## **Proposal Reviews**

## **#30: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project**

California State Coastal Conservancy

<b>Final Selection Panel Review</b>	
Initial Selection Panel Review	
Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review	
Land Acquisition	
Delta Regional Review	
External Scientific Review	#1 #2 #3 #4
<b>Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding</b>	#1 #2 #3 #4
<b>Environmental Compliance</b>	

Budget

### **Final Selection Panel Review:**

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

**Proposal Number: 30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$32,500,000** 

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel acknowledges the broad-based local support for the project as reflected in the numerous letters of support, and commends all parties for their hard work to this point. The applicants are encouraged to continue their dialog with the local community to ensure that non-technical concerns are addressed. On consideration of all the submitted comments, both supporting and opposing, the Panel concurs with its original recommendation, "Consider as Directed Action". There are many technical concerns, some of which are echoed in comment letters, that still need to be addressed. Given the complexities and many uncertainties involved in tidal marsh restoration, the Panel believes it is essential that a focused conceptual model is presented before such substantial resources are committed to the project. The revised proposal should identify the specific restoration approaches that will be used, how and why these will lead to expected benefits, and how possible ancillary effects, such as on water quality and levee stability, will be addressed.

### **Initial Selection Panel Review:**

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

**Proposal Number: 30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

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	X
Not Recommended	-

### Amount: **\$32,500,000.00**

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 acquire a 1200 acre parcel in the western Delta, and develop and implement an adaptive management-based restoration plan for part of the parcel. The Selection Panel agrees that this parcel presents a substantial opportunity for habitat restoration consistent with the goals of CALFEDs Ecosystem Restoration Program. In addition, there are willing sellers who are interested in their land becoming part of habitat restoration efforts in the Delta.

The Selection Panel agrees, however, with the Technical Review Panel that the restoration implementation as currently proposed should not be funded. In addition, the Selection Panel recognizes some problems with the approach to planning and design in the current proposal. Since this property is within the Oakley city limits and is zoned for residential development, the Selection Panel believes it is important that the City of Oakley be supportive of restoration on the parcel. Considering the issues, the Selection Panels recommendation is that the proposal be revised and submitted for consideration as a directed action where it will be receive timely attention. The Coastal Conservancy and the Natural Heritage Institute are encouraged to continue their collaboration and cooperation with the City of Oakley.

As the applicants develop the revisions to the planning and design components, the current team should convene their proposed Adaptive Management Working Group, with assistance from the CALFED Science Program and the ERP Independent Science Board as appropriate, and include individuals with scientific expertise in tidal marsh restoration, habitat utilization by the species of interest, and hydrodynamics and water quality issues in this part of the Delta. The revised conceptual model should explicitly relate attributes of the restored system to expected ecological and water quality benefits.

### **Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:**

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

**Proposal Number: 30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

**Review:** 

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

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

<u>Adequate:</u> No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

<u>Not Recommended:</u> Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	This is an ambitious and well-conceived project, with strong justification and good detail through the acquisition phase. It appears to be very well thought out, but too rushed to get to implementation phases.
XAbove average	**The panel recommends funding of Phase I and the planning portions of Phase II. This should include: Task 1 acquisition, Tasks 2 and 3 should be a baseline survey to support and develop a complete monitoring plan within an adaptive
-Adequate	management framework (250,000 should be more than sufficient), Task 4 outreach, Task 6 management, Task 7 management, Task 8 permitting, Task modeling, and Task 10 Engineering Design (total of \$26,788,000). If these task
-Not recommended	are funded by CalFed, and once the planning is complete (Tasks 2,3 and Tasks 9,10 as necessary), the applicant is encouraged to submit a proposal covering the monitoring and implementation phases with the necessary details (as outlined earlier and in the PSP).

1. <u>Goals and Justification</u>. 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 applicant plans to purchase over 1,200 acres of land under imminent pressure from development and restore much of it to natural flooding regimes. The goal of habitat restoration from subtidal to emergent marsh to terrestrial dune forest is supported by three objectives that: 1) increase public access and human uses of the area; 2) restore habitats; and 3) contribute to our understanding of tidal marsh and floodplain restoration. Four overarching hypotheses are presented that are consistent with the project goal. Some

hypotheses were criticized as being too specific at this stage of the project (i.e., predation effects on native species). However, the hypotheses can only be tested much farther along in this multi-phase project. The project addresses CALFEDs ERP goals of habitat restoration and reducing uncertainties with respect to subsidence, appropriate habitats for native fish, and the role of intertidal habitat in improving water quality.

The acquisition of the three large land parcels is justified by the authors because Dutch Slough is touted as the only remaining tract in the western Delta. Topography, position in the estuary and salinity all combine to make this a unique and critical area to acquire and preserve. The conceptual model is simple, but well documented (however, one reviewer noted a lack of literature from outside the region), and nicely illustrated. The elevation data presented indicate significant areas are available to test hypotheses concerning marsh development and sediment dynamics in the three parcels.

2. <u>Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).</u> 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 approach begins with acquisition and quickly moves into the design and implementation Phase II for the central parcel and then design and implementation for the outer parcels in Phase III. The sequence is completely appropriate, but seems rushed with respect to design and monitoring tasks, which would proceed without review at this level if fully funded. For example, the potential to set up tests of hypotheses that could provide critical information for the regional program is stated, but no specifics are given at this time. In fact, broader scientific input is desired, and workshops to develop strategic hypotheses will be held, and studies will be established accordingly. However, it is difficult to understand how the budgets for unknown studies can be established and approved at this time. It seems the science component needs a different track. It is not clear how a monitoring plan to address unspecified hypotheses can be developed, then peer reviewed and revised, then monitoring conducted for one year prior to restoration implementation under the proposed schedule. The approach is fully documented for Phase I in that only the acquisition is planned, with a general guiding principle to restore tidal and seasonal flooding to three diked parcels of farmland in Phases II and III. In addition, some of the land will be used for public access and amenities.

Two applicants of the coalition that developed the proposal (NHI, Cal. Coastal Conservancy) have led several other large projects funded by CALFED. The local participants have long-standing community ties to gain public support. Only administrative milestones and accomplishments are defined as performance measures and presented in the proposal. Performance measures specific to design, implementation and ecological responses will be developed in further planning activities to be completed in Phase I. The panel felt that a complete proposal review (including details on monitoring, assessment using performance measures, and studies to reduce uncertainties) must follow development of Phase I, so this information can be used to support the restoration proposal. Reviewers indicated the need to locate an appropriate reference site and conduct a historical analysis of conditions (and processes where possible) over the sites.

3. <u>Outcomes and Products.</u> 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?

Phase I will include the purchase of land and development of scientific and technical approaches to design and assess the tidal restoration. Products of value are likely to emerge from the monitoring component if promised steps are successful and if currently requested funds are appropriate to support the monitoring studies.

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

At 27,000 an acre, (higher considering the sellers match) the land costs appear to be quite high or a bargain, depending upon the reviewer. The administration costs of the grant are very low, and the endowment is justified for some reviewers, but not for others. Planting and monitoring costs are unable to be judged given the lack of 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 Delta Regional Panel gave the proposal a HIGH ranking due to its time sensitivity and potential for urban development. However, they were aware that the City of Oakley was not cultivated as a partner in the proposal and the acquisition is a controversial issue in the City, thereby introducing uncertainty regarding the feasibility of the project. The panel thought the project expensive, but important.

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

Three reviews of prior experience with the applicants were positive. The land acquisition reviewer gave responses that supported the project and more insight to the controversial nature of the proposed land use. The environmental compliance review indicated no issues or problems. The budget reviewer complained there was not enough detail to evaluate efforts, costs and equipment expenses.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

### Land Acquisition:

Proposal Number: 30

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

1. Is the site's ecological importance documented in the proposal?

XYes -No

If yes, please import relevant text and citations here:

Acquisition and restoration of this site is justified both for habitat and research purposes. The site currently encompasses nearly six miles of relatively barren levee shoreline along major tidal sloughs and Marsh Creek. Despite the site's impressive restoration potential, recent wetland and biological surveys conducted by the owners indicate that there are limited wetlands and no special status species on the site's interior.

This project intends to transform this area into shaded riverine aquatic habitat. In addition, restoring tidal inundation to the interior of the site would add nearly ten miles of shoreline edge habitat to the site. Restoration of the site can be accomplished cost-effectively without significant grading. Tidal inundation and restoration of the site would create a diverse mosaic of habitat types from tidal marsh to Antioch dune scrub. The unique opportunity to restore the nearly extinct Antioch dune scrub habitat may, in and of itself, justify the project. Despite the site's impressive restoration potential, recent wetland and biological surveys conducted by the owners indicate that there are limited wetlands and no special status species on the site's interior

Elevation and topographic diversity: The Dutch Slough site is one of the few, if not the only, large-scale sites in the Delta not already acquired for restoration that is currently at suitable elevations for tidal marsh restoration. The diverse topography of the site allows for restoration of an ecological continuum of tidal wetland, low marsh, high marsh, riparian habitat, and upland transition zones, including inland dune scrub habitat, with only minimal grading.

Site location: Very few opportunities exist to restore tidal marsh in the western Delta where most native fish congregate. The Dutch Slough site is the only available site in the western Delta. We hypothesize that restoration of the site will be particularly beneficial to target fish species because: 1) most native fish congregate in the western Delta; 2) unlike tidal marsh on the periphery of the northern or eastern fringe s of the Delta, all anadromous fish in the watershed pass through tidal marsh in the western Delta; and 3) environmental gradients, particularly salinity gradients, in the western Delta are most likely to favor native fish.

Sufficient knowledge of tidal marsh restoration: The site is ideally configured for a large-scale experiment. The site consists of three nearly equal sized parcels with similar area, topography, and shape that can be flooded and managed independently to test restoration treatments under different hydrodyamic, salinity, temperature, and other physical regimes. Furthermore, each site encompasses a diversity of topography and soils creating the opportunity to study marsh ecology and development on varying substrates.

There are several unique learning opportunities associated with this project that justifies the investment needed to restore this site to tidal marsh habitat. First, the site location, at the upper end of the gradient between saline and freshwater environments in the Delta, provides an opportunity to evaluate tidal marsh ecology that is not available at the northern Delta tidal marsh restoration sites. Second, unlike all of CALFED; s currently planned tidal marsh restoration sites in the northern Delta, the topographic and edaphic diversity (see Figures 4 and 6) at the Dutch Slough site is well suited for testing hypotheses regarding marsh evolution and ecology on varying substrates. In addition, the physical configuration of the Dutch Slough restoration site lends itself to designing field-scale experiments. Because the Dutch Slough property consists of three discrete parcels (473-acre Emerson, 312-acre Gilbert, and 444-acre Burroughs properties), it offers a unique opportunity to experimentally test a range of hypotheses essential to understanding and furthering tidal marsh restoration activities. The availability of three similar parcels for experimental studies on a relatively large scale gives this project unprecedented learning potential for tidal marsh restoration. On this site, scientists can test and refine approaches on the first site to improve the likelihood for success on subsequent parcels (restore parcels sequentially), or measure the response of native fish and other species to three different types of marsh restoration (restore parcels as replicates). It is also possible to control tidal flow into the site with gates to test various hypotheses or to manage for exotic species. Further, because restoration could proceed immediately at the Dutch Slough sites with minimum subsidence reversal efforts, restoration here will proceed more quickly than sites that require years for sediment deposition and buildup of marsh habitat. Thus, the results of these fieldscale experiments will provide the early learning necessary to inform other restoration activities.

2. Is the owner's willingness to sell the site documented in the proposal?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Is evidence of local government support for the purchase included in the proposal?

-Yes XNo

If yes, please explain:

4. Is the use proposed for the site after its purchase clearly consistent with the site's general plan designation and zoning?

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

The site is designated mixed-use (M-8 - Mixed Use - Oakley Community Center). It has several zoning designations, including: Single family residential, Multi-family residential, Commercial and Office. This designation could permit approximately 4,500-6,100 residential units and other development to be constructed on the larger 1,539 acres of the site. The City of Oakley recently incorporated and is currently in the process of developing its initial general plan. The City is currently considering two options for the parcels: 1) Delta recreation uses, and 2) urban development. If CALFED recommends this proposal for funding, the applicants, and particularly the landowners, will work with City officials and residents to obtain strong evidence of public support during the public comment and review period. The Delta recreation/resource conservation alternative being considered {for site site during development of the city's plan} would be consistent with the Dutch Slough Restoration Project.

The property is outside of the Delta Primary Zone and the jurisdiction of the Delta Protection Commission.

5. Is the land mapped as prime farmland, farmland of statewide significance, unique farmland, or farmland of local importance?

-Yes XNo

If yes, please explain the classification:

Is the site under a Williamson Act contract?

-Yes XNo

Will use of the site change from agriculture after its purchase?

XYes -No -Not Currently in Agriculture

6. Is this a time-sensitive acquisition opportunity, according to the proposal?

XYes -No

If yes, please import relevant text here:

The Delta ecosystem and its prospects for restoration are threatened by rapid urbanization along the periphery of the Delta. The Dutch Slough property is currently slated for urban development. The Dutch Slough property was designated for mixed-use development in the Contra Costa County General Plan in 1991, which includes the entire Dutch Slough Restoration Project area. The Dutch Slough property remains inside the County; s urban limit line. Residential development around Dutch Slough has already occurred or is imminent.

The Dutch Slough site has been historically managed for dairy and range, but the larger 1,539-acre site has been approved for development as a masterplanned community of 4,500 to 6,100 housing units. If CALFED does not grant acquisition funds, the Dutch Slough properties will be immediately sold for development. It is no longer feasible for the landowners to continue dairy and grazing operations at Dutch Slough, and thus, they have expended substantial sums to study and successfully secure non-agricultural development entitlements on the Dutch Slough property over the last decade, which they will exercise if CALFED does not fund this application. The landowners have already secured a verified delineation from the Army Corps of Engineers covering 2 of the 3 properties. This delineation identifies less than 45 gross acres of wetlands.

Under any scenario, the approximately 300 acres south of the Dutch Slough Project Site and the Contra Costa Canal would be developed.

Other Comments:

This application is controversial in Oakley, where some argue it hobbles the city's ability to develop tax revenues important to the city's viability, + others assert it will be an open space + recreation amenity that helps assure the city's success.

### **Delta Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number: 30** 

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium XHigh

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

# This project was ranked highly because of its time sensitivity. If CALFED does not fund this project, the properties would be developed as part of the City of Oakley.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Unknown. This is a controversial project in Oakley. The city and some other local interests were not adequately involved in the application's development. Because the the properties are within the boundaries of the City of Oakley, it may raise legal challenges to their purchase if it not satisfied with the project.

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

XYes -No

How?

### Restoration of various habitats -- wetlands, marsh, floodplain.

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?

# Linked with various studies and projects previously funded by CALFED along Marsh Creek (watershed stewardship), Franks Tract and Big Break.

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

-Yes XNo

How?

The City of Oakley was not involved in the development of this proposal; it is within that City's limits.

Other Comments:

The panelists thought this project seemed very expensive, because the land is slated for urban development. Acquisition of conservation easements (as opposed to fee title) was not considered as part of the proposal. However, the project was given a high ranking due to its time sensitivity and the desire to not have these properties developed into urban uses.

### External Scientific: #1

### **Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form**

Proposal Number: **30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

#### **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; <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	Appears to be very well thought out, but too rushed to get to implementation and the wetlands seem over priced.
XGood	
-Poor	

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

The goal of habitat restoration from subtidal to emergent marsh to terrestrial dune forest is supported by three objectives that: 1) increase public access and human uses of the area; 2) restore habitats; and 3) contribute to our understanding of tidal marsh and floodplain restoration. Four overarching hypotheses are presented that are consistent with the project goal. The project addresses CALFEDs ERP goals of habitat restoration and reducing uncertainties with respect to subsidence, appropriate habitats for native fish, and the role of intertidal habitat in improving water quality.

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 acquisition is justified by the authors because Dutch Slough is touted as the only remaining tract in the western Delta. Topography, position in the estuary and salinity all combine to make this a unique and critical area to acquire and preserve. The conceptual model is simple, but well documented and nicely illustrated. The elevation data presented indicate significant areas are available to test marsh development and sediment dynamics in the three parcels.

3. <u>Approach.</u> 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 begins with acquisition and quickly moves into the design and implementation Phase II for the central parcel and then design and implementation for the outer parcels in Phase III. This sequence is completely appropriate, but seems rushed with respect to design and monitoring tasks, which would proceed without review at this level if fully funded. For example, the potential to set up tests of hypotheses that could provide critical information for the regional program is stated, but no specifics are given at this time. In fact, broader scientific input is desired, and workshops to develop strategic hypotheses will be held, and studies will be established accordingly. However, it is difficult to understand how the budgets for unknown studies can be established and approved at this time. It seems the science component needs a different track to keep ahead of the implementation.

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 in that only the acquisition is planned, with a general guiding principle to restore tidal and seasonal flooding to three diked parcels of farmland in Phases II and III. In addition, some of the land will be used for public access and amenities.

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?

Only administrative milestones and accomplishments are defined as performance measures and presented in the proposal. Performance measures specific to design, implementation and ecological responses will be developed in further planning activities to be completed in Phase I.

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?

Phase I will include the purchase of land and development of scientific and technical approaches to design and assess the tidal restoration. Products of value are likely to emerge from the monitoring component if promised steps are successful and if currently requested funds are appropriate to support the monitoring studies.

7. <u>Capabilities.</u> 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?

Two applicants of the coalition that developed the proposal (NHI, Cal. Coastal Conservancy) have led several other large projects funded by CALFED. The local participants have long-standing community ties to gain public support.

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

At over \$20,000 an acre, (considering the sellers match, \$30,000 an acre!) the wetland costs appear to be quite high, perhaps inflated, though they are supported by independent assessors.

**Miscellaneous comments:** 

### **External Scientific: #2**

### **Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form**

Proposal Number: **30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

#### **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; <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 an ambitious and well conceived project, for which much groundwork with regard to the land aquisition objective has already been laid. A very strong case is made for the value and need to acquire the three Dutch Slough parcels. The experimental and modeling approach to the restoration objectives is to be
-Good	commended, and the hypotheses addressed are highly relevant and interesting not only in the context of the proposed project, but within the field of tidal marsh ecology and restoration. The restoration project is designed to maximize success through a phased, adaptive management approach. Restoration plan development
-Poor will be gu reasonabl gained in for subsec	will be guided by an advisory group yet to be identified. The budget seems reasonable to undertake the first phase of restoration proposed. The experience gained in the first phase of restoration will inform budgeting and funding requests for subsequent phases.

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

The goals of this project are ambitious and timely. A very strong case is made for the need and value of acquiring the Dutch Slough parcels with major support from CALFED. There is a solid commitment to development of a science-based restoration and implementation plan, and the opportunity to test some interesting, basic hypotheses that will certainly further our understanding of tidal marsh ecology and restoration. It would be very distressing if the acquisition goal cannot be accomplished and this major opportunity for the science and practice of tidal marsh restoration is lost.

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?

A weakness of the proposal is the lack of a good review of the literature regarding other large scale restoration efforts, such as those ongoing in the Delaware Bay and along the Oregon Coast. However, since a major portion of the proposal focuses on the need to fund a scientific planning process with outside expertise, the scanty lit. review was not considered in my scoring considerations. I find the phased process outlined to be thorough and practical, and clearly explained and justified. If the planning, pilot implementation and adaptive management process is funded and carried out as described, the results of the effort will provide an excellent, well documented, independent model for large scale tidal restoration. I suspect this would be one of the largest, if not the largest, marsh restoration project motivated and carried out independently of the need to mitigate a permitted environmental disturbance.

3. <u>Approach.</u> 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?

3. The broad approach outlined should allow achievement of objectives, and the results will certainly add to the knowledge base, some of which will be of general application (e.g. hydrologic modeling, marsh import-export processes, marsh accretion and erosion processes), some more specific (restoration/creation of habitats for rare plant, fish and bird species/communities). The success of the restoration will depend in part on the plan developed by the as yet to be named members of the working group. The response of the system to the implemented restoration design will make for a highly instructive story for decision makers, restoration practitioners and scientists alike. Every restoration project produces novel results, and this one will certainly be no exception. I do think the hypotheses chosen as a focus for the evaluation of system response to be of very broad scientific and management interest. One issue that will need to be raised in the planning process is that of an appropriate reference system (either real or hypothetical) against which to measure the performance of the proposed restoration.

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 rationale for the approach outlined is well developed. Questions of technical feasibility are more appropriate for the restoration plan that will be developed by the project, rather than for the planning process outlined. I do think that the science of tidal marsh restoration could benefit greatly from the planning process if efforts are made to bring together scientists from both coasts to exchange ideas as members of the working group. There is no a priori reason that I can glean from the proposal as to why the restoration effort should not succeed at some level. The degree of success will depend on the plan that is developed.

5. <u>Project-Specific Performance Measures.</u> 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 restoration will be developed as part of the planning process proposed, and thus cannot be assessed at this time. I suggest it will be very helpful to acquire as much information as possible about hydrology, geomorphology and ecology of the restoration site prior to disturbance, and extant reference sites (if they exist), to inform the planning process. I dont recall any description of the site prior to disturbance, or the history of disturbance, in the proposal.

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?

6. The proposed restoration plan, and evaluation of hypotheses and performance measures for the initial restoration of the Gilbert parcel, are very likely to be of great value to restoration scientists, practitioners, decision makers, and interpreters. The quality and value of the effort will be in part a function of the past experience of NHI and the Coastal Conservancy (which appears to be very impressive), and in part a function of the experience of the members of the working group, and group dynamics and leadership. These latter cannot be assessed at this time.

7. <u>Capabilities.</u> 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 sponsoring groups (NHI, CCC, CF) are clearly capable of carrying out large and ambitious projects. They deserve acknowledgement for identifying and contemplating the current project. I would be surprised if there are other groups that would have the capacity and experience to take the project on. It appears that the proposed project is the last chance to restore significant tidal wetlands in Dutch Slough. I suggest that they work with an experienced restoration scientist in developing the composition of the working group.

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

8. The amounts budgeted for restoration planning and implementation seem reasonable, given that the project has yet to be designed, and therefore lacking details. The costs of vegetation planting and maintenance are high relative to other restoration project elements. It may well be that less will be needed, if the system responds favorably to hydrologic restoration, and more money could be devoted to other aspects of the project, such as baseline data, review of historic information, and monitoring. Project management costs are admirably low for such a large undertaking. As for the purchase of the property, this seems a bargain that shouldn't be passed up.

**Miscellaneous comments:** 

### External Scientific: #3

### **Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form**

Proposal Number: **30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

#### **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; <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	The purchasing of the land appears to be a good idea. The applicants gave compelling reasons that support this to be a good restoration site. This part of t project I would rate excellent. The rest of the project lacks the detail to adequate evaluate its potential success. The goals and objectives of the long-term outlook into the future when they could do scientific experiments look good but those
XGood	
-Poor	the rest of the project I would rate it poor. That is how I came to the overall rating of good.

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

This proposal requests funds to purchase three adjacent parcels of land totaling 1229 acres along Dutch Slough near the City of Oakley (26 M + 1 M endowment) and do some baseline monitoring (0.5 M) (Phase I). It will also design, restore, and monitor one of the parcels (5 M) (Phase II). The applicants present compelling arguments as to why this land would be desirable for restoration - its location and variety of potential habitat types, minimal subsidence and the need for little grading, suitability for experimentation, the fact that native fish congregate here (some references on this would have been nice), willingness of property owners to sell, and the time sensitivity due to possible residential development.

The overall goal of the project is clear, however specific objectives for the funds currently requested seem to get mixed into the long-term goals of the overall project. There is considerable discussion of hypotheses regarding native fish abundance, sustainability of the restored wetlands, water quality issues concerning mercury and DBPs, and effect of environmental gradients on species distribution, but there are no experiments designed to address these issues with the current funds requested. These are apparently projects that could be done later.

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 funds requested for land acquisition are justified as are the endowment funds. Some funding for restoration plan development and baseline data collection would be justified. I feel that seeking funds for the actual restoration part of one of the parcels at this time is premature because they haven't developed a restoration plan yet.

Under the conceptual model they discuss hypotheses dealing with native fish abundance, restored wetlands sustainability, and water quality. As I understand it these would all be addressed in future proposals and are not the subject of this one, so it doesn't really explain the proposed work for which they are currently seeking funds.

3. <u>Approach.</u> 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 applicants have identified a worthy piece of land for restoration and seem to be very close to purchasing the property once the funds are appropriated. They have willing sellers that are willing to essentially cost share. They propose to have workshops to develop the restoration design, but have not as yet identified exactly who would be at those workshops except to say consultants and agency and independent scientists. No details are given as to the monitoring methods. For example, how will sedimentation be measured? How often will measurements of all variables be made? What types of fish sampling will be done? Regarding the actual restoration - how much earth moving is thought to be needed? Are there dikes to be breached (they do list a levee breach in their timeline)? How long are the dikes now and approximately how many breaches are expected and where? Will there be water control structures? Will they build any dikes or re-slope any? They mention planting in their timeline - what species? Apparently these are all issues they will figure out once funded, but I think that in order to have identified these particular pieces of land as good restoration sites there must have been some plan as to how hydrology would be managed to bring about the various habitats discussed. They must know more then they've told us.

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 land acquisition is feasible since they have the sellers. They still need to identify a long-term landowner but with an endowment that doesn't look like a problem. Whether or not the actual restoration is feasible all depends on the restoration plan and we don't have that yet. Nor are there enough details about its development to make a judgement.

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?

They say they "will develop more specific performance measures and quantitative environmental indicators when baseline and project impact monitoring begins". Other than giving a list of the things they would monitor, such as accretion rates, invertebrate sampling, wetland vegetation, fish surveys, water quality monitoring, etc. there are no details given as to specifics of the monitoring program so its impossible to say whether or not they will be adequate. For the land acquisition part they have adequate measures.

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 main product is the land. Other products could be a design plan, baseline data, restoration of one parcel, and an adaptive management plan, but details to evaluate these are inadequate.

7. <u>Capabilities.</u> 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 team appears qualified.

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

Apparently the land was appraised at around \$40 million and they will be getting it for \$28 million and then the Conservancy will cost share \$2 million. So the land cost to CalFed seems reasonable. The endowment seems like a good idea. The budget for the rest of the proposal is impossible to evaluate because they have not developed a restoration plan yet and monitoring details are not provided, therefore judging for example whether \$1.5 million for planting, \$250,000 for water control structures, or \$800,000 for monitoring is appropriate can't be done.

### Miscellaneous comments:

I would suggest funding the purchase of the land and an endowment, with the endowment possibly more than requested - maybe \$2 million. Then let them use the income from the endowment to develop a restoration and monitoring plan after which they could come to CalFed for funds to complete the restoration and monitoring. Later, investigators could come to CalFed for individual scientific studies. The endowment could then be used for management of the site.

### **External Scientific: #4**

### **Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form**

Proposal Number: 30

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

#### **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; <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	I think the acquisition and planning portions of this proposal are important, time sensitive, and should be funded. The threat of development and the opportunity to restore wetland functions to the project site make funding Phase I and the planning portions of Phase II an imperative. That is why I gave the proposal an
-Good	overall rating of "Excellent". Unfortunately, there is not enough detail provided to gauge the potential success of the pilot restoration actions and associated research projects proposed for the
-Poor	Gilbert Property. I recommend funding years one and two of the project, a requesting that year three work be resubmitted for review after more deta the proposed restoration actions, monitoring and associated scientific resea can be provided

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

The overall goal of this project is to restore a significant continuum of habitat from tidal marsh to upland forest in the western Delta. It might also be added that another major goal is to prevent urban development of the area in question and conserve it as restored tidal

wetlands and riparian fringe. According to the proposal: The project objectives are: 1) Implement a large-scale, locally supported restoration project that will serve the local community with shoreline access and other opportunities. 2) Restore the 1200-acre Dutch Slough properties to a fully functioning, self-sustaining ecosystem that includes a mosaic of habitat types including shallow water, emergent marsh, inter-tidal marsh, seasonal wetlands and flood plains, Antioch dune scrub, riparian forest, and oak savannah. 3) Significantly contribute to the state of scientific understanding of floodplain and tidal marsh restoration through ongoing experimentation and monitoring under an adaptive management framework.

The goals and objectives are clearly stated and internally consistent. While the hypotheses are clearly stated and logically follow the goals and objectives, it is less clear how they will be tested as the specific experimental designs will be developed as a part of the proposed work plan.

The concept is definitely timely and important. This appears to be a time sensitive acquisition opportunity. While CalFed should not be "blackmailed" into choosing to fund a particular project at a particular time by the threat of urban development, it would be a shame to lose this particular acquisition and restoration opportunity.

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 proponents claim, that "The Dutch Slough site is the best - and perhaps the only - site in the Delta where the location, elevation, ownership, and physical configuration combine to create the opportunity for implementation of a large-scale tidal marsh restoration and research project", cannot be verified by this reviewer based on my understanding of other opportunities in the Delta system. Perhaps overshadowing the restoration opportunity, is the opportunity to prevent urban development on the properties and the habitat and water quality degradation that inevitably follows such development. At less than \$27,000.00 per acre, the land owners would be selling their properties at a substantial discount compared to what they could command if the properties were sold for development purposes. The fact that the project proponents have a pending purchase agreement with the land owners for the purposes of conservation, restoration and education is significant and justifies the relatively large budget.

The conceptual model is based on the assumption that restoration of tidal and hydrologic dynamics on the site will form a mosaic of habitats, including freshwater tidal marsh, creating habitat for a range of native species. The conceptual model is clearly stated and explains the underlying basis for the proposed work.

Claims in the proposal that "Restoration of the site can be accomplished cost-effectively without significant grading" are important in terms of both overall cost and the eventual effectiveness of restoration actions. The potential overall effectiveness of the project is further supported by claims that "Tidal inundation and restoration of the site would create a diverse mosaic of habitat types from tidal marsh to Antioch dune scrub."

The partial focus on investigating predation effects on native species in the restored marsh area is perhaps too specific and out-of-sync with the timing of the proposed restoration work. Similarly, critically examining the role of restored wetlands in affecting water quality parameters may be outside the temporal scope of this study. Answering questions such as "How can tidal wetlands be designed to minimize predation effects?", or improve water quality may take many years to answer as new habitats form in restored areas. The focus on studying the evolution of tidal wetlands in response to various restoration treatments in the different portions of the target area are probably more appropriate for this project. Studies focused on differences in predation rates and water quality in newly restored/disturbed treatment areas versus some "natural" and diked reference areas may be appropriate as well.

The application of experimental restoration projects appears justified, but I would like to know who the "many scientists and managers" are that will hammer out the specifics of the restoration experiment "as part of a collaborative effort". Finally, will experimental treatments be reversible and/or converged through adaptive management to eventually achieve maximum function over the entire site?

3. <u>Approach.</u> 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?

According to the proposal, "The project will be designed and implemented in three phases. Phase I includes site acquisition, baseline data collection, adaptive management planning for the entire site, and a community access and design program to ensure that the ultimate site design serves the local community as well as the CALFED Bay-Delta program. Phase II includes restoration design, implementation, and monitoring for the middle parcel, the 312-acre Gilbert property, which is the most suitable for immediate restoration."

The Coastal Conservancy and their partners in the proposal have identified the approach needed to purchase the properties necessary to carry out the proposed restoration and studies of Phase I and II of the project. I cannot overemphasize how fundamental and key the acquisition of the property will be to the success of the overall project.

It is difficult however to tell whether the approach for the proposed studies is well designed and appropriate enough for meeting the objectives of the project. There is a lot of emphasis put on the ability of adaptive management planning workshops to come up with the appropriate design for both restoration actions and specific studies to monitor their effects. For example, it is not clear to me how a question as basic as how the location and number of levee openings needed to restore tidal influence to the site will be determined? Given the complicated nature of tidal wetland ecosystem restoration, this "cast of thousands" and research plan by committee is perhaps appropriate for such a large and complicated project, but it is difficult to evaluate the potential for success in advance.

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 objectives stated in the proposal and my evaluation of their relative feasibility follow:

"Project Objective 1: Implement a large-scale, locally supported restoration project that will serve the local community with shoreline access as well as educational, recreational, and economic opportunities." With enough money, it appears that the Coastal Conservancy and their partners will be able to purchase the property and initiate project design efforts and planning for the community service aspects of the project. In fact, the Feasibility Section (Section 4. of the proposal) focuses almost exclusively on these aspects of the work plan.

"Project Objective 2: Restore the Dutch Slough properties to a fully functioning, selfsustaining ecosystem that includes tidal wetland, low marsh, high marsh, riparian habitat, and upland transition zones." If you just break the dike in as many places as possible, some level of restoration will be attained. It appears the project proponents are looking to maximize ecosystem function through application of intelligent restoration and adaptive management. The proposal provides too few details to determine whether this objective will be acheived. In any case, it is unlikely that this objective is attainable in the timeframe of this proposal (three years). A more reasonable objective would read: Initiate a pilot restoration project that is designed to set a portion of the Dutch Slough complex on a trajectory towards a selfsustaining tidal wetland ecosystem.

"Project Objective 3: Contribute to the state of scientific understanding of floodplain and tidal marsh restoration through on-going experimentation and monitoring under an adaptive management framework." As with objective 2 above, the proposal provides too few details to determine whether this objective will be acheived, although convening expert workshops is an appropriate way to get to the level of detail necessary to carry out this work.

Tidal wetland restoration is not rocket science, and the general approach outlined in the proposal seems reasonable and technically feasible. However, the the proposed restoration and research action items are not fully described or documented. The likelihood of success for purchase of the former wetlands is very high given the avialability of funding. There are too few details given to determine whether the restoration and adaptive management for the proposed project will be a "success", however the proposed adaptive management approach will help to document and address problems with the restoration trajectory that surely will occur. The scale of the project in terms of funding and reliance on multiple outside sources for technical support is consistent with the objectives of the project.

5. <u>Project-Specific Performance Measures.</u> 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 outlined in Table 2 are largely administrative measures and measures of action. These seem like the appropriate performance measures for Phase I of the project. There is enough detail to quantify whether the project will attain levels of performance for the acquisition protion of the project.

The proposal states that "When baseline and project impact monitoring begins, we will develop more specific performance measures and quantitative environmental indicators." For the restoration portion of the proposed project, monitoring plans are not explicit or detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed.

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 described in Table 2 of the proposal are appropriate for all phases of proposed work and valuable at least for the execution of the proposed work at this site. The project proponents have identified the appropriate monitoring products at a macro scale (e.g. the level of detail provided in Table 2.), but not at the level of detail necessary to determine whether in fact such products are likely to be delivered accurately and on time. Interpretive outcomes are proposed here.

7. <u>Capabilities.</u> 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?

Being from out of state, it is not possible for me to verify the track record of applicants in terms of past projects without detailed accounts provided in the body of the proposal.

It impossible for me to determine the qualifications of the local land owners to achieve the assigned role of securing the necessary local support for the project. There are a number of intangibles that could play in here. My guess is that local political leaders will frown on lost opportunities to expand their tax base through development unless clear economic benefits associated with the proposed restoration can be identified and/or their hesitancy is overcome by overwhelming public support.

Nadine Hitchcock, Program Manager for the San Francisco Bay Conservancy Program appears to be amply qualified to oversee project management, interagency coordination, environmental compliance, facilitation of public and nonprofit organization forums, and consultant and contractor selection and oversight.

Nancy Schaefer, Director, California Office, The Conservation Fund appears qualified to oversee the acquisition of the land parcels, which is fundamental to the success of the proposal.

The Natural Heritage Institute staff will coordinate planning and design of the restoration projects and oversee the development of an adaptive management plan. It is difficult to gauge the capabilities of this group from the information included in the proposal, although they appear to have expertise and experience in the appropriate areas.

The project team appears to have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish at least the acquisition and planning portion of the project.

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

The budget is reasonable for Phase I. It is difficult to tell whether or not the budget is appropriate for Phase II given that the specifics of that work are not described in the proposal.

#### Miscellaneous comments:

Fund Phase I. Fund the planning portions of Phase II. Withhold funding for Restoration actions in Phase II until Phase I and Planning for restoration actions are complete and resubmit for review.

### Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

**New Proposal Number: 30** 

New Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

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

CALFED #00-B04, USBR #01-FC-20-0001 - Natural Heritage Institute - Focused Action to Develop Ecologically-Based Hydrologic Models and Water Management Strategies in the San Joaquin Basin

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 contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

-Yes -No XN/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 XN/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No XN/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?

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

No personal knowledge of performance of California State Coastal Conservancy who is applicant for this proposal.

### Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

### **New Proposal Number: 30**

New Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

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

#### 01-N32 - Natural Heritage Institute

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 contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

#### NFWF has no prior Agreements with the applicant, California State Coastal Conservancy.

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No XN/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?

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain:

NFWF did not administer the contract for the previous phase of the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration.

Other Comments:

Progress on 01-N32, stated as the previous/ongoing CALFED project number, is satisfactory. Our Agreement for 01-N32 is with the Natural Heritage Institute.

### Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

### **New Proposal Number: 30**

New Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

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

# **99-A01** Innudation of a Section of the Yolo Bypass to Restore Sacramento Splittail and Other Native Species

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

### Х

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact 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:

X

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:

X

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:

X

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

X

### Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #4

### **New Proposal Number: 30**

New Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

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

### 99-F09 Introduced Spartina Eradication Project

- 2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)
- 3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact 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 XN/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

### NA status of 99-F09 is not discussed in the proposal.

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?

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain:

### NA this is not a next phase proposal

Other Comments:

Coastal Conservancy has been professional and responsible during the implementation of 99-F09. In my experience, they have been carrying out tasks and duties in a timely and reliable manner.

### **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number: 30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

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

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

### Identified under the Comments section of the Environmental Compliance Checklist

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:

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

-Yes XNo

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

### **Budget:**

**Proposal Number: 30** 

Applicant Organization: California State Coastal Conservancy

Proposal Title: Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project

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?

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

### there is very little information in the budget justification or throughout the proposal.

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

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

### not clear of the dollars.

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

### gives the hours but does not address who or what the hours are for.

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

XYes -No

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

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

-Yes XNo

If no, please explain:

### very little information is provided regarding what the funding is for.

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes XNo

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: