

# Proposal Reviews

## #152: Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005

Sonoma Ecology Center

**Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review**

**Bay Regional Review**

**External Scientific Review**

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding**

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

#1

#2

#3

#4

#1

#2

# Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 152

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005

**Review:**

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

**Above Average:** Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Adequate:** No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Not Recommended:** Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
-Superior	<b>All four reviewers gave this proposal a "Poor" ranking:</b>  <b>1) Conceptual model and hypotheses are poorly defined. Objectives of project are so broad they contain no information</b>  <b>2) Approach and feasibility are difficult to assess because of lack of details provided in the proposal. Performance measures were either not defined or very weak when they were defined.</b>  <b>3) Recommend resubmitting as separate proposals so sufficient detail regarding hypotheses and approaches for testing them can be included.</b>
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

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

**Two of reviewers found the conceptual model and hypotheses very poorly defined. One reviewer found the objectives so broadly defined that they contained no information (e.g. to study physical and biological processes).**

**All reviewers felt the project had poor justification The proposed work is not a research project as no clear hypothesis-experimental framework was presented.**

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 approach was criticized on the grounds that it lacked several elements of resource monitoring and evaluation, and that there was not sufficient information provided in the proposal to evaluate the methods and analyses. All reviewers felt they could not evaluate the projects feasibility, there was simply not enough information on the individual components.**

**All reviewers commented that the performance measures were weak, poorly justified, and/or poorly defined.**

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?

**One reviewer could not determine whether any useful outcomes or products would be generated by this project. Another reviewer stated that while products of value may emerge, the probability of generating interpretive outcomes is low. He questioned the utility of an integrated database in the absence of clear and testable hypotheses.**

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

**All reviewers commented that the budget was very large. There was disagreement among reviewers as to whether the cost was justified given the tasks, but this is understandable given the scope of the project and lack of detail in the proposal.**

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

**Scored a "Medium" ranking although it was noted that it could have scored "High" but that it didn't meet the regional review "essential" test.**

**All comments were positive, mentioning strong linkages with agencies and local groups, and alliance with CALFED goals. The regional panel considered this to be a good example of comprehensive watershed planning and restoration work.**

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?

**Budget is OK assuming funding is accounted for under "Administration"; and scheduling the timeline is included under "Administration and Coordination"**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**None**

## **Bay Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 152

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005

Overall Ranking:    -Low    Medium    -High

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

**The team agreed that this is a good example of comprehensive watershed planning and restoration work.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

**Yes This is ongoing funding of an effective program.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**Yes, many CALFED priorities from estuary-wide goals down to local goals, from water quality through restoration of habitat.**

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 project involves and is supported by many regional agencies and groups, from federal agencies such as USFWS, down to the local kiwanis Clubs. It involves and complements many different restoration and preservation efforts in the watershed.**

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

Yes -No

How?

**The Conservancy is a locally-based project that has a newsletter and outreach to the local community, also see above.**

Other Comments:

**Again, this could easily have been ranked as a high priority project, but didn't meet our "essential" test.**

# External Scientific: #1

## Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **152**

Applicant Organization: **Sonoma Ecology Center**

Proposal Title: **Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005**

### 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 work elements, database development and process studies, should be clearly separated. Arguments for each should be made including goals, objectives and hypotheses. The current proposal does not bridge the elements in a persuasive manner.</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?

**The goals, objectives and hypotheses are stated. However, the hypotheses are trivial. This is due to the fact that the project is not research but database development.**

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 specific need for the proposed activity, database development and limited integration, is argued. No analysis is given of the many other available databases and what they might offer. Based on the presentation, some development work already has been done and the**

**proposed activities are simply a continuation. Even so, an analysis of alternatives should be done. The use of an existing database could save a lot of time and money.**

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?

**Assuming no other database is available or appropriate, the work program seems reasonable. The proposed analyses of the stored data sound interesting but a more complete is needed. If decision-makers can form the questions and the necessary data have been stored, the database could be useful. Combining database development with the data collection on the physical, biological and land use processes seems odd. Only after the database is developed should data be collected to ensure that the data is collected in the proper format and at the appropriate intensity.**

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?

**Database development is feasible. The likelihood of success depends on whether the staff is capable of structuring efficient storage and retrieval algorithms. Data retrieval and analyses will require access to statistical routines. The scale of the project is adequate.**

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

**The performance measures are not appropriate for testing hypotheses. The measures for this project are really the products: database, answers to a series of questions and an operators manual.**

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 are discussed in the previous section.**

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 seem well enough qualified for the project work but are they and the lead agency the appropriate organization to be developing a land use and natural resources database. What is the state doing about land use coverage? What is the USGS doing about the water resources data? The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and others have extensive databases. Why are they not being used? Why is a new database being proposed?**

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

**The cost/benefit ration would be much higher if existing databases, their contents, and the supporting data collection efforts were used. Less than 10 percent of the cost is allocated to database development and the rest to data collection. If the process studies are the important parts of the project, they should be argued and funded separately.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**The budget needs to be comma delimited. A simple time line needs to be presented. The attached schedule is difficult to read.**



## External Scientific: #2

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **152**

Applicant Organization: **Sonoma Ecology Center**

Proposal Title: **Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005**

#### 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>I think this is very good initiative but have reservation associated with the consideration of this project as a research project. The research component is only one part of the many things that are being done, and it is not the single primary focus of the conservancy.</b>
<b>-Good</b>	
<b>XPoor</b>	<b>I recommend that the proposal be more clearly divided into which projects are restoration oriented, research oriented and watershed management oriented.</b>

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

**The goal of the Sonoma Creek Conservancy is reasonably well stated and remains consistent throughout the proposal.**

**Embracing the concept of the proposal as a means to provide integrated watershed management is a very important one that is usually not included in large scale restoration initiatives.**

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 conceptual model for the project is clearly stated and provides required information to understand the basis for the proposed work.**

**However, the selection of the project as a research project is not appropriate, and I would classify this project as a demonstration project or an full scale implmenetation project to show how some aspects of watershed coordinated management can be achieved. My reasons for this are: 1) A large component of the work appears to be the refinement of data handling mechanism for a broad diversity of projects occuring in the basin (i.e. improving the KRIS database/model). 2) There is a large number of projects being conducted that have no direct relevance to research that promotes better understanding of land use effects of physical and biological process (i.e. planning and permitting restoration projects, monitoring fish passage at culverts , stream flow gage maintenance, vineyard demonstration projects) 3) There is a large amount of more 'planning' or 'adminstative time' for attending meeting and coordinating with others.**

**Research on land use effects is one of many tasks and clearly not the one with the most focus.**

**I think the project is justified as an full scale implementation project, but not as a research project**

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 scope of the project is too broad to be considered a research project. However, the approach to the project as a full scale implementation project is justified.**

**I expect that the project will produce novel information that will aid not only in the management of the Sonoma watershed but also provide some information about how best to coordinate assessment of land use impacts and restroration projects in a single watershed.**

**This project will be useful for decsion makers concerned with the Sonoma 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?

**Given the scope of the intaitve I do not beleive it it possible to fully document the approach. In general the approach to the project appears feasible from the information provided. Because of the very diverse nature of the proposed activities, I have some uncertainies how all of this is managed to meet deleiverables on time and on budget. Essentially, we must place confidence in the principles of the conservancy to manage this effectively and without more information this is very difficult to judge. That said it appears the group has a sound track record for managing this very complex project. I think there is a moderate chance of success with this proposal.**

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?

**There is very limited documentation of performance measures for each of the many initiatives of the proposed project. This is somewhat understandable because of space limitation but those given appear to be non quantitative and not reflective of the program as a whole.**

**It stands out that no consideration is given to provide performance measures for the overall program. Recognizing that this is difficult I would expect some effort to consider this to be made.**

**Generally I would conclude that project specific performance measures are lacking from the proposal.**

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

**I believe the list of products from the work are likely to be produced.**

**I also note that the products are very specific to individual sub-projects not for the program overall.**

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?

**From the information provided in the proposal, it appears that the staff are capable and have a good track record for completing the type of tasks proposed.**

**The infrastructure of the organizing appears sufficient to ensure successful implementation.**

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

**The budget for this project is very large, but given the scope of activities it appears reasonable. As a result of the degree of collaboration and inter-twining of this project with other initiatives in the watershed it very difficult to ascertain the incremental benefit that will be realized from the overall project.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**The proposal provided a very good model for promoting integrated watershed management. I found the proposal a little confusing in that it is registered as a research project but really encompassed a broad range of management activities.**

## External Scientific: #3

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **152**

Applicant Organization: **Sonoma Ecology Center**

Proposal Title: **Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005**

#### 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 proponents should resubmit components of the proposal as separate projects, so enough detail on objectives, hypotheses, approaches and methods can be provided.</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?

**Yes, the goals are clearly stated. The concept of integrating existing knowledge into an accessible format for decision makes is useful. The hypotheses are not clearly stated, or given for that matter. This is a major weakness of the proposal. A few token hypotheses are listed. The basic tone of the proposal is we are going to collect/integrate a lot of data and then analyze it - this is not acceptable in my opinion. The objectives are so broad that they contain no information (except for the first one which is reasonably well defined). The objectives are to study physical and biological processes and land use.**

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 conceptual model is very broadly defined. The linkages among specific components is not specified, and only provided in moderate detail when examples are given.**

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?

**Given the scope of the work, there is not near enough information to determine if the approaches they propose (or only vaguely outline) are valid. I'm not even sure I know all the components (e.g. they briefly mention a hydraulic model, but then never reference it again or mention why they are proposing to develop one). A few examples:**

**· Invertebrate sampling. How many streams, how many samples, what time of year, what type of habitats. · Monitor success of CALFED-funded fish habitat enhancement. This is not a trivial task, how are they planning on doing this? · Monitor the success of steelhead passage. I noted in the performance measures they plan on doing this by observing if depth and velocity are adequate for fish passage. This is completely inadequate, what standards will be used? Having seen many steelhead streams and barriers, I continue to be amazed at the obstacles these fish can surmount. In BC, we evaluate passage by sampling for fish upstream of potential barriers. The fact that the proponents are advocating such an ad hoc technique makes me question their unspecified methods for other aspects of the work.**

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 approach is not documented at all. It is impossible to evaluate the likelihood of success**

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?

**No, very few performance measures are specified and this reflects the lack of detail provided in the proposal.**

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

**Unknown**

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?

**Given the superficial level of detail of the proposal, I have little confidence in the proponents.**

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

**It is a very large amount of money, with few details provided concerning hypotheses and approaches.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## External Scientific: #4

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **152**

Applicant Organization: **Sonoma Ecology Center**

Proposal Title: **Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005**

#### 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 proposal was over-ambitious thus suffered from insufficient detail in any one task, and an overall goal was vague. Resource agencies may already have much of this capability and expertise, with the assistance of University staff.</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?

**The goals are fuzzy and centered on 4 tasks: build an integrated database, explore physical processes, examine a number of biological indicators, and examine land use management history. While a long argument for the importance of what is perceived as an ecological approach is presented, an overarching ecosystem model is not envisioned in this work, thus the importance of the work appears lost in the process. The hypothesis is that if all of the tasks are completed, fish populations will improve. No detail on how this will be measured is provided. It is likely unworkable and untestable with standard procedures unless a design is explained and the response variables are defined. The cataloging of data on land management and presentation in GIS format would be useful, and not new, but may not generate any fish.**

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 proponents suggest that by addressing four tasks on information gathering, a better approach to ecosystem management will evolve, yet no clear conceptual model of how this will occur is provided. There is the suggestion that there is research involved here, but it is not scientific research with clear hypotheses testing in an experimental framework - it reads as development of a large bureaucracy to build a communication tool to demonstrate ecological interactions. It is difficult to see how that will be done with success.**

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 lacks several elements of resource monitoring and evaluation (e.g., smolt and esapement momnitoring to delineate life stage survivals and trends towards hypotheses development), and although touted as an adaptive management project, it in fact is not a control/treatment experiment. The information would add to knowledge by producing a central database, but there is nothing novel in the approach (GIS is now a common tool to display and catalog land use patterns). They are asking to coordinate data management at an ecological center, and this could be a useful function, which could be of assistance to decision makers.**

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 large project could not be fully documented in the limited space provided. It is in fact better divided into at least four separate projects/proposals. Each subtask has a reasonable likelihood of success, but the overall goal of providing an integrated communication tool is perhaps overzealous. Thus, the tasks are best scaled down into separate components. First and foremost, a thorough watershed assessment is required, including fish habitat, channel, riparian, and upland condition assessments according to standard protocols. This must be followed by a listing of rehabilitation tasks by priority, than a clear model of monitoring and evaluation.**

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?

**Preformance measures are weak and poorly justified. FOr example, no information on the monitoring of benthic invertebrates is provided, a questionable response variable regardless. No information is provided on the variables of choice for monitoring of fish populations. Performance measures are not defined or poorly suited to the task; e.g., examining depth and velocity in freshets and structural integrity of passage facilities will not provide data on improved recruitment of fish. No detail is provided for broad statements like "understand instream flow requirements for salmonids of all ages" or " comprehensive monitoring and assessment for all species of concern" - broad statements like this abound, with little description, which gives the impression of a lack of understanding of the complexity of these issues, and the difficulty of the task. Entering information in a database, no matter how detailed it may be, will not address these matters.**



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?

**Products of value may emerge from components of this project, e.g., a useful integrated database is possible, if it is new and contains information not already available from resource agencies. Interpretative outcomes are questionable. Creation of a map-based information system will not on its own accomplish much without a clear testable hypothesis or ecosystem model to explore.**

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 very capable of coordinating several funding sources and agencies, complete with a well-equipped office environment, but appear to require assistance with experimental design and ecosystem modeling such as ECOSIM or ECOPATH.**

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

**The budget is extremely high, but substantial partnership and cost-sharing is indicated (totalling \$6.6M). The \$1.8M requested here seems excessive for the four tasks listed, given that much of it is in the gathering of existing information from agencies.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**This work may be better presented as 4 or more separate proposals. This is not a science proposal, but was evaluated as such.**

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

**New Proposal Number:** 152

**New Proposal Title:** Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005

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

**N/A**

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:

**NFWF does not have any direct agreements with applicant. Sonoma Ecology Center has been a subcontractor.**

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:

**The status/progress of current efforts accurately stated with Southern Sonoma County RCD (SSCRCD) as lead organization on application.**

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:

**SSCRCD's progress to date has been satisfactory.**

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:

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

**New Proposal Number:** 152

**New Proposal Title:** Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005

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

### **00-F11 Arundo Eradication and Coordination**

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 -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:** 152

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

**FESA compliance and NEPA documentation required.**

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:

**If funding is accounted for under Administration; and scheduling the timeline is included under Administration and Coordination.**

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:** 152

**Applicant Organization:** Sonoma Ecology Center

**Proposal Title:** Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2002-2005

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).

**Funding brought forward is \$1.00 difference.**

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: