

Proposal Reviews

#26: San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

California Department of Water Resources

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

#1

External Scientific Review

#2

#3

#4

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 26

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

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:

The Selection Panel concurs with the Technical Panel review that the project is deficient in many areas for addressing selection criteria. It was questionable as to whether or how the information generated previously, and therefore in the future, is used to manage water quality on the San Joaquin River. The Panel does recognize the value of baseline water quality monitoring in the San Joaquin Valley and suggests the applicants continue to work with other interests to develop a strategy to support this effort.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 26

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

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	This project was given an adequate rating mostly because of its past performance being considered adequate. However, the proposal was deficient in many areas for addressing the requisite criteria. A key factor to the continuation of this project is how useful the current data are to managing the water quality input to the San Joaquin River watershed.
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-Not 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?

This project is a follow-on to a current project. It is apparent that the applicants believed the ongoing project was sufficient justification for this second phase, and did not clearly articulate the overall objectives and state why this two-phase project was critical to management of the San Joaquin water quality program. A question was raised as to what patterns of water quality were revealed by the first 3 years of measurements. How well are the current data being used for management decisions.

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?

Two of the three reviewers found the approach to be minimally described and insufficient to adequately judge the feasibility. The performance measures were wholly lacking. Capabilities were adequate for this project. Project success is difficult to measure without some information on how well the current project is being received by management.

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?

The combination of data reports and compilation on a webpage are considered to be adequate. However, are the data currently being used? As one reviewer described, this proposed project would have greater value if the ability to link the data to water-use reductions and ultimately to the improvement in the habitat for aquatic organisms was made.

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

No major problems were found with the budget. The total amount of \$1,260,458 and the individual components totaled \$1,284,300, which gave a difference of \$28,842. The primary technical reviewer found that the level of effort in the text does not match the budget request.

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?

One regional review high rank. Applicability to this region was considered to have a high potential to improve management of the San Joaquin water resource. Is supportive of other activities, particularly TMDLs.

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?

Past performance regarded to be adequate and acceptable. No major environmental compliance issues.

Miscellaneous comments:

The applicants had not demonstrated how the first 3 years of data were being used. The proposal was poorly written to demonstrate the technical merit. This is unfortunate because this project has direct value to habitat of the ecosystem and implementation of electroconductivity/salt TMDL.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 26

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

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

This project has a high potential to improve management of the San Joaquin surface-water resource, providing enhanced fish passage and generally improving water quality.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

It is a continuation project.

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

XYes -No

How?

Increases water use efficiency, improves water quality esp with respect to temperature and salinity; related to SJ-3, SJ-5, MR-5

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

XYes -No

How?

Free-standing but supports other activities esp BMPs for attainment of TMDLs related to Se, salinity and potentially low DO.

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

XYes -No

How?

Good coordination with locals via earlier CALFED funding and SJRMP participation.

Other Comments:

This project needs to better demonstrate it's utility and also should have a plan to wean from CALFED funding.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **26**

Applicant Organization: **California Department of Water Resources**

Proposal Title: **San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program**

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	Only a good rating due to deficiencies in proposal relevant to the specified criteria. However, a lower rating was not given because of previous award that obviously deserved merit.
X Good	
-Poor	

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

Rating: Good. Objectives not clear. This project is a continuation of an ongoing project. So, goal is to continue monitoring. However, very little information is given as to how the data are going to be interpreted to derive recommendations for improved management.

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?

Rating: Very Good. Justification is based on the fact that the project has been established and is ongoing. An extra 2-3 years of data would be valuable for this project.

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?

Rating: Very Good. Approach is minimally described and one key sentence is nonsensical. However, a very good rating is given based on ongoing project where approach has been established.

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?

Rating: Excellent. Highly feasible is a continuation.

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?

Rating: Fair. Not well described. Applicant identified products as performance measures. Some level of QA/QC will be needed to ensure data integrity.

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?

Rating: Good. Products are essentially data reports are acceptable. However, no interpretation or basis for recommending improved management decisions is discussed. It appears as if the data and results will be left to the interpretation of the managers.

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?

Rating: Excellent. The capabilities of the applicant and his team are beyond refute.

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

Rating: Very Good. The budget is likely accurate and appropriate. However, the level of effort in the text does not match the budget request.

Miscellaneous comments:

I am hesitant to downgrade this proposal because of its previous award and ongoing project. However, this proposal did not adequately address the required criteria, and in comparison to other applicants, was deficient in requisite detail. I recommend a revision of progress and status of current project to aid in determination of award of continuation.

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **26**

Applicant Organization: **California Department of Water Resources**

Proposal Title: **San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program**

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 team has good experience. Good cost sharing involved. This project will be of benefit to decision makers especially the implementation phase of the EC TMDL. Previous work indicates that continuous monitoring of flow and EC are doable.
-Good	
-Poor	

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

The project goals, objectives and hypotheses are clearly stated. The main objective is to facilitate the control and timing of wetland and agricultural drainage to coincide with periods when dilution is sufficient to meet the salinity (EC) objectives at San Joaquin Vernalis. Vernalis is an important integrated site location with lots of historical information.

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 justification is well documented as the SJ river is listed for Se, boron and salt TMDLs to be developed and these pollutants to be managed within the system. The main objective of the project is to facilitate control and timing of agricultural drainage to coincide with the proper flow to meet EC at Vernalis.

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?

More detail is needed for the approach. The approach states the tasks to be conducted. However, maybe for this type of project a straightforward list of tasks is appropriate.

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?

Previous work (Phase II) indicates that monitoring flow and EC on a continuous real-time basis is achievable. Does CALFED have this documentation?

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?

Are listed in the proposal and appear reasonable, such as reports, and weekly forecasts compared to actual measured flow and EC data to determine accuracy of forecasts.

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?

Weekly forecasts, reports, and data posted on DWR website. DWR web pages dedicated to real-time for EC and flow, this is needed to implement the recently developed EC TMDL.

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 team has adequate experience as a collective whole.

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

Good cost sharing involved by the Bureau of Reclamation, USGS, DWR and irrigation district.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 26

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

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 concept and need for this work is clear. However, this proposal lacks the level of detail that is required to convince an outside reviewer of the benefit of the proposed work relative to the cost. The proposal should include a more detailed technical approach, a complete description of interim and final deliverables, and a detailed discussion of how the final products will be achieved.
XGood	
-Poor	

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

The goals and objectives are straightforward and clearly stated. Additionally, the concept is timely and important. However, the proposal does not clearly demonstrate how the project will meet the main objective, i.e., "to facilitate the control and timing of wetland and agricultural drainage to coincide with periods when dilution flow is sufficient to meet Vernalis salinity objectives". In the introductory sections, it is stated that improved management and coordination of agricultural and wetland drainage flows could reduce the frequency with which water quality objectives for salinity are exceeded. The proposal should show how the information gained through the proposed expanded monitoring network and upgraded model(s) will be used in the decision making process to reduce the releases that are required to meet water quality criteria. Example scenarios could be used effectively to show

the benefit of the proposed expansion of the existing program under proposed Phase III funding.

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?

This is a request for follow on funding. It is assumed that the project can be justified relative to existing knowledge. However, to an outside reviewer, the benefit relative to the requested funding has not been demonstrated.

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 technical approach is not well defined. The project should be laid out as a series of tasks, and a brief work plan should be provided for each task. For example, the effort required, approach and benefit of the proposed transition to the DSM2 model should be better described. What needs to be accomplished? And why is this important? What are the deficiencies of the existing model? What will be provided to the decision makers?

The budget should also be broken down by task.

This project involves follow-on efforts. The proposal would be much more powerful if the accomplishments of the on-going/previous work were described. There is a brief comparison of modeled vs. measured values, but no discussion or presentation of how those results will benefit decision makers.

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 not fully documented. The purpose is clear, and the need for such information is clear, but an adequately detailed technical approach is not presented.

There is no discussion of the technical challenges that must exist. For example, the existing and proposed automated monitoring stations must generate a substantial amount of data. What work has been done to coordinate the data processing and data handling for real-time modeling? What are some of the challenges that exist? What are some of the potential issues associated with real-time modeling, and has the lack of real-time data from the four proposed monitoring stations posed any significant problems?

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 performance measures are not clearly defined. Data are presented in the proposal that show the the ability to forecast flow and EC. But the use of this information needs to be described in more detail. How will this ability be used as to facilitate "the control and timing of wetland and agricultural drainage to coincide with periods when dilution flow is sufficient to meet Vernalis salinity objectives."

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 products are defined but their use is not adequately defined.

One of the products identified is "reduction of days exceeding salinity objectives on the SJR at Vernalis". The proposal does not describe how the data collected and the modeling results will be used to produce the ability to achieve such reductions. This proposal would be greatly improved if the process utilized as well as the ability to achieve such reductions was demonstrated. The proposal would have even greater value, if the ability to link the information generated in the proposed effort to water-use reductions and ultimately to the improvement in the habitat for aquatic organisms was demonstrated.

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 project involves follow-on work, and it appears that the previous work has been successful. DWR and the other participants are clearly qualified.

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

There is insufficient information provided.

The budget for the upgrading of the monitoring stations for real-time capacity is clearly defined. However, the efforts required for the analysis and presentation of the data generated is not clearly defined. For example, the scope of work for the modeling efforts is also not well defined. It is difficult to determine what will be accomplished, the level of effort required, and the level of effort allocated for the modeling work.

The cost proposal should be more closely linked with clearly defined tasks and subtasks. The budget identifies time for workshops, but these workshops or the importance of communicating the results of this work is not adequately described.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #4

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **26**

Applicant Organization: **California Department of Water Resources**

Proposal Title: **San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program**

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	This proposal has a worthy and worthwhile objective: increasing the timeliness of hydrological data monitoring in a lotic system in needed of flow management. The proposal also purports to use the data to drive models of the system; however, detail about the models and their use of the data and their performance, is insufficient to evaluate this aspect of the project.
XGood	
-Poor	I think that this project should be supported but the program officer should give careful attention to the budget and the applicants should strive next time to be more generous in their explanations.

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

The goals and the objectives of the proposal are clear: extending and upgrading a flow and salinity monitoring network. The concept is timely and important. However, how well the current data are being used is not at all clear.

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?

This project builds upon and upgrades an existing monitoring network that was implemented through previous pilot projects. The modeling portion of the proposal is weakly supported. The inclusion of 3 graphs of model results without substantial interpretative comments, or even informative legends, leaves me with the impression that the proposers did not feel that it is worth their time to persuade the reviewer of the value of the project.

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 proposed enhancements to the monitoring network are appropriate and the results will add to the knowledge base. The information may be useful to decision-makers.

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 technically feasible; the likelihood of success is very high, given results from the pilot projects; and the scale of the project is consistent with the objectives of the monitoring network.

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?

N/A

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?

Data will certainly be generated by the successful execution of the project. The existing network webpage is evidence of this. The value of these data will depend upon how the results of the models being fed the data are used by managers. Such valuation is outside the scope of the proposal; details about the models and their use by managers is not provided by the proposal.

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?

In as much as this project builds upon directly related prior work, the applicant team is qualified. It is not clear whether they have the requisite infrastructure available, but given the very high indirect rates for DWR labor (86%-108% of wages), the infrastructure ought to be there!

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

The budget justification does not agree with the budget tables. For instance, DWR direct labor hours in the justification total 7330 hours and \$504,643 but the tables show 6550 hours and \$457,400. The consultant/subcontract detail in the justification gives too little detail (what are subcontractor overhead rates?) and the formatting is a mess. Is there really that range of overhead rates at DWR: 85% for program mgmt to 108% for associate engineer? If so, is this an efficient use of grant funds? \$6K/y for travel? That's 16,438 miles at \$.365/mile by car.

Miscellaneous comments:

The existing project webpage is impressive. Access to the actual data would be useful as well as the summary graphs.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 26

New Proposal Title: San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

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

97-C08

San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

CALFED-ERP

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

None

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:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 26

Applicant Organization: California Department of Water Resources

Proposal Title: San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

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:** 26**Applicant Organization:** California Department of Water Resources**Proposal Title:** San Joaquin River Real Time Water Quality Management Program

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:

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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).

budget summary grand total \$1,260,458 and 17 a \$1,284,300, a difference of \$23,842.

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:

most of the information is identified clearly in the proposal, the last 3 or 4 pages and in the budget justification