

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#151: Arundo Eradication and Coordination**

Sonoma Ecology Center

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review**

**Bay Regional Review**

**Delta Regional Review**

**San Joaquin Regional Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**External Scientific Review**

#1

#2

#3

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

# Final Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: \$2,066,432

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

**None.**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The applicants submitted a detailed letter defending their proposal. Nevtheless, the Selection Panel continues to recommend the project for directed action, rather than immediate funding. The importance of invasive weed mangement to ecosystem restoration is well recognized. The Selection Panel recommends that the CALFED Science Program convene a workshop in the near future to develop a comprehensive strategy to address the issue. It is anticipated that workshop will identify invasive weed management efforts that include appropriate experimental design and monitoring to link these efforts into the overall goal of ecosystem restoration. The Selection Panel encourages the participation of the project proponent in this workshop.**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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).

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

Amount: **\$2,066,432.00**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The Selection Panel recognizes the importance of invasive weed management to ecosystem restoration and the proven track record of the project proponents. The Panel also supports the approach described in the proposal. However, the Panel is requiring for all weed management projects that strong experimental, monitoring and adaptive management components be included. Information to be gained from these components should include comparisons of the effectiveness of different weed management tactics, the integration with restoration of native plants, and monitoring of results over the long term. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the proponent revise and resubmit the proposal for consideration as a directed action with the above-recommended elements.**

# Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

**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	<b>This proposal had excellent regional and administration reviews; however, this panel felt that the proposal was only adequate due to the mainly poor technical reviews as noted above. Moreover, there is no attempt made to test the hypotheses by comparing treatments to controls and it is not clear how the goals differ from those in the project already funded by CALFED. The proposal does not reflect sufficient forethought and planning and the value of the proposed product is limited. If the technical issues could be resolved this proposal could receive a higher rating.</b>
-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?

**A. Mixed reviews, but mainly poor, "because this is an eradication program there is no attempt made to test these hypotheses by comparing treatments to controls", "the goals are timely but it is not clear how they differ from those in the project already funded by CALFED". B. Poor, "The current study is not adequately justified"**

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?

**A. Poor to excellent, fair on average. "proposal does not reflect sufficient forethought and planning", "this project does a good job in pulling all the groups together", "not much attention paid to setting up controls or at least a solid design for comparing before and after"**

changes in vegetation" **B. Yes and no, monitoring after eradication is described, but poorly described.**

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?

**A. Average of fair, "value of the proposed products is limited", "reduced arundo infestation is the primary product". B. Yes and no, above. C. Not enough information provided on prior success.**

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

**A. Yes and no, some felt it was OK and others felt it was not justified.**

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?

**Bay - High - "proposal continues and expands arundo eradication in an effective and coordinated manner", "project proponents have demonstrated track record", "logical extension of ongoing efforts", "widely supported control efforts" Delta - High - "team is highly qualified and experienced. Project design is sound and ready to implement. Panel recommends funding all three phases" San Joaquin - High - "consensus that this is a workable approach to a serious problem", "seeks to involve locals wherever possible"**

**Overall very high regional support for this proposal.**

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. Overall excellent, "the applicants are professional, dedicated, and responsible"**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**None**

## **Bay Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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

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

**The regional panel felt that it was important for NIS projects to be comprehensive and coordinated in their approach. This proposal continues and expands Arundo eradication throughout the CalFed solution area in an effective and coordinated manner.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**1. The project proponents have demonstrated track record, project is a subsequent phase of previously funded CalFed project. The proposal builds on existing monitoring and implementation to employ the most effective control measures for sites and areas.**

**The project provides regional coordination for Arundo control, facilitating permitting and standardizing control practices, providing technical assistance and monitoring overall effectiveness of control efforts regionally as well.**

**The schedule provided is reasonable based upon ongoing efforts.**

**The proposal is supported by local governments, landowners, and others essential to the project's success who are participating as cooperators in Arundo control. Written permission not provided but many partner organizations represent landowners, or landowners are public agencies who are cooperating in the project.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Arundo control is specifically identified in PSP goals.**

**BR 3 and Implement actions to prevent, control and reduce impacts of non-native invasive species.**

**MR 1 NIS control and eradication programs, Coordination of Arundo control and monitoring throughout CalFed Area.**

## **ERP Goal 5 Invasive species control**

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?

**Previous implementation has been funded by CalFed, the current proposal builds on previous effort and expands number of cooperators and geographic coverage.**

**The project does not duplicate work already completed, underway, and funded.**

**The proposal helps carry out a widely supported control efforts in a coordinated Arundo control, activities specified in PSP.**

**The proposal is a logical extension of ongoing efforts, meets objectives of providing coordinated expanded eradication and monitoring of Arundo throughout CalFED area .**

**The project coordinates monitoring and effectiveness evaluation in adaptive management mode to improve control efforts and guide decision makers.**

**The proposal is consistent with INS plan.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**Team Arundo del Norte is working with a broad array of agencies organizations and landowners to implement effective and coordinated Arundo control. Broadly disseminates information on threats of Arundo and control methods. Works closely with other pest plant organizations.**

**Includes landowner workshops and informational material.**

**Supported by a wide array of organizations and agencies.**

Other Comments:

**none**



## Delta Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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

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

**The regional panel favors this projects NIS controls because they are part of comprehensive, coordinated program, rather than an isolated NIS project.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Team is highly qualified and experienced. Project design is sound and readily implementable. Panel recommends funding all three phases.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The project addresses Strategic Goal 5 of the ERP to reduce the negative ecological and economic impacts of established non-native species.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Coordination with the California Department of Food and Agriculture and Ag Weed Management Area Program, California Exotic Pest Plant Council, and the California Native Plant Society. Team Arundo del Norte Advisory Committee includes wide representation (landowners, NGOs, academia, government agencies, etc.)**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Projects are implemented with local landowners. Provisions are made to include consultation with agencies and stakeholder groups.**

Other Comments:

x

# San Joaquin Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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

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

**Arundo is a serious problem at several locations in the San Joaquin Valley. This proposal relies on local Weed Management Areas and is locally driven. This will also do eradication upstream which is important for control downstream. Consensus that this is a workable approach to a serious problem.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Works with existing cooperative groups Seeks to involve locals wherever possible. Past work shows good local interest and involvement. Involves Weed Management Areas which are locally driven**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**MR 1 (several sub tasks) Not specifically mentioned in San Joaquin Valley priorities but Arrundo is definitely a problem that needs to be addressed in the Region.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Coordination with CDFG, Weed Management Areas, and CA Exotic Pest Plant Council**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Good outreach to get local involvement. Success depends on local involvement in eradication efforts. Many local groups already working (CNPS, UCD, CRA(CERES))**

Other Comments:

**May have ESA permitting needs for pesticide use. Much heavier Bay-Delta focus than SJV.**

## Sacramento Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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

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

**In general, the panel felt the need for this project was high because of the necessity for Arundo eradication and the excellent qualifications of the applicant, Team Arundo Del Norte.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

**Level 1 of the program is feasible because it expands upon an existing program. The applicants have successfully identified partners for the project, and have demonstrated their ability to carry out this program. The feasibility of level 2 and level 3 of the project will depend on the availability and reliability of current information on Arundo.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**The project addresses PSP regional priority 5, to implement actions to prevent, control and reduce impacts of non-native invasive species in the region, and multi-region priority 1, to prevent the establishment of non-native species, particularly Arundo donax. Specifically, the project is designed to support eradication efforts for Arundo donax. This effort is primarily achieved through working with partners to develop databases and provide project oversight. Actual eradication efforts are not a primary component of this project.**

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?

**The primary aim of this project is to coordinate ongoing Arundo eradication efforts. The program is sponsored by Team Arundo del Norte, a network of local, state, and federal organizations dedicated to the eradication of Arundo donax. The proposal describes cost share partners with a number of organizations conducting restoration and regional planning**

**efforts in the region, including the California Native Plant Society, the Lake County CRMP, the Information Center for the Environment, and others.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**The project specifically aims to involve local people and institutions conducting Arundo donax eradication. The applicants are well known in California and have demonstrated excellent outreach and communication skills. The project has identified six new partners and involves a number of local people and institutions including the San Joaquin Conservation Trust, Cottonwood Creek/Madera County, Chowchilla women's prison, Lake County CRMP, Tule River Irrigation District, Gray Lodge Wildlife area, and others. The project would involve presentations at CalEPPC and extensive information sharing with weed management areas and other groups undertaking eradication efforts.**

Other Comments:

**Arundo eradication is a critical issue in the Sacramento Valley region. The panel felt the need to coordinate and integrate ongoing Arundo eradication efforts was very important, and that Team Arudo Del Norte had demonstrated its ability to successfully accomplish this task.**

# External Scientific: #1

## Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **151**

Applicant Organization: **Sonoma Ecology Center**

Proposal Title: **Arundo Eradication and Coordination**

### 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.**

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
-Excellent	<b>Overall Rating: Poor. Many ideas in the current proposal have merit such as increased monitoring, organizing workshops, sharing equipment, and providing infrastructure for groups working on a common theme. However, the proposed project does not merit funding as currently written. No supporting documentation of success of Phase 1 as currently funded is provided to justify the Level 1 funding requested in the current proposal. Levels 2 and 3 are not well-developed or justified with the exception of capital equipment purchases (truck and chipper). With further effort and development there is potential to improve the proposal and submit for a future funding competition. Suggestions for a future submission include: (1) building directly on products and outcomes of Phase 1 of the currently funded project, and (2) inclusion of additional riparian weeds to present a more wholistic approach to invasive species management. Overall the proposal is poorly written, poorly organized, and has many typographical errors reflecting insufficient development on the part of the proposing organization.</b>
-Good	
XPoor	

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

**Lists of general goals and objectives are provided. These are not internally consistent with the current proposal and would be stronger if they directly addressed the activities of Phase 2 stage of the project for which funds are requested.**

**The overall concept of grouping disparate weed eradication programs under a cooperative agreement is timely. This concept was funded through a prior CALFED proposal as Phase 1. Increasing the duration of monitoring existing sites, in this case from 3 to 5 years, is a timely and important concept in the field of vegetation management.**

**A list of hypotheses is also provided. This list is nearly identical to those in the proposal currently funded by CALFED. Because this is an eradication program there is no attempt made to test these hypotheses by comparing treatments to controls, which is valid in the case of an invasive weed. Comparisons of the efficacy among various control treatments are appropriate as in Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 3 is not the same on page 2 as in the table on page 8. With respect to Hypothesis 8, comparisons between non-network versus network eradication workers would be appropriate rather than collection of within network respondents. A separate hypothesis that is presented in Attachment A: Requests for Next-Phase Funding, is not a hypothesis at all, but perhaps a goal? This section states: The hypothesis of the project is to stop the advance of the invasive species *Arundo donax* through direct, intensive eradication in infested sections of selected waterways of the CALFED region.**

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 current study is not adequately justified. The idea that Eradication of *Arundo* through effective planning, control methods, and follow up monitoring will reverse the decline in ecosystem health by allowing native plants, animal populations, and water and sediment patterns to reestablish is a valid one. However, justification for the proposed expansion of the program should include preliminary data addressing the success of the currently funded project to date including: (1) how the program has been received among the 6 pilot watersheds, (2) products developed to date (data collection and monitoring protocols that have been developed and posted on website vary depending on how the website is accessed and therefore are inadequate), (3) number of volunteers trained to date, (4) analysis of any preliminary data, and (5) and why the 7 watersheds in the current proposal were chosen and what their inclusion will add to the overall project goals.**

**The idea of adaptive management is a good idea. However, because of the variability in eradication approaches it is essential to follow a scientifically robust protocol. From an analysis of the program forms this area is still lacking and therefore needs to be addressed and problems solved PRIOR TO expansion of the project. For example, forms accessed from through the CALFED project link of the Team *Arundo* website at <http://teamarundo.org> are not the same as those accessed through the web address given in the proposal <http://teamarundo.org/eradproject/monitoring.html>. If I was a cooperator on the project looking for forms for my weekend weed survey I would find this very confusing. Therefore, expansion of the network may be premature.**

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



**The approach is not well designed. See comments above related to dissemination of forms and materials via the web. The remote sensing /GIS component of Phase 3 is not well thought out and needs more development. The current proposal is not likely to generate novel information, methodology, or approaches. As written, products will be of very limited use to decision-makers (refer to Attachment B: Summary of Proposed Work to be Performed by Task with Schedules and Deliverables).**

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?

**Documentation of the approach is not adequate for assessing feasibility. The proposal does not reflect that sufficient forethought and planning have been given to the aspects of the project beyond the duplication of existing efforts at some new sites.**

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?

**If one goes to the web address <http://teamarundo.org/eradproject/monitoring.html> there are appropriate monitoring forms for the currently funded project and for the project expansion as outlined in Level 1. The goals (or hypotheses) and evaluation are nearly identical to those in the currently funded proposal (please refer to page 8 of the proposal). There is no detail given with respect to the evaluation of activities proposed under Level 2 and Level 3 funding.**

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 value of the proposed products is limited. The value would be increased if the products were expanded to include data, maps, and control information at the same level of detail for other invasive riparian species such as Centaurea, Tamarix, and Tree of Heaven. Detail with respect to what types of educational and outreach materials might be developed and how these might be disseminated would lend focus to the teams efforts.**

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

**This is questionable based on the concerns raised in other sections of this review. As stated in other sections it would be beneficial to see initial results from Phase 1. Examination of materials developed to date with Phase 1 funding are not sufficient for project implementation in the initial 6 watersheds therefore expansion to 7 new watersheds is premature. There is no indication of what type of support or infrastructure available to the project (e.g., office space, phone, etc.) therefore this aspect cannot be evaluated. The Program Administrator, Richard Dale, and the Program Coordinator, Mark Newhouser, appear well qualified to serve in their respective roles.**

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

**The budget is not adequately justified. For example, funding is requested for a full time project manager, information coordinator and data coordinator (not stated in justification but in text). The respective hours for these positions are 3750, 3750 and 6750 which amount to 60%, 60%, and 108% of full time based on a 40-hour workweek for 52 weeks of the year.**

**\$13513 per year is requested for expendables. Will \$10,646 be invested in computing each year? There is no justification for this is in the budget and project description. In addition, funds for workshops are not requested, itemized, or justified.**

**There is no justification provided for the \$15,326 in equipment requested annually.**

**Furthermore, no breakdown for 3 levels although the authors state that it can be funded at 1 of three levels. These are up to the reviewers to calculate and are as follows: Level 1 @ \$1,277,441; Level 2 @ Level 1 + \$211,746, and: Level 3 @ Level 2 + \$577,247.**

**The majority of Level 1 funding is for expanding eradication efforts to seven new watersheds. Each new watershed cooperator submitted a budget, but no detail beyond whatever they say is given It is not clear how many sites there are per new watershed; this information may partially explain the nearly five-fold difference in funds requested for the American River versus Tule River watershed. There are 4 San Joaquin River sites indicated on the map and 1 Tule River Site; the cost-share commitments for these sites are \$130 and 150,854 respectively.**

**The concept of grouping numerous watersheds deserves merit, however, a benefit of this approach is also some degree of cost standardization, at least for cost per area of various eradication treatments.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## External Scientific: #2

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **151**

Applicant Organization: **Sonoma Ecology Center**

Proposal Title: **Arundo Eradication and Coordination**

#### 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.**

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<b>This regional group effort is needed if there is any hope of controlling arundo. It is a will thought out proposal which will show the results of many groups working together.</b>
<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**

**This project builds on other work and would be a major effort in the war on arundo. Funding at the level 3 amount is recommended.**

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?

**Good yes, yes, yes, yes.**

**This project does a good job in pulling all the groups together to get the arundo control job done. This project does not show how it is going to deal with other invasive sp. i.e. when you remove arundo other invaders move in.**

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?

**Excellent yes, good, yes.**

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.**

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**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

# External Scientific: #3

## Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **151**

Applicant Organization: **Sonoma Ecology Center**

Proposal Title: **Arundo Eradication and Coordination**

### 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.**

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
<b>-Excellent</b>	<b>The primary problems here are 1) it is not clear what is new about this project relative to the previously funded CALFED grant and 2) no results or products from this previous grant were presented which is very unfortunate as it would provide both context for the new request and credibility that the new grant is feasible.</b>
<b>-Good</b>	
<b>XPoor</b>	

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

**3 - Good The goals are timely but it is not clear how they differ from those in the project already funded by CALFED. How does this new project build on the currently funded one?**

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

**4 - Fair The conceptual framework does not differ from the previously funded project. What is new here and what have they already accomplished?**

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?

**3 - Good It is not clear what new innovations are planned and the remote sensing approach although promising does not appear to be linked well with ground truthing. Also there does not seem to be much attention paid to setting up controls or at least a solid design for comparing before and after changes in vegetation. Monitoring of native plant restoration is only very vaguely described.**

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

**4 - Fair The capacity for expansion in this project is difficult to judge because there is no information on the success of previously funded project.**

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

**4 - Fair Monitoring after eradication is poorly described.**

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?

**Fair - 4 Essentially, reduced Arundo infestation is the primary product, but not much else because of poor description of restoration monitoring. Not clear to me whether we will learn much here; perhaps the development of remote sensing capacity for Arundo. Again, some indication of prior success from CALFED support would be very helpful here.**

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

**4 - Fair Personnel seem experienced but track record of performance from prior CALFED grant is key here and was not given.**

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

**4 - Fair The fairly high administrative support was not well justified at all and I was very surprised at the high cost of the chipper!**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

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

**New Proposal Number:** 151

**New Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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

**99-F08 Purple Loosestrife Prevention, Detection, & Control in the Sac/SJ Delta and Associated Hyrdologic Units.**

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?

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:

**NA this is not a next phase proposal**

Other Comments:

**Applicants are professional, dedicated, and responsible. Carry out tasks and duties above and beyond what is committed to in the agreement. Very responsive to any inquiries/suggestions relating to the project.**



## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

**Will obtain 1600 permit(s) and comply with CEQA. No other permits or documentation needed.**

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:

**Applicant not sure of timeline because of multiple locations, may need more than one 1600 permit. No budget specified for permits.**

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

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 151

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Arundo Eradication and Coordination

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: