The contributions are indeed significant. The contributions are: 1) the role of grass establishment techniques on success of establishment and maintenance, 2) relation of grassland establishment to bird usage, especially in riparian zones, 3) Development of feasible monitoring techniques, 4) Effects of management on weed seed banks. The overarching significance of these contributions is that they define the conditions and practical techniques that maximize opportunities for successful restoration of riparian grasslands and bird communities to be applied to the entire Sacramento Valley.

## Technical Feasibility

The project is well documented as to the methods; however, I was puzzled by the mention of rodents on p. 17 under 5.

## External Technical Review #1

Expected Outcomes and Products. There was no mention of monitoring rodents under the tasks outlined in previous pages. Everything else is very good. I especially liked the description of vegetation analysis under Task 4 (p. 13-14). I would have appreciated reading a list of grass species that were planted and fertilizer treatment that were applied in the earlier project. When a proposal is presented which provides a follow-up phase to an earlier project, a synopsis of the earlier project, especially with treatments applied, should be included. The scale of the project is consistent with objectives.

### Performance Measures

The data proposed to be collected are very appropriate to ascertain the success of restoration, and their rationale is very clear. The conceptual model will be testable with the data collected. The data-collecting techniques described will lend themselves well to statistical analysis and presentation in professional formats. Relevant performance measures include ground cover and biomass measures of the plants, soil seed bank measures, tests of burning and grazing, and the spatial analysis of the wildlife in relation to the plant community.

### Products

The one thing I found a bit vague is the description of actions under Task 5 (top of p. 17). They propose to hold meetings and review literature, but it would help the reader to see a list of criteria that they'll use to decide which monitoring methods are most appropriate for standardization and application to other restoration sites, which very likely won't have the resources to perform such detailed biological and ecosystem assessment as this project. In other words, how could a more extensive system of monitoring be derived from this intensive system? Shouldn't such criteria include low cost, repeatability, ease of training, and effectiveness at capturing the bottom-line proofs of success? It is also not clear exactly who or what types of users these standardized techniques are aimed at.

## External Technical Review #1

### **Capabilities**

The team's qualifications are really excellent. They have a good mix of skills and experiences to perform this project. Their record indicates strong likelihood of success.

### **Budget**

The budget is reasonable and adequate.

### **Additional Comments**

This is an excellent project that should be funded.

# External Technical Review #2

## Goals And Justification

The proposal is especially well developed with respect to explicitly stating goals and objectives, proposing a clear conceptual model, and clearly stating hypotheses. The hypotheses are well justified relative to existing knowledge and gaps in knowledge.

## Approach

The proposed approach would be substantially enhanced with input from a professional statistician who is familiar with application of the kinds of sampling protocols proposed. In particular, the authors need some understanding of the sample sizes required to detect statistical differences if they actually exist among the several treatments. Factorial designs of the complexity described in this proposal can require large sample sizes, especially if the variables being measured have large variances. It is possible that a finding of "no difference" among or between treatments could result from inadequate sampling of variables with high variances. Either with already existing bird count data collected by PRBO, or with samples collected during Year 1 for both birds and vegetation, the researchers can get an estimate of sample sizes required to determine if statistical differences exist at some predetermined level of significance. An approach for estimating sample size using a pre-sample can be found in the text book Biometry (Sokal and Rohlf, 1995, p. 263), and other introductory statistics texts.

Since 1993, there have been significant refinements to the point count protocol described by C.J. Ralph and others, and cited in the proposal. In particular, the double-observer method proposed by Nichols et al. (Auk 117(2): 393-408) should be applied in this study. Using Nichols's approach will allow stronger inferences to be made regarding differences among and between treatments with respect to the responses of birds, as well as providing some information about observer error.

## External Technical Review #2

Additionally, there have been substantial advances made in estimating species likelihood of occurrence in samples (e.g. point counts) when species are imperfectly detected (i.e. the species is present, but not detected, as opposed to actually not being present in the sample). See MacKenzie et al. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 73(3): 546-555 (2004) for an introduction. Application of these methods and concepts to the proposed project would strengthen the inferences derived from the work.

In addition to counting birds, behavioral evidence of actual breeding activity should be collected. Such information can be collected during the course of point counts without additional staff if breeding bird atlas procedures are employed. This is qualitative information that will substantiate actual use of the study sites during the breeding season, in addition to the kind of presence and relative abundance or relative density information that results from point counts.

Explicit enumeration of the variables related to vegetation would be helpful. In particular, litter depth would be useful to measure as an indicator of potential sources for invertebrate food for birds foraging on or near the ground.

The title of the proposal specifies that "wildlife response" will be assessed. However, the focus of the proposal is use of habitats by birds. Rodents are mentioned once on p. 17 of the proposal, but not anywhere else, and protocols for sampling rodent populations are not discussed anywhere in the proposal. Given the proposed cost for the work, I recommend that conspicuous invertebrates, including butterflies and foraging, adult odonates, be inventoried. This easily could be done during bird counts or vegetation sampling activities and would add another, useful dimension to the work and broaden the concept of "wildlife" to include other organisms in addition to birds.

### **Technical Feasibility**

It is not clear if sample sizes will be sufficient to determine if real, statistical differences do exist among the different treatments (see above). I recommend that more point



## External Technical Review #2

counts of birds during the breeding season be made. I also recommend inclusion of a statistician, who is familiar with determining sample sizes and protocols for work of this kind, on the project team. Alternatively, biologists with the USGS/Biological Resources Division at Patuxent Wildlife Research Center (e.g. Jim Nichols, John Sauer) or at Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center (e.g. Doug Johnson) could be consulted in advance of initiation of the work.

### **Performance Measures**

See comments above about sample sizes and sampling protocols. Revising the proposal to include the recommendations I've made above potentially will enhance the performance measures proposed in several, important respects.

### **Products**

The outreach component needs to be described in greater detail. It is not clear what materials will be provided to participants and who the anticipated audience(s) will be. How many individuals will be reached and where? What is the potential for an information dissemination multiplier effect and for production of materials or protocols that can be used in other contexts in California or elsewhere? A method for assessing the effectiveness of the outreach component is not proposed. A plan for evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed outreach activities should be included.

An evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of any monitoring protocols proposed for implementation as a result of this research should be included. How many person-hours, at what cost, and what kinds of equipment, at what cost, will be required to implement any monitoring protocols that are recommended?

### **Capabilities**

Staff appear to be strong in all areas except applied statistics and sampling. See related comments above. A statistician should be added to the team or input solicited

## External Technical Review #2

from a statistician.

### **Budget**

The amount of cost-sharing from Rancho Llano Seco and the USFWS is not explicitly stated. Otherwise, the budget and budget justification seem reasonable for work of the kind proposed. Enhancements or improvements to the proposed research that I have outlined above should be achieved without adding to the original cost estimate.

### **Additional Comments**

The work proposed is important to determining the effectiveness of restoration of native riparian grasslands for birds. The methods described and evaluated in this research have potential for providing useful guidance to conservationists in other areas of California.

# External Technical Review #3

## Goals And Justification

The goals of the project, to expand monitoring of common restoration treatments, are quite useful. In particular, the opportunity to take advantage of already-established treatments (planting density, fertilization) is an excellent one. As for the proposed new treatments, the establishment of plots to test the effects of grazing and fire on bird abundance and native grass establishment is quite novel and well worth funding. The proposal suffers somewhat from the lack of testable hypotheses. It appears likely from the rest of the proposal that the authors have ideas in mind and are implicitly testing hypotheses with their designs; however a specific discussion of them would have improved the proposal.

## Approach

The approach is very strong. There is a carefully established framework already in place, that the authors propose to continue sampling. And, the proposal to establish grazing and fire treatments (+ interaction) would be very valuable. My main suggestion is to expand monitoring in each replicate/plot within the treatments. As I read the proposal, the authors only propose to sample grass abundance in 8 1m<sup>2</sup> subplots across the 8 replicates. It is NOT sufficient to extrapolate the responses of the larger grazing treatments from such a small sample. If the number of burnbox treatments need to be examined, so be it.

## Technical Feasibility

Yes on both counts.

## Performance Measures

The bird, vegetation, and seed bank sampling each will allow sufficient sampling of the responses to various treatments. The experimental design clearly lays out the way that the

### External Technical Review #3

analysis and conclusions will be completed.

## Products

This is a particular strength of this proposal. As the authors describe, there is relatively limited knowledge of the effects of restoration techniques on long-term vegetation composition or bird populations. This project is designed to answer the question. The opportunity to examine the effects of treatments such as grazing or fire at various seeding densities is an important one. The authors have specifically stated their commitment to present their information to restoration scientists. This commitment should be a high priority - the importance of describing such experiments in the literature is obvious.

## Capabilities

Yes

## Budget

The budget appears quite reasonable for the scale of work proposed.

## Additional Comments

I was really sold by the proposed experimental design to test the long-term effects of various restoration tools on native grass success and weed seedbank.

# Budget Review

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

**Yes.**

If no, please explain:

**Travel is higher than standard rates \$.55 per mile.**

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

**Yes.**

3. Are project management expenses appropriately budgeted?

**No.**

If no, please explain

**Project management is primarily cost-share. Recommend more detail of project management costs.**

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

**No.**

If no, please explain

**No Breakdown of overhead costs provided.**

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:

**Cost share amount not identified.**

## Budget Review

**Contract Language Exceptions -Recommend that grantee provide information regarding its financial capability and stability as well as it's 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.**

If no, please explain:

**None**

8. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

**No.**

Other comments:

**A financial evaluation of small and Non-profit organizations is recommended to ensure cost share funds are available and the organization has the financial capability to do business with the State.**

# 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.**

Comments

**It is possible that construction of the eight grazing enclosures (nearly 3/4-mile of fencing) could require NEPA and CEQA compliance. A Categorical Exclusion and Categorical Exemption would probably be the appropriate documents.**

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.**

#0114: Vegetation and Wildlife Response to Native Grass Restoration on the LI...

## Environmental Compliance Review

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?

**Does not apply.**

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 #1

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

<b>Project Title</b>	Sacramento River Active Riparian Habitat Restoraion
<b>CALFED Contract Management Agency</b>	US Fish and Wildlife Service
<b>Amount Funded</b>	\$ 410,216.00
<b>Date Awarded</b>	2000/01/01
<b>Lead Institution</b>	River Partners
<b>Project Number</b>	114200J088

List the other CALFED or CVPIA grants received by this applicant for which your agency manages contracts:

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?

**Yes.**

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?

**Yes.**

## Prior-Phase Funding Review #2

<b>Project Title</b>	Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit.
<b>CALFED Contract Management Agency</b>	GCAP
<b>Amount Funded</b>	\$ 289,784.00
<b>Date Awarded</b>	2003/01/01
<b>Project Number</b>	ERP-02-P39

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.**

**See "Other Comments" block.**

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**

Other comments:

**Feasibility studies and monitoring plan on current Agreement have been delayed due to coordinating reviews and comments through a large TAC and several partners and due to one**

Prior-Phase Funding Review #2

subcontractor late with a deliverable. Grantee will determine in early May if an Amendment Request is needed to extend the Agreement term by a few months.

