

Proposal Reviews

#127: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Bay Regional Review

External Scientific Review #1
#2

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: 127

Applicant Organization: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

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:

The Selection Panel concurs with other reviews that the biological component of this proposal is not as promising as the physical component. The applicants might wish to better link biological models and techniques to assessment goals and resubmit for future CALFED consideration.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 127

Applicant Organization: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

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	From a geomorphic perspective, this is a solid project that could theoretically test several relevant hypotheses regarding the decline of three at-risk species in the Napa basin. The value of CALFED projects should be the integration of the biological and physical factors influencing ecosystem health. The reviewers did not think that the proposal in the present form was successful in this integration, but we encourage the applicant to incorporate a stronger biological link in future proposals.
-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 of this project are relevant, and the hypotheses and conceptual models are clear. The proposed project is Phase II of an assessment of geomorphic and ecological factors important to watershed restoration in the Napa basin, to promote recovery of key at-risk species. Four clear hypotheses regarding three key species (chinook, steelhead and California freshwater shrimp) are advanced. The hypotheses regarding critical factors leading to the decline of these species build upon the information gathered in the Phase I reconnaissance study (which was funded by the Water Quality Board, not CALFED. They focus on life history stages and processes that are likely to limit overall production of the three species.

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?

Reviewers found the proposal to be feasible in terms of the physical work. The authors have considerable expertise in geomorphology, which increases the likelihood of this section to succeed. However, reviewers had concerns about the biological work. For example, no specific population model is proposed, and the explanation of the marking techniques for the steelhead study is inadequate. An underlying assumption of the proposal is that bigger is better for smolts, but the reviewers had reservations accepting this assumption without a broader consideration of life history theory and tradeoffs between growth and mortality.

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 outcome will be a final report that will review all hypotheses, summarize whether each is rejected, accepted, or uncertain, and the level of uncertainty associated with these conclusions. Recommendations will be formulated regarding specific ecosystem-based restoration strategies and for long-term monitoring and adaptive management needs for the basin. Reviewers thought strong integration of biology with the geomorphology was lacking, and would diminish the value of the final product.

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

The Water Quality Board will provide some staff time. The consultants bid on task, and did not list number of hours needed for a task. This made it difficult to evaluate the total cost of the project. The overall cost seems high. If other aspects of the larger project are not funded from other sources (for example, juvenile outmigration studies, large woody debris inventories), how will the final report of this project be hindered?

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 Bay regional review panel rated this as medium. Although a solid project, they prefer that funding go towards implementation of restoration projects. They did not feel that this research was a critical limitation to implementation of restoration projects.

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?

A cost discrepancy of \$7863 was noted. The researchers will need to comply with CESA by getting a 2081 for state-listed species. The time needed to get this permit was not specifically addressed in the proposal.

Miscellaneous comments:

none

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 127

Applicant Organization: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

Overall Ranking: -Low Medium -High

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

The project appeared to be a very feasible research project; however, the panel as a whole felt that implementing restoration projects in the Bay region should receive a higher priority than research supporting restoration. Though the research is desirable given unlimited funds, the panel did not indicate that this research was a critical limitation to implementation at the present time.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Partially. The project appears very feasible and the project applicants are connected to local research and restoration efforts (see below). Multiple species approach is warranted and desirable; however, developing three population models as an outcome of this work may be too ambitious given the timeframe of the project.

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

Yes -No

How?

Yes. As proposal suggests, increasing an understanding of the physical, hydrologic, and ecological factors limiting salmonid and shrimp production, should lead to scientifically-based management recommendations by the end of the project and outreach is planned to assist in this process. Also, The focus on studying sediment dynamics, large woody debris, physical barriers to passage, changes in channel conditions and field assessments are exactly what is needed to determine areas for restoration. And the project specifically addresses the following priorities as state in the proposal: Draft Stage 1 Implementation Plan priorities, including: BR-5 (restore shallow water, stream, and riparian habitats for benefit of at-risk species); BR-6 (protect at-risk species in Bay using water management and regulatory approaches); BR-8 (use existing/proposed monitoring to improve strategies for restoring Bay fish populations and at-risk species); MR-5 (ensure restoration is not threatened by degraded water quality); and MR-6 (ensure recovery of at-risk species by developing conceptual models). ERP Goals addressed by the proposed project include: ERP 1 (recover at-risk species including steelhead trout and chinook

salmon); ERP 2 (maintain and restore ecosystem processes to support self-sustaining native species assemblages); ERP 4 (protect habitat via holistic watershed assessment to guide management priorities); and ERP 6 (maintain or improve sediment and water quality). CVPIA Priorities to protect San Francisco Bay and enhance native fish and wildlife species associated with riverine and riparian habitats.

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?

Yes, there appear to be very good connections between this project and others, some of them previously supported by CALFED Napa River TMDL, Napa River Watershed Mapping Partnership (CALFED supported), Napa River Flood Management Plan. The applicant stresses that technical information from this study will assist in TMDL development (focus is sediment) which is plausible since determining load for beneficial uses will require an understanding of species requirements and changes in channel condition due to human impacts.

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

Yes -No

How?

Yes, Napa County RCD (data), CDFG (staff time), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board is principal applicant and are providing significant cost share.

Other Comments:

Data collected should be made available in publicly accessible website not just available to public upon request. CALFED should host a means to ensure that all CALFED supported data gathering is produced in formats that are accessible across regions.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 127

Applicant Organization: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Proposal Title: **Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration**

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	I thought that the geomorphology/physical processes parts of this proposal were extremely well thought out and I gave the proposal an excellent rating for related tasks. I thought that the proposed biological work was much less sophisticated, however, and I rated that work as only fair. It seems to me that the biological work might be delayed for a year (to allow improvement in design of biological studies) and that CALFED might fund a reduced budget project to address only the physical processes work and possibly also some preliminary geographic distribution work on freshwater shrimp. Overall, I guess I would give this proposal a rating slight below good.
XGood	
-Poor	

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

I thought that the writing in this proposal was exceptionally good and I enjoyed their expression of hypotheses as their best guesses of what was actually going on as opposed to silly expressions of "null" hypotheses that are a priori implausible or known to be false. Although I cannot judge for certain whether or not the Napa River system was "intended" for inclusion within the CALFED process, it certainly seems like it is a system that merits

substantial attention given the increasing diversion of land to grape-growing and related water diversions in the watershed.

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?

Justification for the study seemed reasonable to me in most respects. I continue to be greatly bothered by the persistent use of old hatchery data that relate survival of steelhead to size at release. It is hardly a surprise that larger steelhead smolts enjoy greater survival rates. The real population dynamics issues are more complicated. There is generally a penalty for larger size at migration: delayed migration and increased mortality prior to migration. The existence of a wide variety of sizes and ages at smolting in steelhead is presumably a reflection of the variability in success of various outmigration strategies. Thus, in some years smaller fish may survive well and, if so, would be strongly represented in subsequent generations whereas larger and older smolts might, by chance, encounter poor ocean conditions and not do well. No single strategy may uniformly outperform other strategies. To summarize - this is a complicated issue of life history theory that has amused theoreticians for many years!

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 approaches proposed seem first-rate with respect to physical geomorphic topics, but seem poor with respect to fish, shrimp and insect work. Among other things, there are no specific "population dynamics" models mentioned and some notions - e.g. interpretation of steelhead growth & survival data - seem devoid of life history theory and basic demographic understandings. Explanation of the marking technique for the steelhead study (\$177k) is inadequate and there was no attachment to my hardcopy (perhaps the attachment is available on the web?). Assessment of the importance of estuarine rearing would be based only on a literature review - hardly useful. How can they separate seasonal effects from flow effects in determination of availability of aquatic invertebrates and fish growth? and so on.

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?

Various subtasks in Task 1 seem technically feasible. In task 2, I would recommend only funding of some initial surveys of geographic distribution of CA freshwater shrimp. The remaining "fish" work seems poorly conceived. Task 3 could/should be renamed and limited to modeling of physical processes.

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?

reports and public outreach

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?

see 5.

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?

Orr and Dietrich are very well known and have carried out many large-scale projects previously.

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

This project is expensive (\$1 million/2 yrs), but I cannot judge costs of physical processes work. The steelhead growth study (\$115k for one year) seems extremely expensive given the vague specifications for this project task.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 127

Applicant Organization: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Proposal Title: **Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration**

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	This is a solid project that will test several relevant hypotheses regarding the decline of three at-risk species in the Napa basin. It is cost-effective because of the shared responsibilities and cost sharing with agencies. The biological aspects of the project should be better documented. If other aspects of the larger project are not funded (for example, juvenile outmigration studies, large woody debris inventories), how will the final report of this project be hindered?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	
-Poor	

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

The proposed project is Phase II of an assessment of geomorphic and ecological factors important to watershed restoration in the Napa basin,, to promote recovery of key at-risk species. Four clear hypotheses regarding three key species (chinook, steelhead and California freshwater shrimp) are advanced. The hypotheses regarding critical factors leading to the decline of these species build upon the information gathered in the Phase I reconnaissance study (which was funded by the Water Quality Board, not Calfed). They focus on life history stages and processes that are likely to limit overall production of the three species.

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 authors suggest that without basic knowledge of how the Napa River watershed has changed in the last century it is impossible to effectively plan restoration activities. The conceptual models presented in Figures 5a-c show a variety of factors that can affect different life history stages, and these models show how the focus of the proposed study fits into the larger ecosystem picture. The project supports several ERP and Science Program priorities concerning the restoration of habitats for at-risk species, ensuring recovery of species by developing conceptual models, and restoring ecosystem processes.

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?

Three major tasks with several subtasks are clearly defined. Task 1 involves a sediment source analysis. Part of this task will be the development of site-specific hypotheses about how land use, topography, and lithology affect erosion and sediment delivery rates to the channel. Because this proposal is Phase II, it seems that the authors could have been more specific in their hypotheses by this time. Because baseflow reduction may be a real problem, the installation and monitoring of baseflow at 25 sites will provide critical information. Likewise the monitoring and modeling of stream temperatures address the question of possible temperature impairment. Task 2 involves mechanistic studies and life history assessment of three species. Direct monitoring of juvenile outmigration is not proposed at this time; instead the applicants plan on coordinating with other agencies to pursue this task. Instead, a variety of other tasks are proposed, including the assessments of predator abundance and distribution, juvenile steelhead growth, potential food availability and estuarine use. These tasks will provide quantitative data that will directly help land managers in evaluating problems in the watershed. Task 3 will synthesize the information from Phase I and Tasks 1 and 2, to generate recommendations for watershed management and restoration strategies. The approach is well defined each task will result in furthering basic knowledge of the Napa watershed.

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

The project is ambitious in that it is covering many aspects of life history of three species. However, the tasks are clearly defined and are technically feasible, the time frame seems reasonable, and the likelihood of success is high. There is good connection with other work going on in the region, so that the applicants can build upon past studies and assessments.

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 authors will produce data reports, presentations and publications as results of this study. They did not specifically mention peer review of their reports. All data collected will undergo standard Stillwater Sciences QA/QC procedures.' A time line showing when deliverables will be completed is listed in Figure 13.

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 final reports will review all hypotheses and summarize whether each is rejected, accepted, or uncertain, and the level of uncertainty associated with these conclusions.

Recommendations will be formulated regarding specific ecosystem-based restoration strategies and for long-term monitoring and adaptive management needs for the basin. Such products should be useful for all stakeholders in the basin. Reports will be posted on public web sites, and upon completion of the technical report for the TMDL, copies of all field forms and data files will be provided to several agencies, and to the public upon request.

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 staff involved are well qualified to conduct these studies. They have been involved in similar work in the past, and Stillwater Sciences has the available infrastructure to manage this project.

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

The costs for each task are listed in Attachment A. No costs for Water Quality Board staff are requested, but it would have been helpful to see the time commitment they allocated to this project. Direct labor hours seems reasonable for the amount of work to be accomplished. the project requests \$46,000 for travel, which seems high since Stillwater is not located that far from Napa. \$107,000 was listed for consultant fees, without much detail supporting that amount.

Miscellaneous comments:

One of the hypotheses is that insufficient juvenile growth can dramatically reduce the number of returning adults. The basic premise of low growth (small smolt size) being related to probability of adult return is from study by Kabel and German (1967) (Figure 7). However, the reference is not listed, so the it is impossible to verify or assess the quality of the original study. How many fish were captured, for how many years and under what hydrologic conditions (dry or wet years)? The same remark holds true for the Brett et al (1969) data on stream temperature and steelhead growth rate (Figure 8). The were no legends for Figures 9 and 10 on my copies.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 127

New Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

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

2000-E05, Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase III, Stillwater Sciences.

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:

Please note - NFWF does not have any direct agreements with applicant, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. NFWF has agreements with Stillwater Sciences, also listed as applicant.

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?

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

If no, please explain:

This is not a next phase project.

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 127

New Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

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

00-F04, A Mechanistic Approach to Riparian to Riparian Restoration in the San Joaquin Basin this project was listed in table provided to me but was not identified in the applicants proposal. I have not administered any projects with this applicant

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?

-Yes -No **XN/A**

If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

-Yes -No **XN/A**

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

-Yes -No **XN/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No **XN/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No **XN/A**

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Applicant was not primary contractor in previous project listed.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 127

New Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

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)*

11332-0-MO09 - Stanislaus River: Smolt Survival

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:

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:

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 127

Applicant Organization: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

In addition to the Section 10 permit listed by the proponents, they will need to comply with CESA by getting a 2081 for state listed species.

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:

If project proponents obtain necessary permits, the project is feasible.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 127

Applicant Organization: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Proposal Title: Physical Processes and Population Dynamics Assessment in the Napa River Basin - A Foundation for Restoration

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).

budget summary states total funding of \$987,095 and in 17a funding total is shown as \$994,958, which is a difference of \$7,863

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:

there are no direct or indirect costs because costs are included in the services or consultants.