Proposal Reviews

#53: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy

Initial Selection Panel Review	
Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review	
Sacramento Regional Review	
External Scientific Review	#1 #2 #3 #4
Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding	#1 #2
Environmental Compliance	
Budget	

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 53

Applicant Organization: Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy

Proposal Title: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

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: **$$1,860,000.00**

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

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel recognizes the importance of Deer Creek in the ERP and the critical role and good work of the Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy, but does not recommend funding this proposal. Although the Technical and Regional Panel reviews are generally favorable, the Selection Panel is concerned with the cost and scope of the proposal. The Panel suggests that the Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy prepare a revised proposal for Phases 1 and 2 (Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design of initial projects elements) in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Reclamation Board, and Tehama County for consideration as a directed action.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 53

Applicant Organization: Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy

Proposal Title: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

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	**Based on a compilation of all reviews, this project receives a 'above average' rating. This proposal is regarded to be a project that deserves consideration for funding. However, an addendum may be required to address some shortcomings with the technical details. Two reviews rated this proposal as excellent. One external reviewer admitted having problem deciding between excellent and good rating. Another reviewer considered the proposal to be poor because of issues regarding the approach. What is an estimate of the acreage the applicants expect to be affected by restoration? What would be the potential habitat restoration gains? However, during the panel review, a consensus was reached that the deficiencies noted with this proposal were not insurmountible.** **The panel believes the pricetag of 681K may be too high for the scope proposed. Budget is too high, and justification is required before funding.**
XAbove average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

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

   Goals and objectives are well organized and relevant to high quality restoration with a strong sense of ecological knowledge and application. The primary goal was stated as improving biological habitat while developing feasible solutions to the flooding problem...

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

   The conceptual model appears to be founded on good science. The existence of a functiona wild population of salmonids in the watershed underscores the relevancy of this project. Some reservation expressed by one reviewer for vague language under approach, thus giving an impression that part of the approach is not well thought out. Approach was considered to be lacking in background details on flood history, extent of flood loss. Capabilities of team members are outstanding.

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?

   Both the interim and final products appear adequate for the desired outcome. However, the applicants could have been more explicit about the ultimate outcome and expected deliverables. A peer-reviewed manuscript is good in that a scientific endorsement would be valuable to supporting the approach and model development.

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

   A discrepency exists in the budget request. They state the total amount is $1,860,000, while the budget shows $681,400 and no cost sharing is indicated. The applicants request the full budget up front; but, the project is scheduled to last 3 years. The budget explanation is unclear.

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

   One regional review -- high rank. Recommend funding Phase I, but need a budget breakdown by task. This project requires a high degree of outreach and coordination with stakeholders. The region is supportive of this project.

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?

   Administrative review supportive of this project. The project team is considered very well organized and consisting of expert professional members.

Miscellaneous comments:

Applicants must clarify the details of the budget and identify costs for each task.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 53

Applicant Organization: Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy

Proposal Title: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

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

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

-Committee recommends funding Phase I. -Needs a budget breakdown per task. -Requires high degree of outreach and coordination with locals, state and federal agencies. -Expand technical review committee.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   The project is feasible, however, should incorporate close involvement by local residents, the County Flood Control District and the Corps of Engineers who has authority over the levee system.

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

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   The proposal addresses PSP Sacramento Regional Priorities No. 1-4 and 7.

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?

   It is linked to various past CALFED funded actions in the general area, the 1998 Deer Creek Watershed Management Plan and USF&WS Grant to reduce erosion in the upper watershed of Deer Creek.

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

   XYes **-**No

How?

It is proposed to involve landowners. As some landowners have expressed reservation regarding the project, public outreach will be an important element.

Other Comments:

Applicant is open to funding Phase I at this time which would complete the Feasibility Study and Identification of Initial Project Elements for Initial Implementation.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **53**

Applicant Organization: **Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design**

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):

I will soon begin a data synthesis project in which Matt Kondolf is a participant. I have never met Dr. Kondolf, and have no past association with him of any kind. As this workshop and synthesis project has not yet begun, I feel that the conflict is minor.

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	**a strong team** **a sensible goal of using the floodplain to store floodwaters and restore habitat** **too vague on the details** **the stated goal of restoring steelhead feels like window-dressing**
XGood	
-Poor	

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

   goals are nicely stated on p 2: "improve aquatic and terrtestrial habitat while developing feasible solutions to the flooding problem..." and "to use "managed floodplain restoration to meet the above-described habitat restoration goals." Additional sub-objectives also emphasize stakeholder education.

These are well stated and shape the proposal. The concept of managed floodplain inundation is 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?

   The justification stems from the flow regime concept, well-accepted arguments favoring floodplain storage of flood waters, and a conceptual model presented as figure 2. The related hypotheses are the strongest part of the justificationa nd demonstrate a good command of expected consequences (and benefits) of flood plain restoration. Otherwise I consider this section to be a bit brief.

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?

   One interstesting aspect of the approach is its explicit separation into three phases: feasibility, design, and environmental documentation for implementation, allowing CALFED to choose only 1 and 2, or only the first of these. But it makes sense to go all or none.

   Monitoring includes aerial photography for terrestrial, and some existing monitoring of salmon escapement for the aquatic system. I was not reasured by statement top p 8 to the effect that they "assume" fish monitoring will continue and "will establish" additional monitoring of insects. Post-project monitoring will not be planned unless the project is implemented. All of this might be fine, but I strongly recommend that CALFED send a strong signal to the PIs about the importance of the monitoring elements.

   The content of pp 6-10 left me with two strong impressions: this is a sophisticated proposal, and this is a vague proposal. I'm not at all sure what to make of these seemingly contradictory impressions. There is a lot of "will be developed" language. For example, next to "collection of new data" I wrote "vague", next to "Hydrologic modeling" I wrote "sounds sophisticated", and next to "review of project elements" I wrote, "really hard to tell what is involved". Phases II and III are very briefly described. By the way, if CALFED buys the whole project, who decides which alternative gets implemented?

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?

   My thoughts here carry on the same theme as what I wrote under "Approach". The proposal states that "this is an ideal project for demonstrating the opportunities and results of controlled floodplain inundation.." Except for figure 2, which is described as based on preliminary work, I haven't a clue what "opportunties" exist and what experimental inundations will be performed. The proposal stresses that it is unique in using floodplain inundation to restore channel habitat. Maybe, but again I am having trouble reading between the lines on this.

   I assume that floodplain inundation will involve taking out or shaving down levees - but for this reader, a little bit of common sense discussion of what their alternatives might look like would have been really helpful.

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 throughout this project are really the promised products or study outcomes. This sounds reasonable enough to me, but doesn't really match the notion of performance measures.

   I expressed my reservations about the monitoring aspects under "Approach".

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?

   Well, the ultimate product could be a permit to modify the flows - that would be useful.

   I suggest again that the PIs be pushed to strengthen the monitoring component.

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

   This looks like a strong team. In fact, it looks so strong that I feel uncomfortable with the reservations expressed above. The strength and past experience of this group makes me vascillate between 'good' and 'excellent' for the proposal. But in the end, I have to go with what I read in the proposal.

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

   $1.8 million ain't cheap. I didn't see any budget pages or justification. I will not pass judgement on this question.

Miscellaneous comments:

How do the steelhead benefit?

How will instream channel habitat benefit?

Is the monitoring program adequate to answer these two questions?

What are the likely alternatives?

What does the site look like today? (There clearly was much landscape change by 1938 - how different is it now?)

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **53**

Applicant Organization: **Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design**

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 proposal deserves an excellent rating for being well organized and well written to address the specifications of this solicitation. The approach and concept are very relevant and are highly feasible.**
-Good	
-Poor	

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

   Rating: Excellent. Goals and objectives are well organized and relevant to solid ecosystem restoration with a strong sense of ecological knowledge and application.

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

Rating: Excellent. The existence of a functional wild population of salmonids in the watershed underscores the relevancy of this project. The conceptual model is founded on good science.

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

   Rating: Excellent. Approach links the objectives with the desired outcome, and involves a comprehensive scope that includes public outreach, baseline ecological monitoring, and interaction of the stakeholders in the solutions.

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

   Rating: Excellent. The applicants describe in the feasibility in sufficient detail. Use of previous successful models and approaches underscores the feasibility. Also, a majority of the stakeholders are in support.

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

   Rating: Excellent. Performance measures discussed for each of the 3 phases and the various aspects of the project.

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

   Rating: Excellent. Both interim and final products appear to be adequate for the desired outcome. The follow-through with scientific manuscripts will make this project and its process usable to a broader audience.

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

   Rating: Excellent. Strong credentials of the team.

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

   Rating: Very Good. Budget appears to be adequate, but not clearly described. Full budget requested up front, but the project is 3 years. Breakdown of project costs not clear.

Miscellaneous comments:

This proposed project meets the specifications of this solicitation, and is well described in its concept and approach. The applicants provide sufficient detail to support their goal and objectives.

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **53**

Applicant Organization: **Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design**

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	**The proposal simply does not indicate familiar with the study area, its flooding problems or the restoration potential. The budget is inadequately explained and inconsistent with the requested funds.**
-Good	
XPoor	

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

   The goals and objectives are clearly stated. The overarching hypothesis is so general as to be intractable, certainly within the study period. The sub-hypotheses also will be difficult to measure because of the random nature of the underlying hydrology. The idea is excellant

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 lacks any justification of the intended work. The floodplain and the locations of levees are poorly defined despite readily available information from federal and state agencies (e.g., Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Corps of Engineers). Other than a general statement, flood losses are not quantified or spatially represented. Again, this information is available from FEMA in the form of structure-by-structure damage and frequency of damage. The potential scope and nature of the lands to be restored are not qualified by location or quantified. A 1998 watershed management report was cited but the results were not revealed or integrated into the justification of the project. The same is true of the 1949 Army Corps of Engineers report that lead to the construction of the offending levees.

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?

   Other than the use of a 3D model, the design methodologies are standard engineering.

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 development of an acceptable plan is feasible. The use and value of the 3D model is less certain. In any event, detailed topographic mapping will be required. This mapping effort will need to be extended to the levee structure itself. Other than modeling assessments, measured responses will take a long time, far beyond the scope of this planning study.

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 proposed monitoring program is described only in general terms. For example, neither flood stage data nor streamflow data were referenced. Existing and potential hydrologic monitoring locations were not discussed. No reference is made to either the U. S. Geological Surveys stream gauging or the Corps of Engineers flood stage recording program. Past wildlife monitoring data were not described or referenced. Consequently, the baseline conditions remain uncertain.

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?

   Assuming that the proposal cover only plan development, the product, the plan, is reasonably described.

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 proposed staff seems to be well qualified. Given the lack of site details, the staff may not be very familiar with local conditions.

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

   The budget presentation is inadequate. Too few task categories are presented. And, there is a major discrepancy in the proposal. The requested funds are $1,860,000 but the budget totals only $681,400. In any event, only plan development is discussed in the proposal so the lower amount is assumed to apply. Still, this amount is far too much for the described work. One is left to assume that the mapping and modeling work is accounting for the lions share

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #4

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **53**

Applicant Organization: **Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design**

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 is well written and convincing. The opportunity to develop multiple scenarios for restoration and involve the stakeholders in helping to select the final decision is excellent. The underlying science is strong. There are details to quibble about but overall this is one of the better proposals I read.**
-Good	
-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. Hypotheses are stated but as the PI state, they can only be tested much later (future phases) in this project. The idea is not only timely (with respect to restoration goals nationally and regionally, but flood management (restoration of floodplain flows) for this particular site should occur now before any more development occurs on the floodplain.

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 ecological importance of this site (particularly for salmonids) and also the fact that flood problems exist in many areas due to prior (ca. 1983 1940s) channelization and levee construction. The conceptual model outlines the overall strategy for final completion of restoration of this area and like many other conceptual models in this competition, it is a nice overview but provides little else (i.e., the scientific meat is not in the overall model). The underlying basis for the work is well laid out in the text and is convincing. Existing knowledge in the scientific literature does suggest that channel heterogeneity will increase if natural flows are restored (in this case, including periodic inundation of the floodplain). This heterogeneity should (theoretically) lead to an improvement in fish an invertebrate populations. This would be an excellent test of that theory and existing knowledge much of which is intuitive but not adequately tested.

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 excellent. This is largely a research and planning project. Their planned use of models to develop restoration scenarios and then take these to the landowners is outstanding. Particularly since they will use not just HEC-RAS but also 3-D hydraulic models. Many restoration projects have failed because the hydrologic analysis was too coarse a scale particularly if the interest is in restoring structure, function, and heterogeneity in-stream at scales appropriate to fish and inverts. As outlined in 2) above, I do believe the results will be transferable to other systems and add to our broad knowledge base on restoration practice and science.

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 is a little harder to gage. Some of the PIs are highly qualified; others (some of the firms), I simply have no knowledge on. My one concern is making sure the scenario (results) evaluation with the stakeholders proceeds forward without crashing. Apparently the DCWC has active involvement of stakeholders (clear from the proposal) but when it comes to flooding someones land, it is hard to say if a consensus can be reached. So here is where I would like to have seen a bit more on consensus building techniques and additional information on the views of the most critical stakeholders. With respect to more technical aspects: the modeling should be feasible, although we are not given many details on this especially the 3D- model (which is not straightforward). The gemorph work appears to largely hinge on aerial photos but some in-stream work will occur. We are not told exactly what or how much (e.g., in the way of geomorphic surveys, particle size studies, etc.)

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 largely very general i.e., produce reports, produce model output, attain consensus, document # of stakeholders attending meetings. I would say they go further than most of the proposals I have read in outlining metrics.

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?

   This project could add significantly to our knowledge base on how floodplain restoration influences in-channel features. They promise broad dissemination of the results (which are actually of most interest if later portions of this overall work plan are fundedi.e., the actual restoration). I do think interpretable outcomes will result although it would have been nice to see what types of information from the models the group will present to landowners.

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

   From what is provided the team is certainly well qualified and has done past restoration work as well as some research. However, see my comments in 4) above.

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

   seems reasonable, especially the amount of geomorphic work and modeling that is promised. It would have been nice to see a little more detail on the products from those, however.

Miscellaneous comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 53

New Proposal Title: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

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

   97-E02Deer Creek watershed plan

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?

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

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

If no, please explain:

Not requesting next phase funding

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 53

New Proposal Title: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

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

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

   Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy management strategy development.

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 **X**No -N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

   They did not cite AFRP project above in their proposal, but DCWC completed proposed work on time and within budget and produced an excellent product, the DCWC Watershed Management Strategy.

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

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

XYes **-**No **-**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Very well organized watershed group, retaining expert professional members to carry out complex project accounting and management activities; definitely up to the task of managing their own watershed projects.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 53

Applicant Organization: Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy

Proposal Title: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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:

This proposal is for planning and feasibility study phases of project only. Proposal does discuss third phase, which will include preparation of environmental documentation. Timetable for that phase seems appropriate.

Budget:

Proposal Number: 53

Applicant Organization: Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy

Proposal Title: Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design

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).

   Question 17A state $1,860,000 while the budget shows $681,400 and they indicate no cost share

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

   XYes **-**No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

XYes **-**No

If yes, please explain:

The discrepancy in Question 17A and their Budget Summary is over $400,000. There is nothing that suggests cost share

Other Comments: