

Proposal Reviews

#56: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

External Scientific Review

#1
#2
#3
#4

#1
#2
#3

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 56

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

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

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

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

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	Three of four outside reviewers and one of three regions identified serious problems of excessive budget and lack of specific objectives and deliverables. CALFED should not fund projects that lack concrete methods and deliverables.
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

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

The goals are stated, but the justification, strategic statement, and scientific literature review are inadequate.

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?

Ducks Unlimited has a very good track record. However, this proposal is far too vague on approach, and performance measures, as on the issues raised above. As mentioned by one reviewer, San Joaquin Valley agriculture differs profoundly from the fairly simple rice farming system with which DU has more experience. Much more scoping needs to be done, and the methods clearly specified.

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

The proposal is extremely weak on monitoring and deliverables.

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

The proposal is premature in light of the deficiencies noted above. Thus we regard it as very much over budget.

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?

Delta: Medium Ranking. This outreach program to expand DU's Agriculture Technical Assistance Program in the South Delta and San Joaquin regions could be helpful. It builds on existing works. The project pursues the restoration priorities applicable to the reg.

San Joaquin: High ranking: Project meets priorities for consideration which were listed in the application process; 1. working with at risk species in relation to habitat in an incentive based program with local land users, 2. It will reestablish natural ecological processes in the riparian habitat affecting corridors of habitats near rivers, 3. it will require easements in nearby lands to promote wetland, riparian, and aquatic habitat for all species.

Sacramento: Low ranking. The proposal was not well-prepared, duplicative, vague, perhaps expensive. Looking to NRCS to release info on clients who are doing wildlife friendly farming projects could be a problem. Unless things have changed with NRCS, they will not release any client information. Information on cost-share programs already exists and is accessible through NRCS, FSA, RCDs & others, both in offices and over the internet. ERP goals 1,2 &4 are listed, but not proven by text.

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?

No problem with environmental compliance.

Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary? No: Costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds are included in budget summary.

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: Status, No! Progress, Yes. Accomplishments, N/A Financial Status of the 99-B02 currently shows \$750,000 obligated towards the CALFED portion and \$250,000 obligated towards the CVPIA portion of the USBR Agreement 99-FC-20-0055. Amount stated by applicant as income (\$531,850.58) may reflect actual expenditures from the CALFED portion of the Agreement at the time of proposal submission

Miscellaneous comments:

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 56

Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

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

This outreach program to expand DU's Agriculture Technical Assistance Program in the South Delta and San Joaquin regions could be helpful.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

build on existing works

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

XYes -No

How?

wildlife friendly agriculture (DR-3), wetlands (DR-1), + MSCS

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?

builds on other efforts

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

XYes -No

How?

dependent upon new staff, consistent with other efforts, will lead to contact person for farmers to go to for technical assistance

Other Comments:

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 56

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

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

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

The committee recommended a high ranking for this particular project because it met priorities for consideration which were listed in the application process; 1. working with at risk species in relation to habitat in an incentive based program with local land users, 2. it will reestablish natural ecological processes in the riparian habitat affecting corridors of habitats near rivers, 3. it will require easements in nearby lands to promote wetland, riparian, and aquatic habitat for all species.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Current activity by Ducks Unlimited and the Sacramento region of the Delta has already commenced under previous Cal-Fed funding.

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

XYes -No

How?

1. working with at risk species in relation to habitat in an incentive based program with local land users, 2. it will reestablish natural ecological processes in the riparian habitat affecting corridors of habitats near rivers, 3. it will require easements in nearby lands to promote wetland, riparian, and aquatic habitat for all species.

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?

Current activity by Ducks Unlimited and the Sacramento region of the Delta has already commenced under previous Cal-Fed funding.

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

XYes -No

How?

It involves farms as well as other land holders in the areas that are going to be targeted for habitat restoration.

Other Comments:

None

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 56

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

Overall Ranking: ☒Low ☐Medium ☐High

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

The proposal was not well-prepared, duplicative, vague, perhaps expensive.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

-Yes ☒No

How?

Looking to NRCS to release info on clients who are doing wildlife friendly farming projects could be a problem. Unless things have changed with NRCS, they will not release any client information. Information on cost-share programs already exists and is accessible through NRCS, FSA, RCDs & others, both in offices and over the internet.

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

-Yes ☒No

How?

ERP goals 1,2 &4 are listed, but not proven by text. Goal 4's rationale doesn't appear to relate to this project, as it has to do with easements. Multi-species 121901 & E011907 are specifically referenced, but there are no project performance criteria listed to show how this project will add to these. Draft Impl. Plan.: Proposal sites this is an Implementation project, but it was not evaluated to be one. Science Priorities: "Dev. Performance measures to track wildlife-friendly ag program." The proposal only vaguely meets this, but nothing listed in the proposal justified referencing this priority. Overall, relevance to this PSP is unsubstantiated. The relationships listed are infused with another proposal's justifications.

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

-Yes ☒No

How?

A wide-ranging idea that is unclear as to its relationship to other activities or efforts.

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

☒Yes -No

How?

Looking to gain cooperation from State and Federal agencies and growers to identify Wildlife-Friendly Ag projects, monitor some impacts, and develop criteria for CALFED projects.

Other Comments:

Proposal tasks are vague and duplicative of information that is out there and available to the ag and restoration community. It also appears expensive.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **56**

Applicant Organization: **Ducks Unlimited, Inc.**

Proposal Title: **Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

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

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	A strategic overview is lacking, as are details on deliverables and goals. The literature review is inadequate.
-Good	
X Poor	

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

No. Unclear.

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?

No: there is no literature review. No. No.

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?

No. No. Unclear.

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?

No. Not clear how success would be measured. No.

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?

No. No. Not appropriate.

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?

No. Not appropriate. No.

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?

Unclear what the track record is. The project team looks qualified. Infrastructure and support are unclear.

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

The proposed project would be very expensive.

Miscellaneous comments:

A strategic overview is lacking, as are details on deliverables and goals. The literature review is inadequate.

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **56**

Applicant Organization: **Ducks Unlimited, Inc.**

Proposal Title: **Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

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

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	The concept is good, however, the approach and feasibility are lacking to justify funding.
-Good	
XPoor	

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

The project goals, objectives and hypotheses are not clearly stated.

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?

It is unclear how an individual will be able to evaluate friendly agricultural practices in a large geographic area.

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

How is the project going to bring in all of the local and regional agricultural groups? All agriculture or specific crops or specific types of farmers (e.g., crops, stone fruit, dairy farmers, etc)? What type of monitoring data will be generated?

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?

It is unclear whether it is feasible. Agriculture is very diverse with farmers (dairy, cattle) and growers of commodities such as orchards vs row crops. Thats a lot to cover. Maybe the project should address a narrower group first, then expand.

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 products just appear to be meeting with agricultural entities and preparing reports on wildlife friendly agric criteria. So how will performance be measured for meeting with agric entities? Performance is cited as meeting deliverable on time. What about quality of the report and usefulness of the information?

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

It is not clear from the proposal what the products will be?

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?

Personnel appear to be qualified.

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

Cost sharing from Ducks Unlimited for \$50,000.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **56**

Applicant Organization: **Ducks Unlimited, Inc.**

Proposal Title: **Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

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

No connection

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	This is an important concept, and could be an important addition to work now going on in the Sacramento Valley. The cost seems very high for the scope of work, which includes only one employee and two part-time supervisors. The geographic region is large and contains a very important component of high selenium agricultural drainage water that might impact implementation of this program. No mention of selenium as an issue for waterfowl in the San Joaquin is made in the proposal, and should have been addressed.
XGood	
-Poor	

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

The goals of the project are clearly articulated, and parallel ongoing projects, which should facilitate good progress. The concept of wildlife-friendly agriculture is important, timely and achievable. The deliverables from this project are somewhat vague, as the project involves generating a catalog of existing wildlife friendly agriculture programs currently in existence. The monitoring component is dependent upon identification of suitable programs.

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 study is justifiable within the context of existing knowledge. The conceptual model is only briefly stated, but the need for such work is clear, and the geographical range for this study is appropriate, although the geographic area is very large for a single employee to cover adequately. This project is really only a bare beginning, with the hiring of a single employee to get an overview of the magnitude of the potential in the San Joaquin Valley, and to monitor up to 6 undefined individual projects.

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 sketchy, and the logistics are not clearly stated, but this will be a project to parallel an existing project in the Sacramento Valley, which makes it much more likely to be successful. The project will not likely generate novel information, but will document conditions and locations where wildlife friendly agriculture exists or can be expanded in the San Joaquin Valley. The information will be of use to Agencies and decision makers within 3 years.

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?

Although the approach is not fully documented, I believe the participants have sufficient background and concurrent experience in the Sacramento Valley to conduct a successful project.

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?

There is not enough information to adequately assess whether the performance measures proposed will generate the specific data necessary to continue with a full-scale implementation of the concept.

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 monitoring portion of the project is not thoroughly explained. The concept is general, and this initial project is scoping in nature and not detailed. Up to 6 monitoring sites are planned, but no specific locations are documented, and no specific species of wildlife are targeted. Swainson's Hawks are mentioned, but no specific agricultural practices are discussed that might be applicable to Swainson's Hawks. Riparian restoration would be more suited to Swainson's Hawks, but this is not specifically included. Sandhill Cranes are also mentioned, and the management practices discussed are much more applicable to cranes and to waterfowl.

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?

Ducks Unlimited has an excellent track record of wetland project success. DU also has a successful ongoing program of wildlife friendly agriculture outreach. I believe the team and the organization proposed for oversight are adequate to insure the project will proceed correctly. The infrastructure is in place and adequate for the job.

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

The budget does not seem reasonable. The scope of work is basically one employee at a salary of \$44,000 plus oversight supervision costs of \$14,000 per year with benefits of about 27%. The Other Direct Costs are higher (\$84,000 year 1), although the description of these costs reads almost exactly the same as the indirect costs of \$30,000 for year 1. The cost for year 1 is \$189,000, which seems very high for the scope of work. No travel costs are included, although the employee is supposed to interface with growers and ranchers. If travel costs are part of the other direct costs, they should have been identified.

Miscellaneous comments:

This is an important concept, and could be an important addition to work now going on in the Sacramento Valley. The cost seems very high for the scope of work, which includes only one employee and two part-time supervisors. The geographic region is large and contains a very important component of high selenium agricultural drainage water that might impact implementation of this program. No mention of selenium as an issue for waterfowl in the San Joaquin is made in the proposal, and should have been addressed.

External Scientific: #4

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **56**

Applicant Organization: **Ducks Unlimited, Inc.**

Proposal Title: **Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

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

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	The proposal is well written and clear enough. The objective of bringing attention to wildlife friendly farming in the SJV is a worthwhile one. Creating networks among groups and individuals active in the valley will be useful. The monitoring and development component of wildlife friendly farming practices seems to be weaker to me.
X Good	
-Poor	

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

The goals are clearly stated. The hypothesis offered is very general: that wildlife friendly farming will enhance wildlife use. Since there are no specific practices or quantitative targets identified, this hypothesis can easily be shown to have been sustained almost no matter what the outcome. The concept (fostering wildlife conservation-oriented farming practices) is timely. Importance is a more relative judgement. Public policy favors increasing wildlife abundance generally. This proposal is consistent with that objective.

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 proposal only states that six pilot projects will be chosen. These have not yet been identified. There is an assumption that such projects exist and are numerous. I cannot evaluate that assumption. Pilot projects could be very valuable if they are used to quantify wildlife benefits and the costs to farmers of altering their farming systems to achieve these benefits.

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 San Joaquin Valley (SJV), unlike the Sacramento Valley (SV), has very little rice. Rice can be regarded as a managed wetland species with obvious connection to waterfowl. The development of wildlife friendly practices in rice growing areas was relatively simple, and was aided by an unacknowledged agricultural research and extension program carried out by the University of California, that allowed rice growers to understand the consequences of altering their winter management practices. Rice is also a highly simplified farming system compared to those followed in the SJV. Rice acreage in the SJV is unlikely to increase significantly for a number of technical and policy reasons. So DU will have to explore the development of upland "wildlife friendly" practices. They have less experience in this area, and will be starting with less basic understanding of the habitat requirements on non-wetland species and of the farming practices used. Larger amounts of effort may be needed for this phase of the project than the investigators anticipate. They did not acknowledge these differences in their proposal and may have underestimated them. Some of the goals identified, buying conservation or wetland easements for example, are not in my view really related to farming or the modification of farming practices. Other goals, such as increasing nutrient or sediment transport to wildlife areas, may directly conflict with Clean Water Act restrictions, and the new TMDL regulations being developed for the SJV. Excessive flooding of fields may increase the amount of saline, trace element loaded drainage water generated in the SJV, in contrast to other public policy goals of minimizing the generation of such water. In these comments, I have focused on the part of the project that emphasizes farming practices. Other parts of the project, developing contacts with other organizations and individuals interested in wildlife friendly agriculture will be easier and should be successfully accomplished. All net-working aspects of the project are feasible and should be achievable as stated.

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 described but not well documented. I would have liked to see a preliminary list of some wildlife friendly projects in the San Joaquin Valley. To the degree that the projects they identify involve wetlands or wetland processes, DU should be successful. Otherwise it is unclear from the proposal that they have anticipated the difficulties of modifying the large-scale, intensive field and vegetable crop farming systems common in the SJV. Simply to get farmers to leave a few acres of unharvested corn or wheat or sugarbeets as wildlife habitat may not require the expensive program contemplated. More significant alterations may require a more comprehensive research and extension approach similar to the one in the Sacramento Valley, but unacknowledged as a key to the winter rice field flooding program. The SJV is large relative to the scale they have identified for their work, but this is no major problem given that they intend this project to be their initial effort.

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 proposal suggests that existing wildlife friendly projects will be monitored. If such projects exist, it is unclear who will do the monitoring. Presumably, the existing projects are doing their own monitoring. If they are, will they welcome DU's participation and use of their data? If they are not monitoring, then DU's one employee may not be able to do very much detailed monitoring at the six sites contemplated in 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?

The development of a network of organizations and list of wildlife friendly farming projects should be very helpful. The quantitative assessment of actual wildlife benefits may be beyond the capability of the project as proposed.

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?

DU has had great success in their rice lands habitat program. This program was a natural fit with historic concern for water fowl habitat. As they deviate from wetlands related farming practices, they may be venturing into new areas and I cannot judge their capacity at this time. I suspect that this project, if funded will increase their capabilities in upland habitats. But past success may not be a guide to predicted success with this project. DU should be able to achieve all their stated objectives with respect to building a network of organizations active in this arena. Their efforts will probably raise this issue to a higher level of awareness among farmers in the SJV and could lead in the future to the development of interesting projects. This proposal may better be seen as a stimulatory effort, rather than as research or demonstration.

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

The budget is reasonable based on the need to support one full time employee plus office overhead and transportation costs. Whether this is a sufficiently large enough budget depends on the degree of technical ecosystem monitoring needed. It may not be enough to develop a very reliable quantitative wildlife use and benefits data set.

Miscellaneous comments:

This is an interesting idea and should be useful in stimulating future work on wildlife friendly practices in the SJV. For these reasons, the proposal should be worth funding. Some of the specific goals identified involve taking some farm land out of production or encouraging practices which may conflict with other laws or public policy goals. These ideas have not been well thought through. Does anyone think integratively about the environment?

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 56

New Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

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

CALFED # 99-B02, USBR # 99-FC-20-0055, Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Analysis for Butte Sink Structural Modifications and Flow-Through System.

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

USBR # 99-FC-20-0055, Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Analysis for Butte Sink Structural Modifications and Flow-Through System.

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

☒Yes -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 -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

Status, No! Progress, Yes. Accomplishments, N/A

Financial Status of the 99-B02 currently shows \$750,000 obligated towards the CALFED portion and \$250,000 obligated towards the CVPIA portion of the USBR Agreement 99-FC-20-0055. Amount stated by applicant as income (\$531,850.58) may reflect actual expenditures from the CALFED portion of the Agreement at the time of proposal submission

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

☒Yes -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:

Reporting, Yes! Record keeping, N/A. Financial management, N/A

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

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

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Ducks Unlimited, Inc. has been able to enlist other fund sources to add to and maximize the work effort concerning the Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II. They are very well organized and forthcoming with all of the paper work and reports required under the current Agreement.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 56

New Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

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

96-M22 Gorrill Dam Fish Screen and Fish Ladder

95-MO5 M&T Parrott Pumping Station and Fish Screen

96-M21 Rancho Esquon/Adams Dam Fish Screen and Ladder

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 56

New Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

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)*

Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase III- Butte Creek, Drumheller Exclusion Barrier Final Engineering, Permitting and Construction, 11332-9-J006 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Butte Sink/Sutter Bypass Stakeholder Coordination/Facilitation, 11332-9-J135 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass East-West Diversion Dam Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review, 11332-9-J122 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #3 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review, 11332-9-J122 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #5 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review, 11332-9-J136 Sutter Bypass Eastside, 11332-0-J004 Lower Butte Creek, Butte Slough Phase II - Preliminary File, 11332-0-J003

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Ducks Unlimited has provided the strongest project management services I have been involved with on the Lower Butte Creek Project. Relative to the Lower Butte Creek Project, DU is managing a very complex effort with many funding sources and project components. If project management standards exhibited by Mr. Zirkle are practiced by other project managers within Ducks Unlimited, CALFED will be well served.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 56

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:**Proposal Number:** 56**Applicant Organization:** Ducks Unlimited, Inc.**Proposal Title:** Central Valley Wildlife Friendly Agriculture Program

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

-Yes ☒No

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

Costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds are included in budget summary.

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: