

Proposal Reviews

#142: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Delta Regional Review

External Scientific Review

#1

#2

#3

#4

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 142

Applicant Organization: San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Fund	
As Is	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$859,405**

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

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

Several owners of land near this project site wrote letters during this proposal's review, expressing concern that it might adversely affect use of their property. Other landowners, the Lodi-Woodbridge Winegrape Commission, and the Riparian Habitat Joint Venture, submitted comments endorsing the project. After considering these comments, the Selection Panel continues to support funding this proposal to restore riparian corridor habitat and monitoring for benefits to neotropical migratory birds. Salmonid habitat restoration, about which several property owners expressed concern, is not a key feature of this project. This project exhibits willing landowner participation, overall community support and a collaborative approach. Project implementation will respect private property rights.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 142

Applicant Organization: San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

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	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$859,405**

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 the Technical Panel that the riparian restoration and song bird monitoring merit support. The Panel encourages the proponents to consult with a bio-statistician to incorporate a statistically valid experimental design into the monitoring tasks for both bird species and plant species.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 142

Applicant Organization: San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

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	This is a very interesting proposal and the riparian replanting and control of non-natives at his site are well described. The monitoring of plant survival and growth are strong. The bird work will contribute to regional management. The site is important and the PIs are well qualified. The panel felt this should be funded but wanted to encourage the PIs to provide evidence that efforts are being made to ensure the plant and bird responses are monitored after the 3 year life of this project. Further, the panel would like to encourage the PIs to erect testable hypotheses for the response of specific bird species to the restoration design (i.e., not just predict bird response as a whole) .
XAbove average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

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

The primary objective is to improve riparian habitat (for birds and for bank stability) by re-planting and then controlling of non-natives. They wish to determine what types of plants will benefit songbirds. They state 4 hypotheses but the independent variables are not clearly defined (e.g., riparian restoration will be equated to what quantitative measures specifically?). Further, the panel wanted to see specific hypotheses regarding the expected response of various bird species to the replanting. The panel really liked the proposal but felt given all the information that is available on the birds, hypothesis development should have been more advanced and there should have been attention to statistical analysis.

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 monitoring plans, particularly the bird surveys, are explained in great detail. Actually they are quite comprehensive. One of the reviewers (a bird expert) raised concerns that their mist netting approach will not provide them with the information they need because the sample size is too small and they may not be able to estimate productivity. The PIs do identify appropriate performance measures so we will know the success after 3 years but no attention was given in the proposal to maintenance of the site or monitoring of the site after year 3. Again, the panel viewed this proposal quite favorably but felt the PIs should show evidence that they or other parties will ensure monitoring will continue beyond year 3 this is essential in riparian restoration efforts, particularly those focused on birds (since recovery takes many years).

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?

In general, they will collect a significant amount of data that should be useful to managers for this watershed. The bird data should add significantly to data sets for the region so even if they cannot test their hypotheses quantitatively for their site during the 3 year duration of the project, the data will be quite useful in a larger context.

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

The budget seems on the high side given the potential contributions of the project to the broad state of knowledge for the Bay-Delta watershed.

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 regional panel ranked this as medium priority. They noted the team has previous experience and is working closely with landowners. They indicated this should contribute to several regional priorities including restoring habitat corridors and reducing the impacts of non-native invasive species.

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 concerns indicated so long as the applicant complies with the environmental regulations and has the funding to do so.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 142

Proposal Title: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

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

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

The panel favors projects, like this, that actively restore critical habitats.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Project has a high probability of success. Applicant team has previous riparian restoration and monitoring experience in this and other Central Valley watersheds and is working closely with EBMUD and other riparian landowners. Permission of private land owner has been obtained. The project would help implement the Calfed-funded Lower Mokelumne River Watershed Stewardship Plan.

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

Yes -No

How?

Project supports recovery efforts for riparian dependent wildlife and at-risk or locally extirpated birds such as the California yellow warbler and yellow-billed cuckoo (cf. DR-4). The project would also contribute to draft Stage 1 priorities DR-1 (restore habitat corridors in the North Delta, East Delta and San Joaquin River), DR-2 (restore and rehabilitate floodplain habitat in eastside tributaries) as well as DR-3 (upland habitat and wildlife-friendly agriculture) and DR-5 (reduce impacts of non-native invasive species).

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?

Project helps implement Lower Mokelumne River Watershed Stewardship Plan, the Lower Mokelumne River Comprehensive Management Plan and compliments AFRP-funded efforts to double natural production of anadromous fish. Applicants regularly attend Mokelumne-Cosumnes Watershed Alliance (MCWA) meetings.

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

Yes -No

How?

San Joaquin County RCD is applicant. Working with private landowner. Partnering with EBMUD (\$192,000 in-kind cost share, mostly for monitoring). Participation in MCWA and Lower Mokelumne Watershed Stewardship Program.

Other Comments:

(1) 3-yr monitoring by Point Reyes Bird Observatory. (2) EBMUD providing \$192,500 cost-share.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **142**

Applicant Organization: **San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River**

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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent	This project will provide needed and timely information of how to manage river habitat in this watershed.
<input type="checkbox"/> -Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> -Poor	

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

Excellent, yes, yes.

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?

Excellent, yes, yes, yes.

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?

Excellent, yes, yes, yes, yes.

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?

Very good, yes, good, yes.

Monitoring at a 5 yr point would show more of a response to the trees planted.

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?

Excellent, yes, yes.

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?

Excellent, yes, yes, yes.

Establishment of improved BMP's will greatly improve this watershed.

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?

Excellent, Good, yes, yes.

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

Excellent, yes.

Well thought out with good detail.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **142**

Applicant Organization: **San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River**

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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent	The bird research is extremely sound and will provide a wealth of information. The riparian restoration is not as well justified and concerns exist about the success.
<input type="checkbox"/> -Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> -Poor	

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

The objectives are very clearly outlined; hypotheses are stated (pg2) the first one is trivial as a hypothesis; the second is good; the 3rd is not addressed directly in later parts of the proposal (i.e., in what way will their project mimic a disturbance regime ? ; related to the 4th , they will know if natives survive but will not know if they can compete with nonnatives as all of their replanted sites will be weeded/maintained.

The idea to restore riparian plants and tract bird populations is very 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 study is very solid but there is much existing work going on related to this. They will add 68 point count sites to an broad area that already has 67 sites; they will however add the new feature of directly monitoring sites that have been restored (planted) so I view this as an important project that is complementary to ongoing work.

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 bird work is explained in some detail and linking the bird results to riparian restoration sites is very appropriate for the CALFED program. While the bird sampling is a lot of work (and I am not convinced their methods will give them all the data they need), this will add to the base of knowledge. I am not convinced the restoration re-planting will work without perpetual maintenance (weeding, herbicides, mowing, etc.) the PIs provided no evidence that the natives will survive. They state (3rd para, page 10) that they are using proven methods to restore native vegetation yet they provide no references or proof of this. I agree if they continue to maintain the sites they will be successful but I would like to have seen more on work to minimize long term maintenance. I.e., in general this proposal was strong on the bird aspects and weak on the riparian 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?

I am not convinced the plant restoration will be successful (see 3 Above)

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?

yes, these are clearly outlined on page 11

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 bird data will be a valuable contribution and so should the plant data if the methods prove to be robust enough for quantitative assessment.

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 San Joaquin RCD has been successful in prior work and clearly has well qualified investigators. The BRI is also established in replanting and Guepel is certainly a well qualified ornithologist

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

In my view, the re-planting costs (contract to BRI) are extremely high relative to the value of the efforts and other parts of the project. Overall, the project cost/benefit is high compared to other proposals

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **142**

Applicant Organization: **San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River**

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	Excellent planning for restoration, vegetation and bird survey work. They should have stopped there - there are some problems with the design of the bird productivity part of the study.
XGood	
-Poor	

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

All are clearly stated. The concept 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 purpose of the project is to continue to restore a specific watershed. There really aren't any basic science questions involved here so a conceptual model is not really appropriate. They do make some general predictions and take an adaptive management approach to see

if their predictions are correct. I would consider this a demonstration project. This is justified since restoration cannot take place except in specific areas and restoring an entire watershed is not practical. You have to take peices of it and go from there.

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 restoration, plant and the bird survey techniques are well thought out and will meet the objectives of the project. The results will really only apply to their specific watershed, not in general (the watershed was not chosen randomly). I do not think their approach with mist netting and productivity will answer their objectives. Basically, their sample sizes are too small. However, that information will add to larger data bases (that they mention). It is very expensive to do a well designed productivity study. So that is the weakest part of the proposal - but they do not emphasize this part in their quantifiable performance measurements. The project is going to generate information useful to decision-makers for this 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 entirely feasible.

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 project is using appropriate performance measure for their goals and objectives. The monitoring plans are explicit and detailed.

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 products they discuss are products of value to the local planners and decision-makers. They do not discuss any interpretative outcomes though the project could tie into an interpretive program.

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 reserchers are perfectly qualified to do this project and have the necessary infrastructire and support to accomplish the project.

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

The majority of the budget is going towards site restoration. That cost is unavoidable. The budget is reasonable.

Miscellaneous comments:

This type of project is important to fund because they are tied into a watershed where active restoration is going on. Watershed restoration will be on a piece by piece basis. Their adaptive management approach to the project and how they tie into the other work in the watershed is a big plus. The only weakness is the productivity part of the project which is unavoidable given the difficulties of measuring productivity.

They also kept mentioning benefits to fish though they never have any explicit measures for that. I wondered why they kept bringing that in other than it is an obvious "hot-button" issue.

External Scientific: #4

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **142**

Applicant Organization: **San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River**

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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent	Quantification of relationships between vegetation structure and bird habitat quality and assessment of specific functional gains of restored habitat are much needed contributions. The revegetation approach, involving building upon existing vegetation structure to increase vertical and structural diversity, seems like a potentially profitable course to follow.
<input type="checkbox"/> -Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> -Poor	

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

The main goals are to provide suitable riparian habitat for particular bird species and other special status wildlife species, and to determine which types of plants and plant associations will benefit the neotropical migrants and resident songbirds while ALSO providing additional functions of stabilizing stream banks and enhancing anadromous fish habitat. Determining the functional importance of restored vegetation to bird species is a timely and important goal. However, the latter goals are a bit ambitious, as the project does not address these other functions. The many specific objectives include restoring (i.e., revegetating) two river miles and assessing relative importance to bird species of riparian habitat patches along the restored reach and other reaches. These generally relate back to the main

objectives. Some of the hypotheses are fairly general and would have greater value if made more specific. For example, in the second hypotheses "Riparian restoration will cause an increase in avian species richness", what does "Riparian restoration" refer to? Replacement of exotics by natives? Increase in vegetation abundance, age class diversity, and or structural diversity? The fourth hypothesis relating to competition between native and exotic plants also is too general to be of value; it needs to have a context specified (e.g., under what environmental conditions are the natives more competitive). The third hypotheses (phased riparian projects will mimic disturbance regimes create riparian vegetation age class and canopy structure diversity) seems important. I was disappointed to find that the project does not actually address this hypotheses.

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 selection of a pilot project is justified, as does the overall study. There is a need to address the functional success of riparian restoration projects and design projects to meet specific functions. Providing bird habitat is a key function that needs more study. Regarding the riparian vegetation restoration, I was hoping for more information on the history, present status, and potential of the restoration site. Apparently there is Valley Foothill riparian habitat at the site, existing as a mosaic of trees and shrubs and open areas with herbaceous plants. The objective is to plant additional vegetation around the existing vegetation to increase overall density. I was looking for more evidence that the site was degraded, some explanation as to what caused the degradation (including an explanation as to what caused the shift from native to exotic vegetation), and some evidence that the site was now capable of supporting the additional native vegetation. In other words, I was looking for more justification that the restoration approach (native planting following exotic removal) was appropriate. A working assumption here is that simply because a species or plant community is predominantly native, ecosystem function will increase. This idea should not be treated as a given'; species specific justification for removing each exotic should be provided.

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?

Much of the effort involves monitoring habitat quality and bird use of existing and restored habitats; these efforts seem sound. The approach for the planting effort involves planting mosaics around existing native plants, to create vertical and horizontal structure; this seems like a sound idea. It is not clear though, whether the reasons for the loss or thinning of the native vegetation have been adequately addressed. What is the basis for believing that the additional vegetation will survive? The approach involves removing all non-native invasive plants. Does this approach counter the notion of the phased-in revegetation process? The non-natives may be supplying habitat to particular species; removing all of the exotics at once could be harmful. More information is needed on which species of native grass and sedge will be planted and why. Are the species being selected to provide specific bird habitat? It is stated that the grasses and sedges will reduce competition from weedy species- but weedy plant species often have high reproductive effort and can produce lots of seeds for granivores; again, is the objective to increase functional value or just to increase dominance of natives over exotics? Regarding re-planting of dead plants: It sounds as if dead plants will be replaced with individuals of the same species to meet survivorship quotas. However, there may be a site-based reason for the lack of survivorship of the transplants. It does not make sense to replant with the same species before determining the cause of death.

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 monitoring approach is well documented and feasible. As to riparian plantings, they indicate they are using proven methods of restoring native vegetation communities in California, but the reader must take this on faith as no evidence is provided

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 appear to be adequate and comprehensive; they relate to survivorship of native plantings, abundance of exotic vegetation, vegetation structure as it relates to bird use, and bird species abundance diversity, and breeding rates. A fair amount of detail is provided on the monitoring methods, on which the performance measures are based.

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?

Knowledge gained from this project should improve ability to design riparian revegetation projects that will be of value to bird communities, as well as better assess the need for undertaking restoration efforts. Assuming that data interpretation and analysis are adequate, the project should provide results of value to other restorationists concerned with improving the quality of bird habitats.

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 team seems qualified.

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

The total cost is \$859,404 for restoring 45 acres (\$19,000 per acre) plus monitoring this and other areas. This seems high.

Miscellaneous comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 142

New Proposal Title: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

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

ERP 99-N15 - Lower Mokelumne River Watershed Stewardship Program

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?

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:

Financial management and reporting has been detailed, organized, effective and timely.

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:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 142

Applicant Organization: San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

Although, this project occurs on private land, the applicant needs to comply with ESA for the endangered species, the willow flycatcher, and consult with the USFWS.

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:

Money and time are not allocated for complying with ESA.

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

Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

If the applicant complies with the environmental regulations and has the funding to do so, this project is feasible.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 142

Applicant Organization: San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River

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).

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: