

Selection Panel (Primary) Review

– **Fund** (a proposal recommended for funding at the amount sought or funding in part of selected project tasks or subtasks)

– **Reconsider if Revised** (a proposal that is a high priority but that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

X Not Recommended

Amount Sought: \$2,282,630

Fund This Amount: \$0

Conditions recommended (Conditions that applicants would need to meet to obtain funds may be recommended for proposals suggested for either full or partial funding. For proposals recommended for partial funding, conditions that identify the funded tasks or subtasks must be recommended.)

Please provide a brief explanation of your rating, including an explanation of the reasons for any conditions that the panel recommends. Revisions required of proposals recommended for reconsideration should be outlined, together with a justification for the suggested revisions:

The Selection Panel agreed with the Technical Panel that, while the project would provide valuable information linking juvenile production with adult escapement, the proposal failed to adequately link this data collection to CALFED funded ecosystem restoration actions. The Panel was very concerned with the very large budget proposed for this project and the lack of justification and detail to warrant such a large request. The Panel also suggests, given current monitoring priorities, that the proponent seeks much reduced alternate funding.

Technical Panel (Primary) Review

inadequate

Explanation Of Summary Rating

The Technical Review Panel recognizes the broader value of the proposed monitoring and the strong support from the Regional Review Panel. This proposal must be rated “Inadequate” due to concerns from the Budget Review and because of unresolved questions about the statistical methods. However, the Technical Review Panel would have rated this proposal as Adequate if those concerns had not arisen.

Review Form

Goals And Justification

This proposal seeks additional rotary screw–trap monitoring in order to more accurately define the relationship between juvenile production and escapement. This is a worthy goal because escapement estimates have been used to evaluate the efficacy of restoration actions, whereas juvenile production is a more direct performance measure for in–stream restoration efforts. However, this proposal does not identify specific restoration actions whose outcomes would be monitored. Therefore, the proposal also does not provide statements of the goals and objectives of restoration actions. The proposal contains a coherent conceptual model that refers to restoration in a generic way. The proposal clearly states the monitoring hypotheses. The proposal is not well–justified in that there is no apparent integration with ongoing research on population dynamics of the winter Chinook run in this system.

Approach

The general approach is reasonable, but there remains an important uncertainty about the specifics. First, the authors assume a linear relationship between the fraction of river discharge that is sampled and the predicted trap efficiency (Eq. 5). That equation and assumption is not justified by previous published work. There are significant problems in the presentation of the statistical methods. This does not imply that the applicants received inappropriate advice from statisticians. The problems may be the result of inaccurate translation. However, project success will depend on correct execution of analyses, and the proposal left the external technical reviewers with doubts about how that would be accomplished. Two technical reviewers noted multiple errors in the equations. One external technical reviewer correctly noted “As these statistical aspects have already been reviewed by

two well-known statisticians, I expect that the methods to be used are generally correct. However, the description on pages 5–8 of the Project Description contains what seems to be a number of ambiguities and errors. As these could lead to mistakes in calculations, I recommend that this section be corrected by the author(s) before this project is considered for funding." The Principal Investigators should pay particular attention to the lengthy and detailed commentary on statistical methods by one of the external technical reviewers. That reviewer is an excellent statistician.

Feasibility And Likelihood Of Success

Aside from the methodological issues described in the detailed external technical reviews, the project is technically feasible. The scale is consistent with objectives. The Regional reviewer anticipates that the project is fully feasible.

Performance Measures

The proposal does not describe monitoring of specific restoration actions. Therefore it is impossible to assess the adequacy of any performance measures that relate to restoration.

Products

The primary products are data, estimates, annual reports and a completion report. The estimates of adult spawning escapement and juvenile production are essential to modeling designed to help inform restoration of the winter run population. Description of products aimed at the open peer-reviewed scientific literature is lacking. Without that final step, the results of this work will not be registered in our collective permanent knowledge base and will not be subjected to independent peer review that would earn the recognition and support of the broader scientific community.

Capabilities

Given the nature of this proposal, it is problematic that a statistician is not among the project participants. Both the cost and difficulty of the project merit the ongoing participation by a professional statistician to ensure that the analyses are executed correctly. Otherwise, the project team seems well qualified to perform the proposed work.

Budget

Two external technical reviewers felt that the budget appeared too large based on their experiences.

Regional Review

This proposal received a “Very High” ranking from the Regional Review Panel. The Regional Review Panel made a strong case for the value of this project and indicated that the resulting data will be very useful to the evaluation of several unspecified ecosystem restoration projects. Given the very high regional importance of this project, it seems critical to address the methodological issues described by the external technical reviewers. The regional review panel also expressed concern about delays in past reporting and the lack of cost-sharing by the USFWS. However, those concerns seemed to be minor in comparison to the very high regional and local value of this project.

Administrative Review

The Budget reviewer expressed serious and lengthy concerns about budget detail that will not be repeated or summarized here. The Environmental Compliance reviewer did not note any serious concerns. However, it is unclear whether the required NEPA Categorical Exclusion permit has been completed. The Prior-Phase reviewer indicated general satisfaction with the past performance of the applicant team. However, this reviewer also noted delays in quarterly fiscal reporting due to lack of access to financial data by regional staff.

Additional Comments

This proposal is not directly linked to specific restoration actions. Rather, it seeks to advance methods for the estimation of abundance of juvenile salmonids that are rather broadly applicable to restoration efforts. The proposal emphasizes data collection. Given the nature of the proposed monitoring, a thorough synthesis of accumulated data seems critical to any demonstration of the utility of the juvenile production index (JPI).

Technical Review Panel's Overall Evaluation Rating:
inadequate

Sacramento Regional Review

Very High

Review:

1. Applicability to ERP goals and regional priorities.

Information collected during outmigrant monitoring will be used to assess the effect of restoration actions implemented by the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Central Valley Project Improvement Act and, CALFED programs. The project would directly monitor the population level responses to CALFED ERP and CVPIA restoration actions in the upper Sacramento River as well as high priority tributaries such as Battle Creek and Clear Creek. The data collected will provide key population status information to allow evaluation of Multi-Species Conservation Strategy milestones for the region. Maintenance of a long term record of juvenile production for the upper Sacramento and upstream tribs, when compared to adult escapement estimates for the same years, will provide direct insight into the efficacy of spawning and juvenile rearing habitat improvement projects, as well as the effects of other environmental factors such as weather, flow levels, water temperatures, etc.

2. Links with other restoration actions.

This program is highly linked to several ecosystem restoration projects and programs throughout the Central Valley. The data collected by this project is provided to the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP), the Bay-Delta and Tributaries website (summarized data), and the Data Assessment Team (DAT) which in turn is utilized by various groups (e.g. the spring Chinook DAT group) in their real-time information assessments and decision making. The information produced allows an evaluation of the population level effects of nearly every restoration action in the upper river and water management agencies use the real-time information for planning purposes (CALFED DAT/WOMT process) to allocate Environmental Water Account (EWA) and other assets to protect emigrating winter Chinook.

Juvenile salmonid monitoring has been an activity of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Red Bluff since 1981. These activities have made significant contributions to the understanding of the life history of rearing salmon in the upper Sacramento River from Keswick Dam to Hamilton City. Rotary-trapping at RBDD has been nearly continuous since 1994.

Standard database structures used by the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) real-time monitoring program will continue to be used to enter, store and retrieve juvenile monitoring data. Data will continue to be made available through the IEP website via weekly data

export/posting and will be electronically entered on a day-to-day basis. Data will be double error checked, using printed hard copies, as part of the quality control and quality assurance program. Data will be disseminated through a variety of means including the IEP website, biweekly reports of daily passage via email and biweekly report posting to the BDAT website, through participation in Data Assessment Team (DAT) weekly conference calls, through semi-annual and annual reports in electronic and paper formats and by formal oral presentation at technical group meetings as well as local and regional conferences.

3. Local Circumstances.

Rotary-trapping at RBDD has amassed a considerable baseline of information including refinement of experimental procedures. The feasibility of successfully implementing this project is based on the following points: • The spawning grounds for winter Chinook salmon occur almost exclusively upstream from RBDD.

- Based on comparisons with adult escapement, the JPI is an exceptional method for evaluating year-class strengths in juvenile winter-run abundance and for supportive evidence of estimated escapement.
- Quantitative methodologies have been independently reviewed and supported by biological statisticians.
- Red Bluff Diversion Dam is an ideal sampling location for winter-run salmon because multiple traps can be attached to the dam and sampled simultaneously within a transect across the river.
- The rotary-trapping program has complied with ESA Section 10 take limits by implementing a scientifically sound sub-sampling design (see below). This same design and trapping location allows us to sample during high flow events when other rotary-trapping programs are unable to sample.
- The structures around RBDD control the channel morphology and the hydrological characteristics of the area providing for consistent sampling conditions for evaluating trends in juvenile abundance within and between years, and for developing a time invariant efficiency model.
- Researchers and resource managers in the upper river have been limited in their ability to conduct mark/recapture experiments because of increased Federal and State protections afforded to Threatened and Endangered species. The trap efficiency model and quantitative methodology have been developed to estimate numbers of outmigrants passing RBDD while decreasing the program's reliance on and need for experimental fish, thereby minimizing

impacts on T species.

There are no local legal, political, or cultural impediments to the project and the access to the study site is completely through Federal/public property.

4. *Local involvement.*

Public involvement and outreach for this proposal will be accomplished primarily through the dissemination of data on the IEP website via weekly data export/posting, through production of annual reports and through formal oral and/or poster presentations at multiple public workshops and seminars.

The principal investigators (USFWS) have, and will continue to coordinate field activities and research projects with students from the Sacramento River Discovery Center (SRDC) and local school districts. The SRDC is a local non-profit resource academy where high school and college students serve as interns. Numerous students have worked with biologists from this program as “Job Shadows” to observe daily work routines in the field of fisheries management. Further, some students have been employed intermittently (weekends primarily) in the Student Temporary Employment Program by the RBFWO as a result of our participation in this local program.

5. *Local Value.*

See information above. This project provides information that increases understanding of multiple restoration actions and allows local resource managers, stakeholders and others to make resource management decisions. It provides managers with information on how well restoration actions are attaining their objectives, how ecosystems are responding to multiple restoration actions in local areas, and whether or not adjustments to prior restoration actions are needed to better achieve objectives. The investigations will be useful at various scales, including the local project area, the watershed, and the region.

6. *Other comments:*

The panel noted that in the past, data and final reports from these programs has been slow in their release and dispersal

The panel had concerns with the lack of cost sharing from FWS on this proposal. All personnel from the GS 5 techs all the way up to a GS 11 supervisor is covered in this request. Also all overhead and equipment costs are included as well.

The bang for the buck for the extra 3 months of sampling is worth the cost. It will maintain

year-round sampling and allow collection of complete info on the other 3 salmonid species and green sturgeon.

Overall Ranking:

Very High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The panel ranked the proposal as very high. It meets all of the required criteria and the data to be collected is essential to salmonid restoration in the Central Valley.

External Technical Review

Goals And Justification

This proposal requests approximately \$750,000 annually to estimate the number of juvenile winter chinook salmon that pass the Red Bluff Diversion Dam. Although I certainly recognize the high profile nature of the endangered winter chinook salmon run and I am also aware of the excellent folks who have been working on modeling the dynamics of this run, I must express serious concern that the proposal appears to have been developed without much (or any?) consultation with the folks who have been working on dynamics of this population.

I raise this issue because the essential logic for the proposed research, as laid out in the proposal, seems extremely weak to me. The authors appear to justify collection of additional data on juvenile production so that they can determine whether or not estimates of escapement past Red Bluff Dam that are based on trapping at the dam or on carcass surveys are highly correlated with juvenile production estimates (or something like that – I could not really tell). One would certainly hope, and expect, that adult escapement estimates at Red Bluff Dam should be highly correlated with estimates of adult spawning escapement based on (mark–recapture) carcass surveys. If all winter run chinook spawn in the areas where carcass surveys are performed, then it would be expected (hoped) that estimates of adult escapement based on the two methods would not just be correlated but that they would have very similar values.

There is no good reason to suppose that estimates of juvenile production would be highly correlated with estimates of adult spawning escapement. Indeed, there are many excellent reasons to suppose that juvenile production would vary considerably with spawning escapement. Even if physical conditions at the locations of spawning were considered highly invariant across years, due to influence of dams and controlled flows, one would expect juvenile production to reflect density–dependent interactions among spawning fish or among incubating eggs or among emerging fry and so on. Thus, although one might find a linear correspondence between juvenile production and adult escapement over a small range of adult spawners, one would not expect to see this if there were sufficient variation in adult escapement (and hopefully there will once more be such variation for winter chinook!). Of course, if there were substantial interannual environmental variation in spawning, incubation or rearing conditions for winter run chinook, then this variation would also have a substantial effect on interannual variation in juvenile production, independent of adult abundance. Anyway, the point of the above digression is that few or none of the issues discussed above are considered in the proposal, therefore greatly diminishing the strength of its justification.

Approach

Although the proposal contains many equations showing how the authors propose to take juvenile counts recorded in screw traps at the diversion dam and convert them to an estimate of annual total juvenile outmigration (mistakenly termed an index throughout), I have three important concerns about these equations. First, although the authors claim that John Skalski and Lyman McDonald (both extremely well-regarded biometricians) have checked out their methods, there is no evidence presented that any one of the project proponents has substantial statistical expertise. Where is the statistician to ensure that their calculations will be correct? I raise this issue because my second concern is that the equations are incorrect and/or baffling in many instances. Examples include equation 7 which should have an N/n factor in front of the equation, to be consistent with the following variance formula that would otherwise not need to incorporate sampling error (only n days sampled out of N days) which is the first term in equation (7). No expression is given for the estimated variance of the estimated trap efficiency (an assumed linear function of flow); equation 14 is inconsistent with the language that immediately precedes it (days or weeks, which is it?). Anyway, it seems generally “mixed up” and not edited by a statistician before the proposal was sent out. That is not to say that the estimation equations are incorrect. If Skalski and McDonald helped them work things out, we can rely on their work. But we cannot rely on the “translation” that appears in this proposal! Third, I don’t buy into a linear relation between trap efficiency and flow AND the authors do not present a graph of estimated trap efficiencies against flow. That concerns me a great deal as it does not allow the reader to determine if there is even any good empirical evidence for a linear model relating trap efficiency and flow.

Technical Feasibility

Igoring the issues raised above, the proposed work seems technically feasible.

Performance Measures

I did not base my review on this issue

Products

Estimates of adult spawning escapement and juvenile production are vital for demographic/environment modeling designed to help develop ways to restore the winter run population.

Capabilities

I'd like to see a biometrician more directly involved.

Budget

Budget seems expensive and I question that rotary screw traps have to be manned/run/monitored as intensively as proposed for this project. Certainly this concern should be addressed.

Additional Comments

I find the proposal to be very expensive, to have no clear “science” component, and I do not believe that it adequately considers the relation between sampling intensity, program cost and errors of estimation of juvenile production. The authors should be requested to resubmit a proposal that addresses the comments above and presents some logic for the intensity with which the screw traps are fished and deployed. Perhaps adequate estimates could be derived from less intensive and less costly sampling levels. How accurate do estimates need to be? In their resubmitted proposal, the authors should also indicate that they either have a biometrician on board with suitable background to keep calculations under control and correct or they should contract that out to somebody like Skalski or McDonald to provide them with a reference document (I could find no citations for equations) that will ensure that their calculations and interpretations of collected data are correct.

External Technical Review

Goals And Justification

The goals and justification seem reasonable, but see the Additional Comments provided below.

Approach

The project is well–designed and builds on previous monitoring in a satisfactory way, but see the Additional Comments below.

Technical Feasibility

The project is fully documented and technically feasible, but see the Additional Comments below.

Performance Measures

The project is reasonable in all of these respects, but see the Additional Comments provided below.

Products

See the Additional Comments below.

Capabilities

I believe so, as they have done similar work before. However, because of some apparent errors and ambiguities in the description of the proposed statistical analyses I believe that some statistical assistance may be required.

Budget

The budget is large and I have not looked at the details to determine whether it is reasonable or not. I leave that task to others.

Additional Comments

In my review I concentrated on the statistical aspects of this proposal. As these statistical aspects have already been reviewed by two well-known statisticians, I expect that the methods to be used are generally correct. However, the description on pages 5–8 of the Project Description contains what seems to be a number of ambiguities and errors. As these could lead to mistakes in calculations, I recommend that this section be corrected by the author(s) before this project is considered for funding.

Here is a list of the problems that I see in the description of proposed analyses (with page numbers from the Project Description):

(a) On page 5 it is said that %Q is the percentage of the water volume sampled, and the notation suggests precisely that. However, on page 6, equation (3) this quantity is defined as the proportion of water sampled. Later, in equation (5) it seems that %Q really is a percentage because if all the water is sampled (%Q = 100) then the trap efficiency is reasonably high at about 0.72. If %Q is a proportion then if all the water is sampled (%Q = 1) the trap efficiency is extremely low at about 0.008.

(b) The left-hand side of equation (4) should be P^d , i.e. with a cap.

(c) Equation (4) may be a reasonable approximation over the range used for the mark-recapture trials, but it seems strange that with 100% of the water sampled it does not give an efficiency of one, and that there is some efficiency with no water sampled. I wonder whether a non-linear function that goes through 0 and 1 may be more appropriate than the linear function assumed here.

(d) I believe that the right-hand side of equation (6) should include the multiplicative factor N/n . This would then be the observed daily mean times the number of days in the week. Presumably $N = 7$.

(e) It appears that the first term in equation (9) is based on the assumption of a binomial distribution for C_d . However, my understanding is that captures of salmon tend to be clustered, so that the variance of C_d is likely to be higher than what is expected from the binomial distribution. In that case $\text{Var}(P^d)$ would tend to be larger than the estimate from equation (9). I am not sure whether this is a serious problem, but it does need to be addressed if this has not been done already. It may be important because the confidence interval from equation (13) depends on the estimate of $\text{Var}(P^d)$.

(f) I have not checked the accuracy of the second term in equation (9) but because $P^d T^d$ cancels out in the equation as written, I suspect there is a mistake.

(g)The last sentence on page 7 (weekly JPI's will be estimated by summing P^{\wedge} across days) needs changing because the following equation is summing across weeks. Alternatively, the sentence is redundant because of equation (6) on the same page.

(h)I see no problem with comparing JPI and JPE values using a paired t–test. However, seeing whether a JPE value falls within the confidence interval of equation (9) has several problems. First, as noted in (e) above, the estimate of $\text{Var}(P^{\wedge}d)$ may be too small. Second, if the trap efficiency model is not estimated very well then all of the confidence intervals will be affected in a similar way, so that the results of each comparison of JPI and JPE values will not be independent. Third, no α value is specified for the confidence intervals. Finally, the procedure assumes that the variance of a JPE value is the same as the variance of a JPI value. I think it would be surprising if this is true. For all of these reasons, I believe that the proposed confidence interval method needs to be reconsidered.

(i)For monitoring during storm events there is mention of sampling one in four non–overlapping periods during days, and similarly during nights. It is not specified how the sampled periods will be selected. This needs to be clarified because if the sampling is non–random then it seems likely that some bias could be introduced.

External Technical Review

Goals And Justification

The proposal does not identify restoration actions to be monitored. As such, questions regarding restoration actions do not apply. Instead, it is focused on different methods to estimate juvenile salmonid abundance. It does clearly state hypotheses to be tested, regarding JPA and carcass JPE vs. juvenile abundance estimates from screw traps.

Approach

The approach is well-designed, and builds on – essentially simply extends – previous monitoring. The activities will extend the knowledge base, in the sense that they will generate additional data on juvenile production in future years. The contributions should prove useful to decision-makers, assuming that gross juvenile production, smolts per spawner, and similar metrics are useful f

Technical Feasibility

The project is well documented, and technical feasibility seems to be assured, given adequate funding. The scale is consistent with the objectives.

Performance Measures

Absent identification of restoration actions – perhaps these were discussed in previous years’ proposals – I cannot provide a useful response to this set of questions.

Products

The project will lead to useful products – data on juvenile production at the dam vs. estimates of adult spawners – that will clearly be useful to scientists. Its utility for others depends on the restoration actions being undertaken. Data dissemination and handling are clearly described, and should enable interested parties to access the results. The project is likely to produce products that will “pass” peer review.

Capabilities

The project team appears well-qualified, with an appropriate mix of disciplines and a good track record.

Budget

The budget appears sufficient for the work proposed.

Additional Comments

The project team appears to assume much greater familiarity with restoration activities and local jargon than was in fact the case for this reviewer. For example, a more complete description of the NOAA JPE model would be useful for comparison to the JPI. A brief description of restoration actions would be useful, as would an overview of any experimental design (before–after, BACI, etc.) employed to detect action effects on fish. A glossary of acronyms would also be very useful. The proposal appears to assume that the past density–independent relationship between spawner and juvenile abundance indices will continue into the future. This may of course be true, but at some point spawner or juvenile density is likely to become important if the number of returning adults approaches recovery levels. This could easily be incorporated into the statistical models. In addition, the proposed models could be altered to give more weight to more precise juvenile production numbers.

Budget Review

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

Yes.

If no, please explain:

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

Yes.

If no, please explain:

3. Are project management expenses appropriately budgeted?

No.

If no, please explain:

No project management expenses identified.

Task and Deliverables – Grantee must provide detailed information for all work including subcontractor work for 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.

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.

If no, please explain:

The overhead is funding expenses at the regional office.

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

No.

If no, please explain:

About the 3/4 ton truck cost: What is already in the USFWS budget for transportation? This proposal will support 11 PE's for three years. 11 PE's is a lot of manpower! Do the tasks stated support 11? There's a lot of training in this budget doesn't the USFWS have training already in their budget?

Is the Estimating the Abundance of Sacramento River Juvenile Winter Chinook Salmon a unique requirement for this office? If not, there is no justification for direct billing training and transportation. Because it should already be allocated in the labor rate.

Major Expenses – If the grantee is awarded a detailed list of equipment purchases should be provided by the grantee so reviewers can better evaluate whether it is more cost effective for the state to purchase large dollar equipment items through the state procurement process. If the equipment list is available within the State inventory or stock, then purchase of some or all of the listed items may be provided, loaned, or leased by the state to the grantee. In the event, that the equipment is purchased by the grantee, the grantee shall maintain an inventory of major equipment for auditing purposes and potential use for future projects. Grantee shall follow State Contracting Manual [SCM] Section 7.61 thru 7.62 rules pertinent to equipment purchase, lease, etc.

6. Are other agencies contributing or likely to contribute a share of the projects costs?
No.

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

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:

Yes, objections.

A very long list!

Contract Language Exceptions – Proposals submitted by grantees which identify exceptions to State of California’s standard contract language provisions as provided in the 2004 PSP; and/or submit alternative contract language in lieu of the State’s standard contract language should be carefully reviewed prior to awarding grant funds. Review will initially be conducted by the funding agency’s contract office and referred to the legal department as needed.

8. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

No.

If yes, please explain:

no

Other comments:

Environmental Compliance Review

1. Is compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) required for this project?

YES– NO~~X~~

2. Is compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required for this project?

YES~~X~~ NO–

3. Does this project qualify for an Exemption or Exclusion under CEQA and NEPA, respectively?

YES~~X~~ NO– N/A–

Comments:

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

YES~~X~~ NO–

Comments:

5. Did the applicant correctly identify the correct CEQA/NEPA document required for the project?

YES~~X~~ NO– N/A–

Comments:

It was not clear if the NEPA Categorical Exclusion has been obtained yet or not. Item 6 below is checked "no" but it is again unclear. A Categorical Exclusion should not take long to complete and file.

6. Has the CEQA/NEPA document been completed?

YES– NO~~X~~ N/A–

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

YES~~X~~ NO– N/A–

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

YES~~X~~ NO– N/A–

Comments:

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

YESX NO– N/A–

Comments:

The applicant has obtained a State Scientific Collecting Permit and is in the process of obtaining an ESA Section 10 permit.

Identify those additional permits that may be needed by this project:

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?

YESX NO– Project is on public land/water or question is otherwise N/A–

Comments:

The applicant has obtained permission from the USBR to secure rotary screw traps to the Red Bluff Diversion Dam. A copy of the the permission letter is not included in the proposal. Applicant launches boats at a public launch facility.

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?

YES– NOX

Comments:

Prior-Phase Funding Review

Project Title	Estimating the Abundance of Sacramento River Juvenile Winter Chinook Salmon with Comparisons to Adult Escapement
CALFED Contract Management Agency	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Amount Funded	1,708,224.00
Date Awarded	2001/01/01
Lead Institution	Red Bluff Fish and Wildlife Office
Project Number	ERP-01-N44
Project Title	Battle Creek Anadromous Salmonid Monitoring Projects
CALFED Contract Management Agency	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Amount Funded	\$1,344,037
Date Awarded	2000/01/01
Project Number	ERP 01-N45
Project Title	Sacramento River Winter Chinook Carcass Survey
CALFED Contract Management Agency	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Amount Funded	\$324,465
Date Awarded	2001/01/01
Project Number	ERP 01-N46
Project Title	Clear Creek Juvenile Salmonid Monitoring Project
CALFED Contract Management Agency	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Amount Funded	\$668,879
Date Awarded	2000/01/01
Project Number	ERP 01-N47

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?

No.

Invoices are good. Delays in fiscal quarterly report due to the regional staff not having access to full financial data.

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.

Other comments:

Although the current closure date for this project is 6/30/05, USFWS has submitted a request, which is currently under review, to extend the project to 6/30/06 to complete field monitoring activities and report writing.

