Proposal Reviews

#100: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.

Initial 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 #3
Environmental Compliance	
Budget	

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 100

Applicant Organization: Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.

Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)
Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	**-**
In Part	**-**
With Conditions	**-**
Consider as Directed Action	**-**
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:

This proposal would build upon an existing study by adding an additional site and increasing monitoring, and consequently may provide only limited new information. A major issue brought up by the technical panel was that alternatives to wing dam construction for diversions should be considered. This proposal is not recommended for funding at this time.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 100

Applicant Organization: Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.

Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

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	**There are concerns about the biological effects of the diversion structures and the ongoing need to supplement bed material. Operation of equipment in the channel will not facilitate bed stability. The structures will shunt fish out of the stream channel and into irrigation ditches where they will not be able to propagate or continue their life cycle. Less environmentally damaging diversion means should be explored and streambed enhancement practices developed.**
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-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?

   The goals, objectives and hypothesis are clearly stated. They are appropriate to the defined problem. The achievement of the goals and objectives and test results of the hypothesis will provide some very useful information. The justification of the research (not implementation-pilot) project is clear and persuasive. The research site seems to be well suited to the goals and objectives. The project staff seems to be well acquainted with the physical setting and the science of sedimentology, hydraulics, and stream habitat. The scale of the project is justified. However, the nature of the project is linked to the construction of temporary diversion structures, which are stream disturbances in themselves. Consequently, the results will not lead help develop self-sustaining ecosystems and only have application in other such settings.

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 proposed approach is quite interesting. If an analysis of grade control could be introduced, the results could open some new doors to stream and floodplain restoration. Nevertheless, the results of the proposed experiment could lead to new design concepts and methods of restoration if the study could be generalized beyond the temporary diversion structures. The present proposal is unlikely to produce results useful to other restoration projects. Getting the desired and interpretable results is less likely than the successful execution of the project. Measures of spawning use are not valid measures of the implications for fish. Many factors influence the numbers and distributions of adult spawners. Before and after measures are not valid indicators of response especially based on only two years of observation.

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 measures of performance are both scientific and administrative. They are appropriate to the work being done. The results of the research will have considerable value in understanding gravel movement and they will have even greater value if they are published. The physical alteration of the stream and floodplain will not be discernable to the casual observer but, in the long run, the habitat structure and wildlife may tell a story. The schedule is will presented and reasonable.

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

   The budget is very reasonable. The reporting cost should be identified separately and the budget large enough to support publication and distribution of the results.

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 San Joaquin Regional Review was high. The project seems to have a lot of public support.

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 problems were identified in the administrative review.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 100

Applicant Organization: Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.

Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

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

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

Continuation of a good project that is already underway with added monitoring. It is questionalble whether the activities of building the wing dams are detrimental to the river bed or not. By utilizing and improving the activities already undertaken by landowners in the river, this projects avoids confrontation with the landowners and diverters while adding needed gravel, monitoring the effects of the added gravel, and monitoring the deliterious effects of running equipment in the river.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Wing deflectors will be built and installed in the river by the diversion operator as has been done historically. The use of spawning gravel for these wing dams is the core of the project, so that when the dams are washed downstream by higher flows, it will be good quality spawning gravel deposited rather than marginal material with fines that can be detrimental to spawning salmon. Supplying the gravel to the diversion operators should not be difficult and it appears that there are cooperative landowners already, though none are specifically identified.

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

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   SJ-2: Restore geomorphic processes in stream and riparian corridors. This project would increase the supply of course sediment that has been identified as a limiting resource on the Merced River.

   SJ-3: Improve rearing and spawning habitat and downstream fish passage on tributary streams and the main stem. By supplying coarse sediment in sites where mixed sediment, including fines, are presently being introduced, the amount of spawning gravel available to salmon can be increased.

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?

   This project continues and expands a project underway (funded by Four Pumps) to study gravel augmentation and transport of gravel wing deflectors. This present project is limited to gravel movement of a single washout followed by diversions being rebuilt with the same material pushed back upstream. The proposed project would supply gravel for the wing dam to be rebuilt with to allow continued downstream movement and dispersal of the spawning gravel. It will provide information on bed load transport that is expected to be beneficial to the Merced County's River Corridor Restoration Project, as well as any other projects that include gravel augmentation in their actions.

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

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   This project requires the involvement of local landowners and diverters that presently construct the wing dams. The project will basically just supply them with better material for their purposes. Diversion dams will continue to be built by the present operators in the way that they have done historically, but with better material more suited for spawning salmon, supplied by this proposed project. The project will be coordinated with the Merced River Technical Advisory Committee, DFG and MID. The Merced River Stakeholder Group has also been advised and will be consulted throughout the project.

   No third party impacts are anticipated. Land use changes will not occur as a result of this project.

Other Comments:

Sites have not been identified in this proposal nor any willing landowners, but the panel is assuming that they exist and have been contacted regarding their willingness to participate.. No criteria have been given regarding insertion sites, including downstream morphology. It makes little sense to introduce coarse sediment upstream from an in-channel aggregate pit. Like to see that point cleared up.

Monitoring and transport of gravel is dependant upon flows which are dependent upon the winter's weather. Gravel may not be transported at all during the project's timeline if flows are kept below 1,200 cfs.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **100**

Applicant Organization: **Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.**

Proposal Title: **Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

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

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

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

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Excellent	**This proposal has three major flaws. 1. It takes an environmentally detrimental practice (pop up dams for irrigation diversion) and tries to add some beneficial outcomes for the environment. This distracts from the question of sound stream management and runs the risks of blurring environmental degradation with attempts to restore degraded systems. 2) The measurements of gravel movement will show movement but offer no context or experimental design for interpreting the outcomes. 3) The measurement of salmonid activity around the gravel additions WILL NOT DETERMINE THE EFFECTIVENESS FOR SALMON. Measurement of presence of adults for only two years ignores many factors (ocean impacts and survival, juvenile recruitment in earlier years, distribution in the measurement year, impacts of instream processes other than the gravel addition). This proposal has serious flaws and would confuse rather than inform.**
XGood	
-Poor	

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

   The proposal clearly states the goal of introducing spawning gravel into the Merced River and tracing the movement of gravel. The objectives are 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?

   The proposal justifies the project based on river modification practices and state assessments of spawning gravel limitations. The conceptual model of gravel dynamics and spawner use of gravels is weakly developed.

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?

   There is a high likelihood that the gravel would be introduced and that data would be obtained. The ability to interpret limited because of the experimental design. The empirical results may assist the state in determining gravel amounts for additions in this reach, but application beyond this site is limited.

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 comment

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

   The measures of performance are limited to reviews by agencies and appear to be largely administrative.

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

   The project will contribute relatively little to the understanding of the Bay Delta Watershed. The project will have minor contributions to aquatic ecosystems and it will be limited to the study sites. Contributions to recovery of salmon will be minor. The outcome of this proposal will be of interest to managers attempting to deal with channel modifications and diversions. The project will add to knowledge of sediment movement. Spawning responses are simply compared to previous years and will be confounded by multiple factors (ocean conditions, harvest, flow variation). This is an extremely weak design for determining the effectiveness for spawning.

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

   no comment

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

The budget is reasonable for the design. It is unfortunate that more funds are not requested for a more rigorous analysis of spawning.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **100**

Applicant Organization: **Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.**

Proposal Title: **Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

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

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

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

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**The proposal presents a clear argument for the research need and approach. The results could lead to more effective and efficient restoration techniques if the effects of grade control can be evaluated.**
-Good	
-Poor	

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

   The goals, objectives and hypothesis are clearly stated. They are appropriate to the defined problem. The achievement of the goals and objectives and test results of the hypothesis will provide some very useful information.

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

The justification of the research (not implementation-pilot) project is clear and persuasive. The research site seems to be well suited to goals and objectives. The project staff seems to be well acquainted with the physical setting and the science of sedimentology, hydraulics, and stream habitat. The scale of the project is justified.

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 proposed approach is quite interesting. If an analysis of grade control could be introduced, the results could open some new doors to stream and floodplain restoration. Nevertheless, the results of the proposed experiment could lead to new design concepts and methods of restoration.

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

   Based on the author's past experience, the proposed project seems feasible. Getting the desired results is less likely then the successful execution of the project. Still, the overall project has a high probability of success. The scale is appropriate.

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

   The measures of performance are both scientific and administrative. They are appropriate to the work being done.

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 results of the research will have considerable value and they will have even greater value if they are published. The physical alteration of the stream and floodplain will not be discernable to the casual observer but, in the long run, the habitat structure and wildlife may tell a story. The schedule is will presented and reasonable.

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 project team seems well qualified and appropriate to the task. They must possess all of the needed tools and facilities to accomplish the work.

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

   The budget is reasonable. The reporting cost should be identified separately and the budget large enough to support publication and distribution of the results.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **100**

Applicant Organization: **Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.**

Proposal Title: **Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

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

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

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

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**With very few exceptions, this proposal covers all contingencies and provides a relatively high probability of success. The idea is novel and sounds like a 'win-win' situation for irrigators as they try to maintain their livelihoods while participating in salmon restoration efforts.** **Clear objective, goal, hypothesis, and monitoring program.** **Recommended to add a geomorphologist to the project team.**
-Good	
-Poor	

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

   Novel idea - to use good quality spawning gravel to replenish material in riparian diversion wing deflectors. This seems to recognize the need to continue to provide for irrigation, but to do so in a manner that replenishes spawning gravels at the same time. The distribution of the gravels would be performed by the river's transport capacity and should result in a more natural distribution downstream than achieved by mechanically placing the gravels in the streambed. The goal, objectives, and hypothesis are all very clearly stated. In addition to being novel, the idea 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 project depends upon using a mix of gravel sizes that (1) are appropriate for spawning; and (2) will be transported downstream. Condition (1) is well understood and documented. Condition (2) is not as well understood. Under the 'problem description,' the proposal states, "current studies...are developing models to simulate...transport rates appropriate for the flows of the Merced River." Will these results be available to the researchers of this project? The 'current studies' are not referenced here. It is possible that they refer to a study that has been attached to the proposal. In that study, significant gravel movement has occurred the past two years with flows of only 1,300 cfs that were sustained for 14 consecutive days. There appears, therefore, to be a good probability that flows will be high enough during the project period to move the gravels downstream.

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 in this project is to make new gravel available each of the two years with which to replenish the riparian wing delfectors. A current project made an initial supply of gravel available, but after the first flow season, the gravel was moved back upstream again to re-form the wing deflector. There will be more gravel distributed downstream in the currently proposed project, and monitoring will continue on the gravels introduced previously. If successful, the current project would provide an inexpensive way to naturally distribute high quality spawning gravels downstream - 'let the river do it.' Such information would be very useful to decision makers. Novel and useful.

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?

   Proposers recongize that results are dependent upon upstream flows exceeding 3,000 cfs during the project period of two years. It is not clear from the proposal text what the probability of such an event might be. If the wing deflectors do indeed wash out, there is a high degree of probability that the project will be successful. With the ability to receive pulsing flows from upstream, there is likely a good chance of achieving the desired flow rate in the project reach.

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?

   Monitoring is described very well and should provide good data with which to test the hypothesis. It is likely in this case that the monitoring program will of itself be interesting enough to be developed into technical papers. Such papers would be useful to other stream restoration experts.

   I was going to recommend a third year to this project to extend monitoring one more year. Apparently, however, the batteries in the tagged rocks don't last that long. Two years should give good data based upon the similar study underway and attached to the proposal.

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

   The standard products will be made available. As noted above, it is likely that the monitoring component will be interesting enough to produce stand-alone publications.

   I would encourage CALFED to consider installing video cameras near the identified weirs to capture over several weeks the gradual disintegration of the structure and transport of sediment downstream. This may provide a very useful visual record of the full-scale experiment.

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?

   Natural Resources Scientists, Inc., appears to be well qualified to perform the work. Both listed principals have good technical training and have extensive experience on the Merced River. There is no sediment transport expert or geomorphologist on the project team. I recommend one be added and that the budget be adjusted upward.

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

   The proposed project has a very attractive ratio of work to management in the budget. With quite minimal proposed management, the budget is devoted to purchasing gravel and monitoring activities. There is $5,000 of in-kind matching provided. The proposed study carries on a previous effort and extends it's monitoring, providing some 'value added' features to the proposal.

   It was not clear if the budget for gravel included the cost of moving the gravel to a location convenient for placing it onto the wing delfectors.

Miscellaneous comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 100

New Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

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

   01-N48, Juvenile Salmon Migratory Behavior Study in North, Central, and South Delta, ERP.

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

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

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

   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?

   -Yes -No **X**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:

Other Comments:

According to the agreed timeline, Natural Resource Scientists, Inc., only recently commenced work on CALFED project #01-N48. N/A on questions 6 & 7 because invoices have not yet been generated. There are no reasons to anticipate there will be any difficulties.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 100

New Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

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

   01-N48 Juvenile Salmon Migratory Behavior Study.

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

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

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

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

   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:

Other Comments:

Contract for this project was executed in August of 2001, no deliverables completed.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 100

New Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

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*)

   Temperature Feasibility Study on the Merced River Contract # 10181-1-Y144

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:

Other Comments:

Dave Vogel has been a responsible contractor for the FWs.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 100

Applicant Organization: Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.

Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

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

   -Yes **X**No

   If no, please explain:

   All current permits and environmental documentation that cover this proposed project need to be identified in the proposal package. Specifically:

   CEQA and NEPA documentation; State Lands Commission lease; CWA 404 and 401compliance; DFG 1603 agreement; CESA and FESA compliance; Reclamation Board approval; Land ownership identified and access status.

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:

   Unless there are outstanding environmental compliance requirements listed above.

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

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

   But implementation would be delayed if there are any outstanding environmental compliance requirements.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 100

Applicant Organization: Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.

Proposal Title: Merced River Gravel Replenishment and Monitoring Project

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

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain:

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

   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?

   XYes -No

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

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes **X**No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: