

# Proposal Reviews

## **#76: Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley**

Grassland Water District

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review**

**San Joaquin Regional Review**

**External Scientific Review** #1  
#2  
#3

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding** #1  
#2

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

# Final Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 76

**Applicant Organization:** Grassland Water District

**Proposal Title:** Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

<b>Fund</b>	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	X

Amount: \$0

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

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The Fish and Wildlife Service submitted a letter outlining the need for additional information about the San Joaquin Valley's giant garter snakes. It suggested funding part of the proposal, which is also being considered for funding through the CVPIA's habitat restoration program. The Selection Panel, however, agrees with previous reviews, noting that the proposal lacks critical experimental design details and presents an indefensibly high funding request. Should this proposal be resubmitted to CALFED or another funding source, it will need substantial revision of the project description, a clear articulation of data acquisition schemes that are consistent with standing hypotheses regarding the current understanding of habitat use, and a budget at a fraction of that in this proposal.**

# Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 76

**Applicant Organization:** Grassland Water District

**Proposal Title:** Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley

**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.

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
-Superior	<b>Although the conservation of the giant garter snake is an important goal, there are several problems with this project. The proposed project does not effectively build upon the knowledge base gained for this species from previous work in the Sacramento Valley and poorly describes how the vegetation parameters for the habitat model will be quantified. It is also not clear whether a sufficient number of snakes will be captured to develop the model nor how the model will be validated. Finally the funding for administrative activities on this project seem very large, unjustified, and inappropriate.</b>
-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 general goal to better understand the habitat characteristics of the giant garter snake is clearly stated and of obvious importance for the conservation of this species but this goal is limited in scope relative to broader CalFed goals and priorities. This work has been going on in the Sacramento Valley for over six years and so justification for extension of scope to the San Joaquin Valley is severely undermined by the lack of information resulting from this previous work. Although a major focus is on relating habitat characteristics to snake distribution there is no baseline data from this previous work and how the vegetation parameters are to be quantified is poorly described.**

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?

**There were concerns that the research approach project does not build on information garnered from previous studies in the Sacramento Valley and that it is not clear from the proposal what is the minimal number of successful captures that are required to develop the habitat model. Why couldn't this threshold level be estimated from the previous Sacramento Valley study? Performance measures were very vaguely described and it is not clear how the success of the habitat model will be assessed. Although the participants appear capable, the lack of significant publications from previous work on this species in the Sacramento Valley is troublesome.**

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 participants have not produced any significant peer-reviewed publications from the previous Sacramento study so the statement that these types of publications will be a major product is worrisome.**

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

**The very large amount of funding dedicated to administrative activities was inadequately justified and seems very inappropriate. This is a very negative aspect of this 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 Sacramento Regional panel ranked this proposal High. The panel thought that if this project was successful, it would be important for long-term management and recovery of the species in the San Joaquin Valley. Although all the permits are not obtained for this project, the panel thought that the applicants should be able to obtain them. The panel also noted that a land management agency was part of the research team.**

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?

**There was some concern that the applicants have not budgeted time or funding for completing the environmental documents and permits that will be required.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**None**

## San Joaquin Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 76

**Applicant Organization:** Grassland Water District

**Proposal Title:** Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley

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

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

**This is an important study that will define habitats used by giant garter snakes in the largest remaining wetland complex in the San Joaquin Valley. Will be important for long-term management and recovery of the species.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Excellent cadre of experienced researchers. Logistics well planned and based on past experience. Have access permission for study sites. Should be able to get all necessary permits.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Yes, but not as described. More likely fill SJ 4 to improve understanding of at risk species, SJ 5 reduce impacts of irrigation drainage and reduce transport of contaminants and MR 6 ensure recovery of at risk species.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Researchers include important land managers. Results will be key to implementing water and wetland management strategies.**

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

XYes -No

How?

**A major agency representing local landowners is a part of the team and will be doing much of the ground work.**

Other Comments:

# External Scientific: #1

## Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 76

Applicant Organization: Grassland Water District

Proposal Title: **Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley**

### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

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	<b>The limited scope and utility of the product, (which may not be feasible regarding the low numbers of snake captures expected), and lack of important results produced from earlier work on this species led to a low summary rating.</b>
-Good	
XPoor	

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

**The goal of the project will be to capture snakes and create a model of likely snake habitat that could be used to prioritize areas for restoration. The goals are clear and consistent internally. Modeling habitat for one species likely fits only one CalFed goal/priority.**

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?

**Extension of the work from the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley, which has different vegetation conditions that affects snake trapping, is acceptable.**

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 was methodical, but the reviewer thinks the work plan could get farther quicker. Generally this seems like work that should be supported by agencies required to fulfill the Endangered Species Act.**

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 possible that not enough snakes will be captured to make the work meaningful.**

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

**The performance measures are all right as proposed, but need success criteria for trapping support of the modeling effort. That is, about how many snakes are needed for create a useful model?**

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?

**Peer-reviewed papers and outreach brochures will be valuable, but may be limited. The reviewer expected to see published literature on the previous work in the Sacramento Valley, but the lack of publications on this work does not instill confidence that results from the proposed work will be published.**

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 capabilities appear to be very good in terms of experience in the discipline. However, the work in the Sacramento Valley has not produced important results as indicated by lack of publications.**

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

**Lots of management is required for this project. Normally these costs are included as overhead, so this should be investigated if the project moves forward.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**System-wide benefits from this work are minimal.**



## External Scientific: #2

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 76

Applicant Organization: Grassland Water District

Proposal Title: **Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

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	<b>This is a carefully constructed research proposal that will provide baseline ecological data critical for informed decision-making in the management and recovery efforts for a federally-listed species. In light of the dearth of published data, this study comes at an important juncture in the conservation of GGS. It is gratifying to see this long-neglected species finally gaining attention from researchers. In this instance, the team assembled brings considerable GGS experience to the project, engendering high levels of confidence in their ability to generate needed data and scientifically sound conclusions.</b>
-Good	
-Poor	

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

**Goals, objectives, and hypotheses are clearly outlined. This project is a critical component in the long-term recovery efforts for the federally listed Giant Garter Snake (GGS). Populations in the southern portion of the species' range have experienced a dramatic, and thus far unexplained, decline in the past two decades. As it now stands, the southern third of the historical range of this species is no longer occupied. The middle third, now in sharp decline, will likely play a role in future repatriation efforts for the southern San Joaquin**

Valley.

**Moreover, the GGS has received remarkably little attention from researchers until it became federally listed. Most of its life history remains poorly known, and the most recent work by Wylie and colleagues remains unpublished outside of agency reports. GGS is unique among all species of *Thamnophis* in its large size and strongly aquatic habits. It is imperative that studies such as the current proposal be undertaken to prevent further erosion of its range.**

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?

**In light of the overall paucity of published life history data for GGS, the present study will provide much-needed data concerning distributional ecology, population density, predator-prey relationships, etc. These data will go a long way in informing both on-site land management decisions as well as recovery efforts in places where GGS have been extirpated.**

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?

**As indicated in #2, the project proposes to gather data that will be extremely useful in species recovery efforts. In fact, without these data, we are operating with a collection of anecdotal information and "best-guesses" in developing recovery strategies. As a member of the USFWS Giant Garter Snake Recovery Team, I can attest to the dearth of scientific information available to guide management and recovery efforts.**

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?

**Perhaps little appreciated by those who have not worked with this species is the considerably difficulty in finding and capturing snakes in the tule/cattail habitats of the San Joaquin Valley. This is not an easy species to work with, and thus, prior experience with GGS is essential. The project researchers have considerably familiarity with GGS, having been extensively involved with field research with the species over the past several years. Indeed, they have developed new trapping techniques specifically targeting this species, and they have been responsible for generating nearly all of the new biological data concerning GGS within the last decade. Their track record with GGS suggests they will be successful in achieving stated objectives for the current 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?

**The investigators have proposed a target of six publications/presentations annually to address various interested constituencies, from local biologists to the larger scientific community. They have also indicated that this project contains elements of adaptive flexibility, important given some of the uncertainties in working with a species which may not be present in large portions of the study area. Appropriate performance measures and detailed monitoring plans are outlined.**

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?

**Potential products deriving from this research include possible modifications to existing trapping technologies and habitat models for evaluating repatriation sites. Further, investigators propose toxicological examination for selenium and possibly other bio-active substances that are potentially widespread within this ecosystem. Study results are to be communicated via presentations and peer-reviewed publications, consistent with standard practice in the scientific community.**

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?

**Text copied from response to #4 (above): The project researchers have considerably familiarity with GGS, having been extensively involved with field research with the species over the past several years. Indeed, they have developed new trapping techniques specifically targeting this species, and they have been responsible for generating nearly all of the new biological data concerning GGS within the last decade. Their track record with GGS suggests they will be successful in achieving stated objectives for the current project.**

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

**Project will study GGS over a three-year period, a reasonable time frame for refining methodology and survey techniques. The budget appears appropriately matched to the work proposed.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**One suggestion to research team is to consider (if they haven't already) nocturnal surveys for GGS, particularly if there are open areas (e.g., dirt or paved roads bordering canals, levees, etc.). I found these to be productive at the Mendota WMA in 1978 during warm summer nights. Both adults and juveniles were found active during these periods. Nocturnal feeding was also observed.**

# External Scientific: #3

## Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 76

Applicant Organization: Grassland Water District

Proposal Title: **Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley**

### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

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	<b>This is an important problem but the applicants do not build upon previous results in designing this study. In addition, the environmental data being collected for habitat characterization seems really inadequate especially in determining the vegetation structure component.</b>
-Good	
XPoor	

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

**2 - Very Good Given that this species is endemic to the Central Valley and its numbers seem to be on the decline, a better understanding of factors determining its distribution and abundance seem 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?

**4 - Fair** Although the objectives are reasonable, it is quite troubling that the applicants cannot provide a better analysis of the baseline data already obtained for this species. Given that there has been over 6 years of work on this species, one would expect that the proposed research would be much more focused. Even taking into account the assertion that San Joaquin environments might be different from Sacramento Valley habitats, the applicants should have provided a much better assessment of what we do and do not know about giant garter snake habitat. One would never know from the approach proposed that we had any information on GGS at all.

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?

**4 - Fair** As noted above the approach seems reasonable but does not appear to build on the knowledge base that exists already for this species. Also, it is not clear at all how the applicants intend to develop population models for GGS based on the parameters measured in this study. If they are trying to develop Population Viability Models (PVAs) then they are not taking the necessary data. The description of the habitat parameters is very poorly described. For example, the vegetation community description will apparently be restricted to species identification which may be very uninformative in trying to describe parameters of habitat structure that are important to the snake. The applicants also mention that the availability of prey items will be described but no real description of methods are given for this potentially very difficult task.

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?

**4 - Fair** From previous work, it appears that trapping techniques are either well worked out or the applicants have a good idea how to modify the procedures to increase trapping efficiency. However, description of techniques for measuring habitat parameters and prey availability are so vague that it is quite possible that the accurate description of habitat for this species may not result from this 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?

**4 - Fair** The primary performance measure of "description of GGS populations in the Grassland Wetlands" is very vague and instead of providing quantitative metrics for attaining this goal, instead the applicants emphasize the production of papers, pamphlets, workshops etc. on this poorly defined performance measure. For the bullfrog portion of the study, the primary performance measure is a report and a paper (again rather vague).

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?

**3 - Good** The primary products are peer-reviewed papers, pamphlets, etc. If properly distributed, they could be very valuable for further restoration efforts.

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?

**4 - Fair** If peer-reviewed papers are the primary product then the track record for the GGS project to date is not very strong. The personnel seem capable, but it is not clear that they will deliver in terms of a strong production of papers or in terms of outreach. Also, how this research will be tied to restoration is pretty vague beyond the idea that regulation of water availability is probably important.

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

**4 - Fair** Funding for the field work portion seems fine but the large amount designated for administration seems excessive.

**Miscellaneous comments:**

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

**New Proposal Number:** 76

**New Proposal Title:** Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley

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

**CALFED #00-B05, USBR #00-FC-20-0154 - Grassland Water District - Adaptive Real-Time Water Quality Management of Seasonal Wetland in the Grassland Water District**

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 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:

**None**



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

**New Proposal Number:** 76

**New Proposal Title:** Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley

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)*

### **Giant garter snake research at Colusa National Wildlife Refuge (2000, 2001, 2002) CVPIA (b)(1) other**

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:

### **Yes relative to Colusa National Wildlife Refuge**

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?

Yes -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:

**Yes (although this proposal is not considered next phase funding)**

Other Comments:

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 76

**Applicant Organization:** Grassland Water District

**Proposal Title:** Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

**Under the NEPA document name, that title appears to be a filename on some person's personal computer, not a legal document name. A CEQA document may be needed for CESA compliance unless they obtain a 2080.1 consistency determination for take of giant garter snake.**

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:

**They did not budget time or money for completing the environmental documents or permit fees.**

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

Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

**If they complete the required documents and have funding for permit fees, then the project is feasible.**

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 76

**Applicant Organization:** Grassland Water District

**Proposal Title:** Characterization of giant garter snake habitat in the Grassland Wetlands of the northern San Joaquin Valley

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:

**Missing types of expense detail for subcontractors, however, percentages for each sub are provided.**

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).

**Spreadsheets add correctly, but amount stated in Q. 17A does not match and is higher.**

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: