Selection Panel (Primary) Review

X 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)

− ***Not Recommended***

Amount Sought: $1,308,449

Fund This Amount: $***1,308,449***

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.)

The grant is subject to a detailed evaluation and approval of the whole budget to determine if labor rates and services are reasonable for services provided and are comparable to state or market rates.

For subcontractor portion of the budget, the proposed grantee shall provide a description of qualifications and a short justification for subcontracting services for pre−selected subcontractors (as sited on page 16 of PSP). The proposed grantee shall also submit a detailed budget identifying the labor rates and indirect costs of the proposed subcontractors.

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 Lower Clear Creek Floodway Restoration Project is a large−scale partnership effort with major previous investments by the CALFED program and other sources. The proposed project focuses on monitoring floodplain related resources, including avifauna, riparian habitat, and geomorphic features and processes. The entire effort has a well integrated adaptive management approach and this will provide valuable information to the overall program framework. The technical reviewers were generally positive about the specifics in the proposal and rated the proposal above average. Although the Selection Panel is recommending this for funding, subject to the specified conditions elsewhere, the proponents are encouraged to consider the suggestions offered by the reviewers.

The Selection Panel is particularly concerned with the high cost of the proposal, and requests the project proponents to resubmit a budget, for the same scope of work with staff costs minimized.

Technical Panel (Primary) Review

above average

Explanation Of Summary Rating

This proposal requests support for ongoing monitoring efforts of an important watershed management project. The proposal is strong and describes research at the appropriate scope. Strengths of the proposal are the scope, the type of measurements proposed, and the integration of stakeholders. Weaknesses included the lack of details of hypothesis and model testing, as well as dissemination of those analyses for scientific peer review.

Review Form

Goals And Justification

The proposed monitoring project consists of three tasks: 1) monitoring avian populations, 2) monitoring geomorphic changes at both the project scale and on the entire watershed, and 3) monitoring vegetation, wetlands, and exotic species in riparian habitats. The proposal clearly identifies the restoration actions that will be monitored and describes the goals and objectives of these actions. Conceptual models are well developed and are linked explicitly with the goals, objectives, hypotheses, and other parts of the proposal. The conceptual models also link the questions to be explored in this system with larger questions of managing and restoring regulated alluvial rivers. The conceptual models are complex, however, and only some of the key processes are monitored under this proposal. Moreover, although the hypotheses developed under the restoration phase of the project are discussed in detail, the specific sub−hypotheses to be addressed under the proposed monitoring are not. The proposed measurements are not linked to specific hypotheses. The general hypotheses of the restoration project clearly relate to current knowledge gaps that CALFED is seeking to address.

The selection of birds as an indicator group for the broader wildlife community is not justified. Whereas birds may be good indicators of environmental or habitat conditions, the notion that birds are indicators for other taxonomic groups has rarely been tested and sometimes falsified. There is no guarantee that improving conditions for birds will increase the diversity or abundance of other species.

Approach

The proposal presents a clear, well−designed approach for the project objectives that is well integrated with previous monitoring programs at the project sites. The methodology builds on previous monitoring efforts that were subsequent to the most recent restoration efforts. The proposal will thus obtain valuable “before” and “after” data. Lessons learned from previous monitoring influenced the proposed approach. For example, the original geomorphic monitoring approach considered only the local project sites. The current proposal states that understanding the sustainability of the project requires a more thorough understanding of the geomorphic context of the site in the larger system and watershed−scale sediment dynamics.

The proposed monitoring is very well designed for all three tasks and will meet the project’s objectives. Reviewers made several specific comments regarding the proposed monitoring approaches. Focal species of birds were chosen appropriately to provide a broad distribution among microhabitat types. The proposal should have included some estimate of nest density to address the likelihood of obtaining sufficient sample sizes of nests. The point count method assumes equal probabilities of detection in all habitats surveyed, an assumption that is rarely met. Obtaining good estimates of the density of breeding birds through territory mapping should offset this shortfall, but territory mapping is extremely time−consuming.

The proposed avian monitoring will certainly be valuable for decision−makers wishing to determine the effectiveness of restoration actions for birds.

Vegetation monitoring techniques are standard, but sample size/replication is not clear.

Feasibility And Likelihood Of Success

Some important details of project methods are contained in the attachments rather than in the body of the proposal. The spatial scale of the proposal is appropriate for the objectives. As noted above, the project aims to consider a larger geographic scale to understand the geomorphic context and success and sustainability of the restoration project. Methods have largely been tested and proved and the project team is experienced, suggesting that their approach is technically feasible. External reviewers wanted more specifics regarding some monitoring approaches, including size of territory mapping plots, location of monitoring plots, number of visits to each plot, and the timing of point counts. Moreover, one external technical reviewer was concerned that there was insufficient discussion of the causes of low nest success, with the result that monitoring would not lead to clear recommendations for changes in management.

There were no issues identified in either the regional or environmental compliance reviews.

Performance Measures

Performance measures are provided for each component, although they are variously referred to as ‘metrics’, ‘performance measures’, or ‘specific process−related goals that could be readily quantified and evaluated.’ Performance measures are clearly related to project objectives, hypotheses and conceptual models.

The design does not provide information about controls for the measurements. Hence, evaluation of effectiveness of the restoration efforts is more difficult and most goals are stated only in relative terms. The lack of quantifiable performance measures weakens the proposal. For example, does 'increase in native vegetation' mean a statistically significant slope over time? This is not explicitly stated.

For birds, the inclusion of specific target levels of abundance, nest success, breeding density, adult survival, and species richness is generally encouraging. However, more specific information on the determination of these target values would have been useful. The proposal states that these targets were derived from monitoring at Lower Clear Creek and elsewhere in the Sacramento Valley, but it is unclear exactly how these data led to the generation of these target values. Despite these concerns, the mere existence of targets this detailed and site−specific shows foresight. Mechanisms for linking data with the conceptual models are lacking since the conceptual model does not explicitly include population parameters such as adult survival or nest success.

The abundance of quantitative data the proposal aims to produce should be sufficient to support or reject any of the models or hypotheses presented, but the proposal would be strengthened with more detail of how this will be done. The conceptual model appears sound, but is unnecessarily complex with causes and effects not clearly distinguished. For example, separate boxes on the same level ('Riverine Processes') are made for 'fine sediment deposition increased' and 'increased sediment transport' without a link showing that transport leads to deposition.

The proposal could have devoted more discussion to the adaptive management strategy. It would have been useful to see a discussion of few examples of specific additional management or restoration actions that would be triggered by monitoring results.

Products

Products include internal reports, a workshop, presentations at conferences, "and other scientific venues, such as professional conferences and journals". This section could have provided more detail on how results will be broadly disseminated. For example, how will the workshop be advertised and to whom? How many peer−reviewed manuscripts will be written

(at least an estimate) and to what journals will they be submitted? To whom are the annual reports submitted, and who has access to these?

Monitoring efforts will provide information about floodplain restoration that will be will be useful to managers and other decision−makers looking to improve habitat in Central Valley riparian ecosystems through restoration. The benefits will accrue primarily to local and regional managers, as well as restoration scientists working in other regions, but caution should be exercised in applying the results of monitoring on this project to other regions.

The data handling and storage section are deficient. A distributed data storage approach is proposed, but no detail on the actual location or accessibility of data is provided. No centralized query application is available. No mention is made of data and metadata standards. There is no project policy for the data access. The timing of data release and possible restrictions are not discussed. Under this data management system, most information will only be available through gray literature reports.

This project is well considered and likely benefited from considerable input from scientists, further improving chances for the results to stand up under peer review.

Capabilities

External reviewers indicated that the project team was well−qualified with the appropriate mix of disciplines. They have already been conducting monitoring in this system for several years. The Technical Review Panel suggested that expertise in geomorphology was lacking from the team. There was also a concern that the team did not demonstrate a strong commitment to publication in the peer−reviewed literature

Budget

External technical reviewers split on the appropriateness of the budget. One reviewer felt that the consultant fees were excessive and stated from personal experience that the work could be done more economically. The other two reviewers found the costs reasonable, but requested more detailed information.

Because so much of the on−the−ground work is done through subcontractors, most of the budget is composed of subcontracting. There is littledetail in the subcontracting sections to determine whether the workload can be accomplished for the proposed budget. It would have been useful if the proposal had presented an estimate of the number of field crew members, the months of their employment, and large equipment needs and prices.

Regional Review

The Sacramento Review Panel ranked the proposal as “High”. The panel considers the riparian and avian monitoring as lower priority tasks in this proposal. Continued geomorphic monitoring is the highest priority because it provides valuable information to manage habitat for the Big R species steelhead and spring Chinook.

Administrative Review

No significant issues regarding prior phase funding were raised.

The environmental compliance review indicated that the applicant should consult with CDFG to determine if CEQA compliance is required.

The project will require a Scientific Collecting Permit. A take permit may also be required if there are any threatened or endangered species present.

No significant issues were raised in the budget review

Additional Comments

Technical Review Panel's Overall Evaluation Rating:
above average

Sacramento Regional Review

High

Review:

1. ***Applicability to ERP goals and regional priorities.***

This proposal addresses ERP and CVPIA priorities in the following ways: 1. It addresses Stage 1 Restoration Priorities 1−5. 2. Clear Creek is an ERP priority stream and is addressed specifically in the Draft Stage 1 Implimentation Plan. 3. It addresses MSCS Big R species spring Chinook, steelhead, and VELB, particularly with the geomorphic monitoring. 4. It addresses milestones to a.) develop a program to establish and maintain riparian habitat, improve floodplain habitat, and salmonid shaded riverine habitat; and b.) restoration of a two mile portion of riparian habitat in lower Clear Creek. 5. It addresses CVPIA section 3406 (b) 12 and specific actions to be implemented in Clear Creek. 6. The work will provide useful information for other ERP floodplain rehabilitation projects throughout the Central Valley. 7. It will dovetail with the EWP that lists Clear Creek as one of its top 5 priority streams.

2. ***Links with other restoration actions.***

The project will address several major restoration actions and adaptive management issues in Clear Creek. Restoration efforts include: gravel injection, removal of Saeltzer Dam, riparian restoration, stream channel modification, flow enhancement, geomporphic flow enhancement etc.

3. ***Local Circumstances.***

The project has strong local support and good access with much of the stream in BLM ownership.

4. ***Local involvement.***

The RCD has strong support from various agencies and local government. Coordination with the Whiskeytown environmental school provides substantial outreach to sixth grade classes in Shasta County.

5. ***Local Value.***

The project will provide valuable information for adaptive management of Clear Creek and large scale floodplain restoration efforts throughout the Central Valley.

6. ***Other comments:***

Overall Ranking:
High

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

The panel considers the riparian and avian monitoring as lower priority tasks in this proposal. Continued geomophic monitoring is the highest priority because it provides valuable information to manage habitat for the Big R species steelhead and spring Chinook.

External Technical Review

Goals And Justification

This proposal outlines clearly the three−phase restoration project of Clear Creek that they wish to monitor with funds from CALFED. The main focus of the restoration activity is protection of salmonid and riparian habitat through management of hydrology and channel morphology. It is a consistent message. The hypothesis being tested is that management of the ecosystems of highly regulated rivers is possible through sediment and flow manipulation. This is an important area of study that will benefit other, future projects by filling critical knowledge gaps, particularly how historic processes of disturbance can be effectively simulated to restore damaged ecosystems.

Approach

The approach involves both administrative/project management aspects and monitoring. Monitoring is three−fold, using bird surveys, vegetation monitoring, and geomorphic measurements. Fisheries monitoring is being done under a different grant. Vegetation monitoring has been ongoing since the beginning of the project in 2000. Because woody, long lived−species are of interest, long term monitoring is appropriate. Techniques are standard, but sample size/replication is not clear (would be useful for evaluation). Bird monitoring is similarly standard, but without design detail (e.g. timing of counts). Assuming these are sound, having these data will be invaluable for quantifying changes since modification, which will lend support (or not) for these management practices. Better still would be if there were controls (i.e. locations without management that are similarly monitored for comparison). However, I understand that with the goal of total watershed management, omission of controls is standard practice and not overly troubling here. The results of this monitoring is likely to be highly valuable to land managers.

Technical Feasibility

As this is a continuation of a previously established project, all approaches have been tested for feasibility and appear sound. Although large, this is not a highly technical project. Scale is consistent with objectives. Collaboration of multiple stake−holder groups is strong aspect of proposal.

Performance Measures

This is the only section that warrants strengthening. Evaluation of effectiveness is more difficult without a control (see comment above), and goals are stated only in relative terms,

except for quantified goals for hydrology. That is, what rate of establishment (of natives) or non−establishment (of exotics) or level of bird diversity constitute a successful restoration? I assume that 'increase in native vegetation' means a statistically significant slope over time? This is not explicitly stated.

Furthermore, how exactly will conceptual model (Appendix B) be tested? The underlying model appears logically sound, but is unnecessarily complex with causes and effects not clearly distinguished; for example, separate boxes on the same level ('Riverine Processes') are made for 'fine sediment deposition increased' and 'increased sediment transport' without a link showing that transport leads to deposition. How will these links be made, in practical terms? Where is Dr. Schwertman's contribution (the statistician)?

That said, the abundance of quantitative data proposed should be sufficient to support or reject any of the models or hypotheses presented. Proposal would be strengthened with more detail of how this will be done.

Products

Products described are simply internal reports, a workshop (no detail given), presentations at conferences, "and other scientific venues, such as professional conferences and journals". I found this section somewhat weak, without sufficient detail to assure us that the proper folks will be receiving this information: How will the workshop be advertised and to whom (i.e. how broad a base of 'restoration teams' will know about this)?, How many peer−reviewed manuscripts will be written (at least an estimate) and to what journals will they be submitted? To whom are the annual reports submitted, and who has access to these?

Capabilities

It appears that the team is qualified, with a good mix of disciplines. Performance record (as self reported) supports assertion that the project is likely to be successful.

Budget

The Consultant fees make up the bulk of the cost and exceed $1 million. This appears excessive to me and needs greater detail; I would like to see a breakdown of their costs. I defer evaluation of their fees to those who have used consultants, but my team could certainly do the job cheaper than this.

Additional Comments

I find this to be a strong proposal to support ongoing monitoring efforts of an important watershed management project. It is clear that for riparian managment to be effective, projects of this scale are necessary, and this one appears to be well−implemented. The strongest aspects of the proposal are the scope and type of measurements taken, and the integration of stakeholders. The weakest aspects were details of hypothesis and model testing, as well as dissemination of those analyses for scientific peer review.

External Technical Review

Goals And Justification

The proposal clearly identifies the restoration actions which will be monitored and describes the goals and objectives of these actions. Conceptual models are well developed and are linked explicitly with the goals, objectives, hypotheses, and other parts of the proposal. The conceptual models also link the questions to be explored in this system with larger questions of managing and restoring regulated alluvial rivers. The hypotheses are well developed and clear. The broad hypothesis – regulated rivers can be 'scaled down' to promote semi−natural hydrologic and geomorphic processes that will create sustainable habitats – clearly relates to current knowledge gaps that CALFED is seeking to address.

Approach

The approach is clear, well−designed, appropriate for the project objectives and is well integrated with previous monitoring programs at the project sites. Lessons learned from previous monitoring are described and they describe how these lessons influence the proposed approach. For example, the original geomorphic monitoring approach considered only the local project sites. The current proposal states that understanding the sustainability of the project requires a more thorough understanding of the geomorphic context of the site in the larger system and watershed−scale sediment dynamics. Critics of river restoration projects often recommend this broader spatial approach to monitoring but few projects attempt it.

The restoration actions that have taken place in the Clear Creek watershed (e.g. dam removal, floodplain reconstruction, gravel augmentation, passive and active riparian restoration) are being, or will be, replicated throughout the Central Valley. Thus, lessons learned here will provide useful information for CALFED broader goals of ecosystem restoration. A particularly valuable contribution may be information gleaned about the relationships between regulated flows, natural floods, gravel augmentation, and channel reconstruction and whether these actions together can restore semi−natural geomorphic processes in a regulated alluvial river. Another important contribution may be the efficacy of restoring riparian vegetation on recreated floodplain surfaces composed of highly permeable materials (e.g. cobbles from dredger tailings); this approach to floodplain reconstruction is proposed for other locations in the Central Valley.

Technical Feasibility

The project methods are described although details are contained in the attachments. The methods have largely been tested and proved and the project team is experienced suggesting that their approach is technically feasible. The scale is appropriate for the objectives. As noted above, the project aims to consider a larger geographic scale to understand the geomorphic context and success and sustainability of the restoration project.

Performance Measures

The data collected will allow evaluation of the restoration actions. Performance measures are provided for each component, although they are called ‘metrics’ within the avian section, ‘performance measures’ in the riparian section and the geomorphic section refers to ‘specific process−related goals that could be readily quantified and evaluated.’ (not a problem that there are different terms, just a semantic note). Performance measures are clearly related to project objectives, hypotheses and conceptual models. The monitoring and evaluation plan is sufficiently detailed to assess project performance and has been improved based on previous experience in this system. Feedback loops are in place to improve monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management.

Products

As described under ‘Approach’ the monitoring is likely to provide useful information, particularly about floodplain restoration, re−iniation of geomorphic processes on a regulated river, and riparian restoration and natural regeneration on recreated floodplain surfaces using highly permeable material. The project explicitly describes how this information will be made available and the project team has a track record of making this information available. Data handling and dissemination systems are in place and will facilitate the sharing and accessibility of the information generated. The proposed project appears likely to produce high−quality data that can stand up to peer review processes. Further, the project has a system in place to involve the broader public.

Capabilities

The project team is qualified and experienced with the appropriate mix of disciplines. They have already been conducting monitoring in this system for several years. As far as is indicated in the proposal they have the performance record to complete this project.

Budget

The budget is reasonable and adequate for the work proposed.

Additional Comments

External Technical Review

Goals And Justification

Restoration actions whose outcomes will be monitored are clearly identified. The goals and objectives are suitably described. However, if an objective is to provide habitat strictly for birds, one wonders why the restoration of other wildlife communities is not considered. Whereas birds may be good indicators of environmental or habitat conditions, the notion that birds are indicators for other taxonomic groups¬ has rarely been tested anywhere, let alone in the Central Valley. (In fact, two of the papers cited in the bird monitoring plan are not in the literature cited, making it difficult to consult the sources of this claim.) There is no guarantee that improving conditions for birds will increase the diversity or abundance of other species. In fact, this and other monitoring efforts represent a great opportunity to test those assumptions. Clearly, this would involve a great deal more effort, and thus, this is not a major criticism of this proposal.

The general structure of the conceptual model is useful, although the level of detail required to fully trace the logic behind restoration and monitoring actions is lacking. Admittedly, this would be difficult for a project of this scope. The identification of uncertainties is a valuable admission of imperfection. There is no identification of specific processes expected to lead to low nest success—I would have liked some text on whether increased nest success is indeed expected from the restoration, and if so, what causes of low nest success (nest predation, cowbird parasitism, low resource availability) were ameliorated or removed. Thus, the stated justification for this portion of the monitoring is weaker, although it's clearly important, as relying on density alone to determine population status can be misleading. The hypotheses for monitoring are clearly stated and justified.

Approach

The proposed monitoring is very well designed and will meet the project's objectives. It follows logically from, or rather repeats, previous monitoring efforts in the region, subsequent to the most recent restoration efforts. Thus, there will be valuable "before" and "after" data. As avian and other monitoring have been ongoing since 1999, initiating a new round of monitoring at this time will be valuable in the eventual generation of a long−term dataset. The contributions this monitoring will make include 1) identifying successful restoration actions that may subsequently be employed elsewhere in the Central Valley; 2) increasing our general understanding of avian community and population responses to stream restoration and riparian habitat improvements; 3) identifying primary sources of nest failure on the restoration site; and 4) demonstrating whether restoration improved conditions for species of concern. These contributions will certainly be valuable for decision−makers

wishing to determine the effectiveness of restoration actions for birds.

The focal species chosen seem appropriately distributed among microhabitat types. It would have been useful to have some estimate of nest density in the proposal to imbue confidence in the ability to obtain sufficient sample sizes of nests.

The point count method assumes equal probabilities of detection in all habitats surveyed, an assumption that is rarely met. Obtaining good estimates of the density of breeding birds through territory mapping should offset this shortfall, but territory mapping is extremely time−consuming. Distance sampling or mark−recapture methods are other ways to obtain decent density estimates, but in this situation, where point counts have been conducted in the past, it is likely best to continue that method, supplemented by territory mapping. Territory mapping also assists with locating nests.

Technical Feasibility

The project is technically feasible. For the most part, it is fully documented, but there are a few details left out that I would like to have seen. For example, what are the size of the territory mapping plots? BBIRD guidelines vary depending on habitat (which affects the density of territories) and the number of plots surveyed. How many visits to each plot will be conducted? The scale of the project is commensurate with the objectives.

Performance Measures

The proposed monitoring will generate data that will be beneficial in evaluating the restoration project. For birds, specific target levels of abundance, nest success, breeding density, adult survival, and species richness will be extremely helpful in determining the success of restoration efforts. The inclusion of such specific information is generally encouraging. However, though the proposal states that these targets were derived from monitoring at Lower Clear Creek and elsewhere in the Sacramento Valley, it is unclear exactly how the compilation of data led to the generation of these target values. How was it determined that the values from field data (or higher, in some cases) were appropriate targets? It does not appear that these values derived from more undisturbed populations, and it is unclear why data from the restoration region would be used to inform target levels. Intuitively, it would make more sense if these targets came from a combination of values from field data, literature values regarding what levels allow populations to be self−sustaining, and expert opinion. Perhaps this is what was done, but additional documentation would have been useful. Despite these concerns, the mere existence of targets this detailed and site−specific shows foresight.

The data collected and knowledge of whether targets were met should be useful in evaluating the conceptual models presented, in a general way. The conceptual model does not explicitly include population parameters such as adult survival or nest success, let alone specific values tied to those parameters, but I don't see this as a real shortcoming.

The proposal does not go one step further in developing a true adaptive management strategy. It is certainly possible that such a task lies outside the scope of a monitoring proposal, and I don't claim to know exactly what CALFED expects in these proposals. However, the obvious step after monitoring data are collected involves what to do with those data. It would have been useful in the proposal to see a discussion of what specific additional management or restoration actions would be suggested if bird species (for example) attained only the "poor" or "fair" level for any given parameter. While there isn't the space to enumerate all the possible outcomes of monitoring and their implications for management, a few examples would have helped.

Products

This project will undoubtedly generate information useful to managers and other decision−makers looking to improve avian habitat in Central Valley riparian ecosystems through restoration. The benefits will accrue primarily to local and regional managers, as well as restoration scientists working in other regions, but caution should be exercised in applying the results of monitoring on this project to other regions. Data handling procedures are well described and others should be able to access data and reports easily if these procedures are followed. This project is well considered and likely benefited from considerable input from scientists, further improving chances for the results to stand up under peer review.

Capabilities

The project's team has an impressive mix of experience that is entirely suitable to the needs of the project. The team has a wealth of monitoring experience and should be able to complete the project efficiently and according to schedule.

Budget

The budget seems reasonable and adequate. Because so much of the on−the−ground work is done through subcontractors, most of the budget is composed of subcontracting. There is insufficient detail in the subcontracting sections to determine whether the workload can be accomplished for the proposed budget. It would have been useful if the proposal had presented an estimate of the number of field crew members, the months of their employment, and large equipment needs and prices. The amounts seem reasonable, however.

Additional Comments

As a terrestrial vertebrate ecologist, I have focused my review of this proposal on the portions relating to bird monitoring. From this perspective, this is a strong proposal overall. Most of my criticisms are minor. The proposal is well written and carefully thought out.

Budget Review

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

If no, please explain:

none

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

If no, please explain:

none

3. Are project management expenses appropriately budgeted?
Yes.

If no, please explain:

none

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:

Recommend clarification of other direct costs.

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.

If no, please explain:

Labor rates indicated appear to be consistent with state rates.

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:

$72,000− Technical advisory committee

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.

If yes, please explain:

none

Other comments:

Subcontracting – Proposals for work to be performed by subcontractors or other entities in excess of the 25% of the total project dollars the grantee is required to provide a justification for subcontracting services. If subcontractors are pre−selected and identified in the proposals as part of the project team, the grantee should provide a justification on how each subcontractor was selected. Grantee shall identify labor rates and indirect costs rates paid to each identified subcontractor to ensure that labor rates are comparable to State rates.

The Subcontracted work should be identified with a rate and hours and attributed to each task and deliverable for each year. A performance evaluation is also recommended for subcontractors that receive more than 50% of the grant funds. If the subcontractor has not

been identified, a position description complete with education level, experience, and abilities be submitted and the rate and hour associated with that position will be attributed to a task, and deliverable. The grantee is also required to comply with the State competitive bidding process as stated in the PSP.

The Grantee should charge a reduced indirect cost rate to the state for services that will be subcontracted by the grantee. (Researching SCM Section 3.06 B).

Environmental Compliance Review

1. Is compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) required for this project?
YES***X*** NO−

2. Is compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required for this project?
YES− NO***X***

3. Does this project qualify for an Exemption or Exclusion under CEQA and NEPA, respectively?
YES***X*** NO− N/A−
Comments:

Possibly. This project may or may not require CEQA. It is unclear. Because the project may require state take permits for the monitoring elements, it could trigger CEQA and may be exempt. The applicant should consult with CDFG to determine if CEQA compliance is required.

4. Did the applicant correctly identify if CEQA/NEPA compliance was required?
YES***X*** NO−
Comments:

See comment #3.

5. Did the applicant correctly identify the correct CEQA/NEPA document required for the project?
YES− NO***X*** N/A−
Comments:

See comment #3.

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:

Again, it is unclear whether they will need a CEQA document. If one is required, I do not anticipate it to be a complex document and will probably be exempt.

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− NO***X*** N/A−
Comments:

It appears the sampling described is a continuation of a past monitoring program that is already permitted. But, the applicant did not check off any "obtained" permits on the environmental checklist even though they state in the text that they will obtain the permits before monitoring begins. They incorrectly state they do not need any permits because they are on state property.

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

This project will require a Scientific Collecting Permit. A take permit may also be required if there are any threatened or endangered species present.

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?
YES− NO− Project is on public land/water or question is otherwise N/A***X***
Comments:

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− NO***X***
Comments:

The applicant should begin the CEQA and CESA/ESA process as soon as possible in order to begin monitoring on time.

Prior−Phase Funding Review

Project Title	Lower Clear Creek Floodplain Restoration
CALFED Contract Management Agency	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Amount Funded	$3,797,416
Date Awarded	1999/01/01
Lead Institution	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Project Number	114209J022

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.

Other comments:

The original contract was awarded in 1998 for $3,559,596. The contract has been modified four times, which has increased the funding to $3,935,416.50 and extended the contract from 34 months to 85 months. As of 1/26/05, another modification is being requested for $67,823, with no additional time increase to conduct avian monitoring.

Prior−Phase Funding Review

Project Title	Clear Creek Prescription
CALFED Contract Management Agency	US Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Amount Funded	$256,261
Date Awarded	2000/01/01
Project Number	99N16

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.

Other comments: