Proposal Reviews

#28: Suisun Creek Restoration Program

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Final Selection Panel Review	
Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review	
Bay Regional Review	
External Scientific Review	#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6
Environmental Compliance	
Budget	

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 28

Applicant Organization: California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Proposal Title: Suisun Creek Restoration Program

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:

The Selection Panel received several comment letters in support of the project, and one letter in opposition. The technical panel did not recommend this project for funding, because the proposal includes a number of broad objectives and does not provide enough detail to evaluate whether these objectives could be met. Other reviewers believed that the project would provide some environmental benefits, but several expressed concern that the proposal did not articulate what the effective benefits of this project would be. The comment letters provided general support for the project, but did not provide any clarifying information that would compel the Selection Panel to re-evaluate the recommendation by the Technical Panel. The Selection Panel does not recommend funding of the proposal at this time.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 28

Applicant Organization: California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Proposal Title: Suisun Creek Restoration 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 proposal has a number of specific objectives and the site is an important one. However, the overall proposal suffers significantly from being too broad (trying to accomplish too much) and so important details of the methods and justification are lacking. We encourage the PIs to prioritize the various objectives and develop a proposal that is more focused.**
-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?

   While the overall goals are rather general, the objectives get more specific and how they are to be accomplished is also quite clear. Work at this site is justified based on the risks to steelhead populations in Suisun Creek; however, the specific objectives are not individually justified in this proposal. In particular, prior work at this site has allowed them to identify a number of limiting factors to steelhead in Suisun Creek; however, the details of this prior work that may justify the present proposal are not provided. Finally, this proposal presents many, many tasks and none of them is developed in sufficient detail to justify funding at this time.

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?

For parts of the project, the approaches are well grounded in approaches commonly used (e.g., HSPF modeling of low and useful geomorphic measures). However, a clear indication of whether or not sediment transport would be assessed was missing. The performance measures are listed but not discussed in detail. Several reviewers raised concerns about the scale of the project is the study reach long enough? Is 3 years long enough to assess success? In general, several of the reviewer scores were high given the many concerns these reviewers raised in the text of their reviews. The team seems quite well qualified for this work; however, the lack of focus on specifics of any one topic suggests a low likelihood of success overall.

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 products will be, if successful, removal of nonnatives from 2 sites and a more complete data base on geomorphic conditions of the stream with design options for releases from the dam.

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

   Budget seems reasonable and well documented.

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?

   This proposal was rated as medium priority by the regional panel. Strengths identified by them included that this ties into grass roots efforts and will encourage agencies to improve management of developed water supplies.

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?

   Some discrepancies in the budget figures were noted.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 28

Applicant Organization: California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Proposal Title: Suisun Creek Restoration Program

Overall Ranking: **-**Low **X**Medium **-**High

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

commitee viewed this proposal as not critical but a project which could have positive benefits to at risk species in a tributary stream to Suisun Marsh.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Project proposal is doable and builds on ongoing work to restore Suisun Creek for steelhead and riparian habitat.

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

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   BR 3 Implement actions to preven, control and reduce impacts of non-native invasive species.

   BR 5 restore local stream and riparian habitats for at risk species

   BR Protect at-risk species in the bay by using water management, Better management of water in Lake Curry to enhance summer rearing conditions.

   MR 2,Wildlife friendly agriculatural practices

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?

   minimal, most closely to effort in coastal streams to imporve farming practices to protect anadromous fish streams.

Consistent with SF Bay Regional Goals project recommendations and San Francisco Bay Joint Venture Implementation Plan

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

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Project is a grass roots effort involving local landowners, local Community college and local agencies and state and federal agencies to improve management of developed water supplies and enhance habitat for steelhead.

Other Comments:

None

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **28**

Applicant Organization: **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance**

Proposal Title: **Suisun Creek Restoration 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 is a useful project that will either point the way to modifications of dam operations to improve flow/temperature conditions, or will show that it is not feasible. The work on invasive plants will certainly provide a map of the distribution of the invasive grass, and some data on the effectiveness of some pilot efforts at control of invasives. Workshops on erosion control should also yield benefits.** **I see this project as a positive step towards improving this creek and watershed.**
XGood	
-Poor	

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

   This project lists 3 goals on p 1 and 7 objectives on pp 4-5. The 3 goals are rather general, and to me seem over-lapping in emphasizing process issues and working with landowners. although the goal of restoring steelhead is clear enough. The 7 objectives are much more specific statements. Objectives 1 and 2 deal with reservoir and flow management to enhance steelhead, 3 and 4 deal with invasive riparian plants, 5 with sediemtns in the creekbed, 6 with workshops/outreach and 7 with monitoring. All of the objectives are timely and important.

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?

   Broadly speaking, the project is justified relative to existing knowledge. The conceptual model put forth in the proposal is essentially the need for appropriate flows and temperatures for steelhead and for stream health. It is adequately presented, but the proposal is more of a work plan than a conceptual-based project. The project's objectives include a mix of research and pilot project, perhaps with some implememention. I view the effort to determine what flows and stream temperatures can be established thru reservoir management (including retrofitting the release structure) as research to determine feasibility. Most of the riparian plant work is pilot or demonstration-scale work, including mapping work and removal efforts accompanied by monitoring of success. The workshops arguably are implementatation. I believe that it is too early to consider full-scale implementation for the issues addresed in this study.

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?

   Most aspects of approach seem appropriate to me. Task 1: I have concerns about the length of stream reach to be monitored (10-20 bankfull widths; I'm guess these streams are 3-5 m wide, so this is prety short). While water quality monitoring for nutrients probably is a good thing, and is already taking place, I do not see how it fits in with the project objectives. I did not see any sign of monitoring sediment transport, yet filling of the reservoir and embeddedness of the stream bed are concerns in this project - so monitoring sediment loads might be useful (they have several indirect approaches to this issue). Task 2: all this sounds fine. I wonder if a new bathymetry is needed, or if 11-year-old data will suffice. Task 3: both banks times 17 miles of aerial photo mapping of an ninvasive grass. sounds fine Task 4: I find it hard to evaluate this task. it seems to be very specific riparian vegetation work at a very local scale. Task 4.7 involves monitoring, so I guess they will learn how effective they are. Task 5: This involves workshops and implementation of erosion control practices developed elsewhere. Seems like a straightforward technology transfer effort. Task 6: community workshops, fine but not much description of goals or process Task 7: project management, fine

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?

   I think the performance measures are reasonable and will give a good sense of accomplishments. However, it is hard to say what will come out of the entire project. with respect to flow and temperature modifications - I don't see how to evaluate the probability of successfully restoring flows and cool temperatures. Nothing is said about municipal water needs and potential user conflicts with respect to riparian plant management: invasive plants are notoriously difficult to control. I cannot evaluate their likelihood of success in restoring riparian vegetation with respect to sediments: workshops to spread the word on erosion control seem likely to have some benefits

   in sum, I think the project will result in a better understanding of approaches to restore/manage this creekshed, and so is a positive step. The long-term and larger success is uncertain.

If I read the budget correctly, CALFED's costs are modest and matching funds are substantial, which favors this undertaking

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 are solid

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?

   products are very similar to performance measures, and should be useful. Monitoring of streambed, temp and DO, and of plant treatments, are of specific value to assessing project success. Monitoring of water quality is of general value but not directly related to project success.

   main concerns are addressed under 'feasibility' above. they may find they can't manage reservoir flows to create favorable conditions for steelhead and they can't control the invasives

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?

   I do not know these individuals. Marcus seems particularly experienced, but all the team look well qualified. They appear to have the technological expertise and past experience.

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

   If I read the budget correctly -- only $44k is requested, and lots of matching funds are available - then this looks like a bargain.

Miscellaneous comments:

at the risk of repeating myself -- my hesitation is centered on feasibility issues described above

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **28**

Applicant Organization: **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance**

Proposal Title: **Suisun Creek Restoration 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:

<u>Excellent:</u> outstanding in all respects;
<u>Good:</u> quality but some deficiencies;
<u>Poor:</u> serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Excellent	**This project does not appear to be aimed at substantial restoration. Past results and information are not presented. It is not clear why more should be invested. The proposal does not give the reviewer much environmental information and does not clearly identify the gains for the ecosystem.**
-Good	
XPoor	

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

   The proposal states a broad goal of stream assessment and land owner workshops. The objectives are specific development of reservoir releases, exotic vegetation control, pilot projects, and landowner workshops.

2. **<u>Justification.</u>** 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 proposal weakly justifies continued monitoring. The conceptual framework is extremely vague and does not provide a rigorous framework for 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 project can be implemented easily but it will contribute relatively little to restoration of ecological functions.

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 project has had funding in the past and it is not clear that the results of monitoring have been synthesized and applied to the system.

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 measures of performance have little to do with the restoration of Suisun Creek.

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 project contributes little to the understanding of the Bay Delta Watershed. At most it will provide additional information on the status of exotic vegetation. Survey methods are limited more than necessary, especially given the budget. The project contributes relatively little to the restoration of Suisun Creek and does not clearly contribute to the recovery of sensitive species. The outcome of this proposal has no major significance to decision makers. Ecologists and environmental scientists will gain little new information from the proposed restoration project.

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?

   no comment

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

   The budget is relatively large (>$330,000) given the modest goals and objectives.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **28**

Applicant Organization: **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance**

Proposal Title: **Suisun Creek Restoration 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**
XExcellent	**This project proposal is well thought out and well written. The principals have obviously been working together for many years and have been working on understanding Suisun Creek for many years. The proposal shows a good understanding of what needs to be done and what it will take to get there.**
-Good	
-Poor	

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

   The program goals of conducting studies and gathering information to support the restoration of trout populations within Suisun Creek are clearly stated and consistent with the project objectives. The project is timely and imporatant in that this multi-faceted program requires a number of tasks to be completed before a complete restoration plan can be developed. This project is also timely because it builds on previous work.

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. Upon completion of the 7 tasks described in this project, a complete plan for the restoration of Suisun Creek, including habitat for steelhead trout, will be possible. Without information gathered through this project, a detailed restoration plan is not possible.

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 the problem is well designed for meeting the objectives of the project. This project is not likely to generate novel information or methods, however, the information that will be generated is vital to the development of a stream and trout habitat restoration plan.

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?

   This project seems very well thought out and clearly shows that the principals involved have a great deal of experience with the situation and clearly know what needs to be done next in order to solve this particular restoration problem.

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 section of this proposal that deals with performance measures is well written and inclusive. I see no problem with the performance measures detailed here.

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?

   Products from this project will be highly valuable for the restoration of Suisun Creek watershed. They will be of minimal value, collectively, as a model for other multi-faceted stream restoration projects. The non-native restoration pilot projects could have value for intrepreting to others the process of removal of non-natives and planting of natives, and the process of monitoring success in restoring native flora.

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?

   I have no independent information on this. It appears from the project proposal that this team has been working for a number of years and has all aspects of the project well in hand. In addition, they have years of experience dealing with the many aspects of the Suisun watershed management, including working with all levels of government and with private land owners.

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

The budget is well documented and appears to be adequate to accomplish the objectives of the project.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #4

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **28**

Applicant Organization: **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance**

Proposal Title: **Suisun Creek Restoration 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**
XExcellent	**Projects like this can make a huge difference in the long term health of a watershed. The most serious comment I have is that the investigators need to pick some type of biological indicator to incorporate into their monitoring.**
-Good	
-Poor	

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

   Objectives on page 4 are clear and their focus is appropriate withn the context of watershed restoration. The objectives focus mostly on "doing" e.g., remove invasive non-native species" as opposed to remove non-native species and measure a hypothesized response variable. Latter approach in objective statements would be more consistent with the proposal's intent to use "adaptive management" (alter the system and watch the system respond). The hypothesis stated is very broad and says that many things will be done to the watershed which will improve spawning and rearing of steelhead trout. Hence the response variable indicated by this hypothesis is the spawning and rearing of trout and should be presumably measured by the project. What would be helpful is to know what response variables are expected to change and in what time frame.

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?

   I think the justification is fine. A fuller explanation of the expected processes that are functioning would have helped. I do not know how Arundo, Vinca major, and Rubus discolor may affect a watershed and hence steelhead trout. Further explanation of the role of the reservoir relative to hypoliminetic releases or winter flushing of fine sediments would have also helped.

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 could be improved by more explicit explanation of the data to be collected and the analyses that will be performed. The approach is organized by tasks.

   Task 1 -- monitoring -- could well be the most important for learning when the watershed is altered so as to observe the response of the stream and steelhead trout. The proposal weakly states what responses in the stream are anticipated from revegetation or from changes in hydrologic patterns. These variables would be very important to incorporate into the monitoring. The response variables are implied by their listing but they are not connected conceptually with any processes. All variables to be monitored are abiotic. No biota monitoring is proposed. Yet the hypothesis stated suggests spawning and rearing of steelhead trout is the primary response variable. Some measurement of these attributes should be undertaken. Potential measurements include redd counts, numbers of adults, and population estimates of juveniles. Other biota measurements could be taken such as diversity, abundance, distribution, and drift rate estimates of benthos. Time series data on some aspect of the biota will enhance learning from this project.

   Task 2-6 seem fine within the context of the objectives. More details are provided in some of these than in task 1. Task 4.7 the data analysis is not specified. Task 7.2 seems to focus on administrative tasks that usually fall under the category of overhead or indirect charges.

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?

   I think the feasibility of this project is high and will likely have success. The temporal scale of the project is unspecified. Work was begun before this proposal and three years will not be enough to maximize learning from the watershed manipulations. It would have been helpful if the investigators had laid out a long-term plan and described how and where in the process this proposal fits in. If funded the investigators should be encouraged to resubmit a revised project for another three years. Likely, a fifteen year time horizon should be planned for in assessment of these management actions.

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?

   Peformance measures seem fine. However, no measures are noted or described for Tasks 4 or 7. Comments regarding the monitoring plan are provided above.

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 listed will most likely be produced and delivered. Monitoring comments are provided above. Interpretative outcomes will be more likely if there is an explict focus on watershed processes and measuring response variables expected to change.

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?

   I have no personal knowledge of the applicants. Based on the description provided in the proposal, the applicants have the appearance of being capable. If these individuals have worked in the area for the past 20 years on over 100 projects, they must have a reputation for delivery or non-delivery of projects that you should be able to assess.

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

   The budget seems reaonable and adequate.

Miscellaneous comments:

I like the project.

External Scientific: #5

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **28**

Applicant Organization: **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance**

Proposal Title: **Suisun Creek Restoration 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:

<u>Excellent:</u> outstanding in all respects;
<u>Good:</u> quality but some deficiencies;
<u>Poor:</u> serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**This is a very good project but I would like to see it expanded to include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the workshops in impacting the participant's behavior.**
-Good	
-Poor	

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

   This proposal outlines the goals and objectives of the effort in a clear, concise manner. Having looked a hundreds of fishery restoration proposals, I can state the concept is both timely and very important. In addition, it appears to be consistent with the broader objectives of CalFed.

2. **<u>Justification.</u>** 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 for the project is directed at restoring steelhead trout habitat in Suisun Creek. Given the generally poor condition of steelhead trout populations on the West coast and the impact of Endangered Species Act restrictions on human activities should such restrictions become necessary, the project appears well justified. The selection of a combination research, pilot/demonstration project seems to be the correct mix for this undertaking.

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 appears to be very well designed to meet the stated objectives. Clearly, once completed, the project will add substantially to the knowledge about Suisun Creek. However, I'm not sure how much of the information will be transferable to other sites around the state or nation.

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?

   Scientifically, the project is technically feasible and the likelyhood of success seem quite good. However, for the effort to truly yield the results we seek, we need to know more about the commitment of the partners in the effort. For example, will the landowners attend the workshops and implement the improved management practices? And will the City of Vallejo act on the study recommendations regarding Lake Curry??

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 for the project appear to be reasonable in most areas. However, what is not clear is how do we measure the effectiveness of the workshop or the lake management recommendations. Do we track the number of landowners that take action? By comparison, following the removal of the non-native species seems rather simple.

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 of this project will be of significant value once completed. These products include the removal of non-native species from Suisun Creek, significant new monitoring information, a feasibility study of Lake Curry, and workshops for landowners and farmers.

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 behind the project seems to have the background and to have developed the partnerships to make this project successful. I have no doubt that they will be able to complete the project as proposed.

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

   I don't have the background to comment on this issue.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #6

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **28**

Applicant Organization: **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance**

Proposal Title: **Suisun Creek Restoration 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 is an interesting proposal that in general is well written and well conceived. The concerns I had with this was an lack of an adequate explanation of how the metrics will be quantified and evaluated. Further, it is not clear this will have broad implications in terms of new science others can use. Finally, the outreach efforts do not appear to be adequately evaluated.**
XGood	
-Poor	

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

   This is an extremely well written proposal with the goals and objectives very clearly stated. The explanation of how these goals will be reached is very detailed and every goal is linked directly to a specific task.

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 proposed work is justified based on the risk of existing steelhead populations in Suisun Creek. It is not clear how at risk these fish are but the proposal is appropriately proactive given the early warning signs of problems to come (sedimentation, nonnative plant invasions, warm water releases from the dam). The pilot projects on the two vineyards are well justified and those alone are important.

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 is very solid. The work is well grounded in state of the art science (e.g., HSPF modeling of flow; geomorph measurements; etc.) and they have selected the most appropriate methods for each task. This will add to site specific knowledge base in terms especially of ways in which dam releases can be modified and how restoration of natural flows may improve geomorphic conditions and instream habitat for fish. There may be some novel information coming out of the natural flow restoration work but the rest is not particularly noveljust appropriate (and needed) for this site. It should be very useful for decision makers (re: dam outlet re-design)

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 project does appear technically feasible. The approach is very clearly outlined and within the grasp of the authors. The team is very well qualified and the likelihood of success high.

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?

   Measures are specified and include plant survival, native vs. nonnative cover, the delivery of options for re-design for dam releases, etc. The one shortcoming is that is it not clear if the data will be quantitatively assessed or statistically analyzed. They could have been more specific about what success is from the pilot (vineyard) projects. Further they do not include any measures of outreach impact. I.e., they promise workshops but dont appear to be measuring a change in attitudes.

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 product will be, if successful, removal of nonnatives on the 2 project sites (& restoration of natives); a longer and more complete data base on the geomorphic conditions in the stream; design options for water releases from the dam. It is not clear that the methods are being developed that will translate to other systems but I suspect the vineyard replanting efforts may have larger relevance.

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?

1 From what is provided the team is certainly well qualified and has done past restoration work as well as some research. They have commitments from the 2 landowners for the replanting projects. The firm to do the dam work is lined up. Groups appear to work well together.

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

   the cost/benefit ratio seems appropriate based on my knowledge

Miscellaneous comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 28

Applicant Organization: California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Proposal Title: Suisun Creek Restoration Program

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

   Notification of BCDC required.

   All other permits and environmental documentation will be obtained and filed.

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

   Timeline adequate, no budget specifically listed for permit or CEQA compliance.

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

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 28

Applicant Organization: California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Proposal Title: Suisun Creek Restoration Program

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

   XYes **-**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 **X**No

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

   The three budget totals $457,918, they are only requesting $44,190. The difference is too great.

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

   XYes **-**No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: