

Proposal Reviews

#14: Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

California Department of Fish and Game

Final Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Bay Regional Review

External Scientific Review #1
#2
#3

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding #1
#2

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 14

Applicant Organization: California Department of Fish and Game

Proposal Title: Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	X

Amount: **\$0**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This project seeks to continue work on restoring approx. 200 acres of tidal wetland habitat in Suisun. Early planning phases of the project have been funded by CALFED and this proposal requests funds to conduct baseline monitoring and construction. The proposal received mixed scientific reviews and a low rating from the regional panel, based on cost considerations. The Technical Review Panel recommended the project not be funded at this time. Further, the Technical Review Panel recommended later resubmission of the proposal with more detail and addressing some of their specific concerns. The Selection Panel considered the applicants' comments, but agrees with the Review Panels recommendation that the proposal should not be funded at this time. There have been delays in contracting regarding earlier phases of the project and these must be substantially complete before more funding is provided. The Selection encourages resubmission of this proposal for future funding in accordance with the Review Panels recommendation.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 14

Applicant Organization: California Department of Fish and Game

Proposal Title: Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	The focus of this Phase is not balanced with the types of information found in the proposal. Several contradictions make the proposal difficult to review and detract from the panels confidence in the project. The panel recommends that the proposal should be resubmitted next year when the information needed to judge the merits of the work becomes available. If they reapply, the applicant should address comments in Section 1 (Goals and Justification) and last two paragraphs of Section 2 (Likelihood of Success).
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

The project addresses the goal of tidal wetland restoration in the critical Suisun area. The goals and objectives are clearly stated for this pilot project. However, the hypothesis is management oriented and circular. Specifically, it states that the work outlined in the Management Plan will allow us to meet the above objectives. They plan to test the hypothesis in Phase IV. Over one million dollars will be spent on monitoring in Phase III, and the panel expected to see tests of significant hypotheses using the data to critically examine aspects of the conceptual model. One aspect of the work that would lend itself to this is the use of reference sites, which are already specified in the project, and were appreciated by the panel. The conceptual model is well stated and documented. It supports the proposed activity of dike removal. The scale of the project is appropriate.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

The project, once constructed, will add important information regarding a number of topics that are critical to tidal restoration, but currently identified by CALFED as uncertain components of the conceptual model. However, the project does not appear to offer any approaches or methods that are novel. The information promised from Phase IV (the next funding cycle) promises to be useful. The likelihood of success is high, but there seem to be limited expectations for the project (low target). Explicit descriptions of targets in the form of performance criteria would help define the expectations. This is Phase III, in which they plan to develop final construction plans, perform the physical components of the restoration and establish baseline conditions for the monitoring and adaptive management program. In Phase II, the team was supposed to obtain the major permits needed for the construction. Phase II has not yet begun (a contract has not been signed), however the permits were described as pending (see Part 4. of the Environmental Compliance Checklist), which is confusing. The focus of this Phase was not balanced with the types of information we expected, but were unable to find in the proposal. For example from the elevation survey, we hoped to learn how much subsidence has occurred on the site and what proportion of the site is expected to support emergent vegetation under current elevations and restored tides. Performance measures were expected to be finalized in detail appropriate for this review in the Monitoring Plan due early Fall 2001. Apparently, it was not completed in time for inclusion in this proposal. However, this proposal does contain clear language that indicates a real program of adaptive management is a central part of this project, specifically for: tidal drainage, planting success and mosquito production (but needs to include the natural revegetation process, sedimentation dynamics and invasive species).

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

Several reports are expected from this project. There is mention of use of a web site to share information and some outreach will be supported on site. A peer-reviewed publication is suggested as well.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Costs of the removal of the berm, creation of public facilities and berm strengthening are not split out and are difficult to assess. Similarly, all aspects of baseline monitoring over the three years is high, and does not appear to be justified on the basis of the information in the proposal.

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

The regional reviewer gave this project a LOW ranking because they felt the budget was too high

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

This funding request is for Phase III of a project. Phase I was conducted with some delays, but no contract is yet in place for Phase II. Environmental compliance is on track. Project management costs were not given in sufficient detail for budget reviewer and budget figures in summary and 17a. did not match.

Miscellaneous comments:

The project will take place on Cal Dept Fish and Game property. One reviewer wondered what resources the agency has used over the past decade to manage the property? Why was no cost sharing identified in this rather expensive proposal? Actually, after stating no cost sharing in the preliminary material, there is cost share from the agency of \$282,000 that is described in section 4.1. This type of contradiction is found several places in the proposal, and creates unnecessary confusion.

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 14

Applicant Organization: California Department of Fish and Game

Proposal Title: Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

Overall Ranking: ☒Low ☐Medium ☐High

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

Very expensive for the size of the project (200 acres) compared to other project proposals which would restore larger acreages for similar or less cost. Funding at this level will set unreasonable expectations of the cost of restoration, which may preclude or limit future restoration attempts. Not necessary to fund now; suggest reevaluation of budget and resubmittal.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

Phase II, which has not started but has been funded by CALFED, includes all permitting and environmental compliance requirements. Some coordination with local entities (e.g., with PG&E regarding protection of infrastructure) has already begun. The applicants state that the project schedule is feasible based on PWA's prior experience with wetland restoration. The landowner, DFG, is the applicant.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

Bay Region PSP priority 1 (Restore wetlands in critical areas throughout the bay, either via new projects or improvements that add to or help sustain existing projects) calls for restoration of tidal marshes along the northern sides of Suisun Bay. This project would restore a portion of a 200 acre site to tidal marsh. Priority 2 which calls for restoration of uplands in key areas of Suisun Marsh. This project will restore the upland portion of the site, possibly to include seasonal wetlands. The project will provide information (such as sedimentation rates) for other restoration projects in Suisun Marsh.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

Consistent with SCIP, SF Bay Area Wetlands Ecosystem Goals Project, and the USFWS's tidal marsh recovery efforts. It's also one of a potential number of restoration projects that may link tidal marsh from Hill Slough to Joyce Island.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

The proposed restoration includes a public access component (boardwalks, interpretive signs, etc.). The proposal states that there is wide support from DFG, USFWS and local groups.

Other Comments:

Extraordinarily expensive for 200 acres. The panel believes funding at this level will set unreasonable expectations of the cost of restoration, which may preclude or limit future restoration attempts. Immediate funding is not necessary because DFG owns the site, so it is not threatened. Suggest examining the budget for reductions and resubmitting. Upland transition habitat on the site is extremely valuable.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **14**

Applicant Organization: **California Department of Fish and Game**

Proposal Title: **Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

NONE

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	The focus of this Phase is not balanced with the types of information found in the proposal. Several contradictions make the proposal difficult to review and detract from the reviewers confidence in the project. Perhaps the proposal should be resubmitted next year when the information needed to judge the merits of the work becomes available.
-Good	
XPoor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

The goals and objectives are clearly stated for this pilot project. However, the hypothesis is management oriented and circular. Specifically, it states that the work outlined in the "Management Plan will allow us to meet the above objectives." They plan to test the hypothesis in Phase IV. Over one million dollars will be spent on monitoring in Phase III, and this reviewer expected to see tests of significant hypotheses using the data to critically examine aspects of the conceptual model. One aspect of the work that would lend itself to this is the use of reference sites, which are already specified in the project. The project addresses the goal of tidal wetland restoration in the critical Suisun area.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The conceptual model is well stated and documented. It supports the proposed activity of dike removal. The scale of the project is appropriate.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The project, once constructed, will add important information regarding a number of topics that are critical to tidal restoration, but currently identified by CALFED as uncertain components of the conceptual model. However, the project does not appear to offer any approaches or methods that are novel. The information promised from Phase IV (the next funding cycle) promises to be useful, but no clear mechanism for sharing this information is provided in the proposal.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

The likelihood of success is high, but there seem to be limited expectations for the project (low target). Explicit descriptions of targets in the form of performance criteria would help define the expectations.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Performance measures were expected to be finalized in detail appropriate for this review in the Monitoring Plan due "early Fall 2001". Apparently, it was not completed in time for inclusion in this proposal. However, this proposal does contain clear language that indicates a real program of adaptive management is a central part of this project, specifically for: tidal drainage, planting success and mosquito production. It should also address the natural revegetation process, sedimentation dynamics and invasive species.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

Several reports are expected from this project. There is mention of use of a web site to share information. This proposal exhibits no strengths with regard to sharing information using traditional or new methods.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

This is Phase III, in which they plan to develop final construction plans, perform the physical components of the restoration and establish baseline conditions for the monitoring and adaptive management program. In Phase II, the team was supposed to obtain the major permits needed for the construction, but these are also described as pending within the first year (see Part 4. of the Environmental Compliance Checklist), which is confusing. The focus of this Phase is not balanced with the types of information we expected, but were unable to find in the proposal.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Costs of the removal of the berm, creation of public facilities and berm strengthening are not split out and are difficult to assess. Similarly, all aspects of baseline monitoring over the three years is high, and does not appear to be justified on the basis of the information in the proposal.

Miscellaneous comments:

The project will take place on Cal Dept Fish and Game property. The reviewer wonders what resources the agency has used over the past decade to manage the property? After stating no cost sharing in the preliminary material, there is cost share from the agency of \$282,000 that is described in section 4.1. This type of contradiction is found several places in the proposal, and creates unnecessary confusion. The reviewer gets the impression that this project is more about: 1) facilitating and encouraging human use of the area; 2) increasing security from flooding by strengthening berms; and 3) increasing the role of active management, rather than a focus on habitat restoration driven by natural processes following removal of berms (passive management).

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **14**

Applicant Organization: **California Department of Fish and Game**

Proposal Title: **Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	The monitoring plan looks good although could be cut back to save money. More detail would have been helpful in the design and construction portion. The applicants appear qualified. The budget seems large in comparison to other projects restoring similar sized areas.
X Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

In this project they propose to restore tidal action to 200 acres of seasonal and permanent wetlands in the Suisun Marsh. They have already received funding to complete a preliminary restoration and monitoring plan and to complete the compliance and permitting process. They request 5.6 M to do baseline monitoring on this and two other reference sites (a similar site not to be restored and a mature marsh), to complete the design plan, and to do the construction. They will later request funds for post-project monitoring and management. The construction portion will involve two breaches in a levee, starter channels, lowering levees in some areas, and making improvements to levees in other areas, some planting, trails, observation platforms, and parking. From Fig. 3 it looks like there are approximately 6300 feet of levee on which work will be done (4500 ft. to be raised or built and 1750 ft. to be lowered with breaches added).

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The overall goal is to increase tidal marsh in the Suisun Marsh and I think this project will certainly do that as long as correct hydrology and elevation are achieved. Its called a pilot implementation and I'm not sure why it's not a full implementation unless there is a plan to do a much larger area later.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The approach seems reasonable. The monitoring plan is well-detailed, but I had a couple questions here: What is their plan for controlling invasive species? Spaying? What are the invasive species of concern? They state that PWA developed a calibrated sedimentation model to predict likely sedimentation rates - I'm wondering what types of sedimentation rates they might expect from this model's predictions. In their physical monitoring they will install sediment monitoring stations - exactly how will they monitor sedimentation? marker horizons? Are any of the fish monitoring techniques aimed at use of the marsh surface? Since a primary marsh support function is nursery and feeding grounds, I am wondering if they will sample fish on the marsh. Pit traps are often used for trapping fish larvae for this purpose. The design resolution description doesn't say much about expected length of the breaches and proposed levee design, but maybe that will all be decided in this process, but a little detail and potential levee designs would have been nice. From Fig. 3 it looks like the breaches may be 50 ft. wide, but some narrative about this would have been nice. The size of the breach can affect sedimentation. They don't say how many trails and observation platforms they are aiming for or how much parking. Some estimates would have been helpful. I realize they are going to decide all this in the design phase, but I'm surprised their Phase I funding didn't provide a little more direction here.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

The monitoring section is well documented. I would have liked more detail for the rest of it. I think that if the dikes are breached and tidal water flows in then the marsh will develop and form habitat for the fish and other animals, especially if there is adequate sedimentation in the areas that have subsided significantly. From their description in the proposal it doesn't sound like subsidence has been a big problem at this site. They say "Hill Slough West is gently sloped and only shallowly subsided, large areas are suitable elevations for rapid initial colonization -- a broad band across the site and narrow bands along the perimeter" (p. 3). Somewhat conflicting however, on p. 2 and in Appendix A, it says that "much of the site has subsided up to approximately 1 m below natural tidal marsh elevations". It would be nice to know what percentage of the area is currently at a suitable elevation and what percentage is not. Knowledge of sedimentation rates is really important if much of the site is 1 m below appropriate marsh elevation.

The project is technically feasible and consistent with the objectives.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans

explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Performance measures will actually take place during post-project monitoring which will take place in Phase IV, not part of the current project. However they state that it will include marsh plain evolution, channel density, species composition, vegetation coverage, etc.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

It would be nice if an article for a peer-reviewed journal could also be written as one of the products so that it would be easily accessible to others interested in outcomes of restoration projects. They are collecting so much monitoring data and making comparisons to a "time scale" with their reference marsh sites that it should be of wide interest.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

From the information in the proposal the applicants seem to be well qualified.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The budget seems high to me in comparison to some of the other proposals I have read. Some things could be cut back. For example, it may not be necessary to sample benthic invertebrates quarterly. This could be perhaps cut to one time when peak activity would be expected. Likewise, the number of fish sampling times could probably be cut in half at least.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **14**

Applicant Organization: **California Department of Fish and Game**

Proposal Title: **Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

NONE

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
X Excellent	The project is well thought out and has sound justification. It also meets CALFED objectives and has a high likely probability of being successful. I encourage funding of this project.
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

The goals of the project is to restore approximately 200 acres of tidal wetland. The goals and objectives of the project are well laid out and clearly stated. Restoration of marshes is a critical to all estuaries within the US. Additionally, the San Francisco Bay area has been losing marshes over the years at an alarming rate. This project will help bring back some of these critical areas.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The project is fully justified and is the third phase of the CALFED program. Therefore, once Phase II is complete, the conceptual plan, restoration plan, and all relevant permit will be obtained. The justification for the project is well stated and is demonstration project. Opening of diked marshes to tidal flow increase marsh areas and increases habitat for threatened and endangered species. It also increases nursery areas for finfish and other species critical to support commercial and recreational fisheries within the San Francisco Bay area.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The approach to construction of the demonstration project is straight forward and well thought out. The plan put forward in the proposal has a high probability of successfully obtain the proposals goals. The restoration demonstration project will show that this approach is applicable to the Hill Slough marsh system. The results obtained from this project will be applicable to other areas within the San Francisco Bay area.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

The approach is fully documented and is well thought out. Additionally, the authors have included construction estimates that appear to be reasonable. The restoration cost per acre is within reasonable expectations. The results of the demonstration project will show the feasibility of opening diked and/or impounded areas for restoration. Additional information collected will also determine if these types of restoration projects are beneficial top target fish species and or other threatened and endangered species within the Bay area. The scale of the project is appropriate for the proposed restoration.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

The baseline data collection is appropriate to measure success once the project is completed. Since the proposed project is construction of a marsh restoration project, no long-term post monitoring has been proposed. Data will be obtained as the construction project proceeds. Therefore, a limited amount of post construction data will be available. However, it is assumed that a Phase IV project will propose follow-on data collection that will provide show success or failure of the restoration. The important point is that the baseline data for both the proposed restoration site and two reference sites will be obtained prior to construction. The data collection plan is sufficiently detailed to understand the types and quantities of data that will be obtained. The proposed data collection plan is appropriate for this type of project and will provide valuable data of how the marsh responds during the transition phase of restoration construction.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

The major product from this project is the restoration. However, the authors have proposed a series of interim reports that will document the restoration process and quantify the results of the monitoring of all three locations. These reports will archive the results of the monitoring for

future work at this site and make the information readily available to other researchers.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

The project proponents have an excellent record for completing marsh restoration projects. Philip Williams Associates has completed many marsh restoration projects along the West Coast and in the San Francisco Bay area. The project team has the depth and the infrastructure to follow the project to fruition. They have proposed on-site monitoring during construction to make sure the selected contractor completes the restoration properly.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The budget appears to be adequate for the project. While it will not be possible to determine this until the bids for construction are obtained, the cost per acre of restored marsh is within a reasonable range. The cost for the monitoring is also reasonable.

Miscellaneous comments:

The proposed project is well thought out and if funded will provide a model for future restoration activities. The project proponents correctly point out that restoring tidal flows to impounded or restricted marshes by removing barriers is the most efficient way to restore a marsh system. The project proponents also openly acknowledge that sedimentation rates are key to the restoration process. They have alluded to the fact that once the construction has been completed they will seek funding for follow-on monitoring to apply the concept of Adaptive Management to the project. This is appropriate and funding for Adaptive Management should be considered once the restoration construction has been completed.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 14

New Proposal Title: Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

01-N14 Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project Phase II

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

Contract not signed

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Contract not signed

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

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Contract not signed

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

This contract is currently being developed, no work has started.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 14

New Proposal Title: Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

98-F08, Hill Slough Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase I; CALFED ERP

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Cooperator submits timely and accurate quarterly reports and is very responsive to Project Officer inquiries. Some project delays but phase I has been completed.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 14

Applicant Organization: California Department of Fish and Game

Proposal Title: Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:**Proposal Number:** 14**Applicant Organization:** California Department of Fish and Game**Proposal Title:** Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase III

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

Budget Justification has a lot of text detailing costs.

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

At the end of Budget Summary.

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

costs identified in Budget Summary. Short detail in Budget Justification.

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

17.A. = \$5,618,335.00

Budget Summary total = \$5,604,022.00

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: