

Proposal Reviews

#158: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

Stillwater Sciences

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

External Scientific Review #1
#2
#3

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding #1
#2
#3
#4

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 158

Applicant Organization: Stillwater Sciences

Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

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

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

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

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

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

Amount: **\$8,547,285.00**

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

none

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This project includes in-channel and floodplain restoration on the Dredger Tailings Reach on the Merced River. Gravels will be moved from nearby tailing piles on the floodplain and used for river channel formation and instream gravel augmentation. This project is phase IV of an ongoing restoration program on the Merced River aligned with the Merced River Stakeholder Group and Technical Advisory Committee. Although river and floodplain restoration and gravel augmentation is of high priority to CALFED, the Selection Panel recommends that this proposal be rewritten and re-reviewed to be considered for directed action. This recommendation is based on the need to include, as an important aspect of the revised proposal, application of science within the study design and adaptive management concepts into the project. Certainly baseline monitoring and vegetation experimentation with pilot plantings are good examples of addressing these concepts but long-term evaluation of post-project is also needed. The rewrite should respond to the Merced River Adaptive Management Forum report and concepts. It also should defend the ecological benefit/cost importance of spending \$140,000 per acre for river/floodplain restoration on the Merced River and in the larger context of the Central Valley rivers.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 158

Applicant Organization: Stillwater Sciences

Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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	The goals and the project have merit. The costs, however, detract from the value of the proposed work. The design and construction techniques need to be revisited.
-Above average	
X 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 goals, objectives and hypotheses are clearly stated once they are located within the proposal. In fact, they are given in great detail. Given the degree of disturbance at the project site, the project is not one of restoration but, rather, it is one of creation. Justification is well stated. Assuming that there is need for wildlife habitat at this location, the site is outstanding. However, given the scale of the project, it might be best divided into two phases: design coupled with baseline data collection and implementation coupled with monitoring.

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?

Since the restoration approach has not yet been defined, the following comments apply only to the design process. This process seems to be well thought out. The critical elements of hydrology, hydraulics, sedimentology and habitat structure have all been considered. Although this is a creation process, at this point in the watershed, given the up- and downstream controls, an understanding of the pre-settle geomorphology and biological controls would facilitate a more effective and efficient design. Natural grade controls should be given careful attention. The design should rely less on channel and bank armoring. The project is technically feasible. Given the grading and establishment of the appropriate hydrology, the probability of success is good.

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?

Both the administrative and scientific measures of performance are well established and articulated. The products, from reports to landscapes, are identified and well qualified.

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

Ways of reducing the costs of grading and filling should be explored. The unit cost for restoring the 60- acre demonstration is over \$140,000/acre. This cost would limit the application of the methods developed by this project. Perhaps, the grading could be limited to the more critical locations on the site leaving the mined surface in other areas. These remnants could then be managed as upland habitats. Given the magnitude of the project and the uncertainty of the design methods, the project should be separated into two phases: design and implementation. This would allow the project team to explore cost saving techniques and alternative ways to create the proper hydrologic conditions for the target plants and animals.

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

The San Joaquin Regional Review is high citing the qualifications of the participants and public support.

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No administrative issues have been raised.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 158

Applicant Organization: Stillwater Sciences

Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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

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

This is a very well thought out project and while extremely ambitious, the proponents have access to enough talent and resources to successfully complete the project. They are scientifically rigorous and the project will provide a great deal of data concerning large scale river channel habitat restoration.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

The proponents have spent an enormous amount of time evaluating the feasibility and impacts of this project through the Merced River Stakeholders Group and Technical Advisory Committee. The project will be on property owned by the co-applicant (DFG) which also should be of some help when it is time to procure various permits. All of the adjacent landowners support the project.

The expertise and experience shared by the proponents and available to them through associates will help ensure a successful completion of this project. The approach to the project as described in the proposal is carefully thought out to provide good baseline data, information on present channel profile and cross sections, bed texture, and texture of available material in the dredger tailings. The development and utilization of sediment transport model for determining gravel augmentation will be critical for the long term success of the project. The site assessment and design approach is also well thought out. The proponents have also been involved in the review of other channel restoration projects on the Merced, Tuolumne and Clear Creek.

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

XYes -No

How?

SJ-1: This project will develop and implement a floodplain restoration plan along the Dredger Tailings Reach of the Merced River and will involve channel/floodplain reconstruction and gravel augmentation.

SJ-2: The project will remove dredger tailings from the Merced River Ranch property, re-grade and re-vegetate the floodplain to re-establish natural geomorphic processes, including floodplain inundation and channel bed mobility.

The project will also increase floodplain inundation and bed mobility to create and maintain riparian vegetation and in-channel habitats, providing more spawning and rearing habitats for native fishes (ERPP Goal 2). It will also provide additional habitat for riparian corridor species and enhance and restore other native biotic communities (ERPP Goal 1&2)

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?

This project is very similar to projects being implemented on the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers with the goals of restoring a dynamic floodplain/channel interaction and riparian ecological processes.

The proponents of this project have been instrumental in the Merced River Stakeholders Group and Technical Advisory Committee. This project clearly meets the goals and objectives of the Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan and has a great deal of public support. It also is very similar and will probably improve upon the Merced River Salmon Habitat Enhancement Project currently underway and partially funded by CALFED. DFG has conducted several gravel augmentation projects in this reach and has purchased the property that this project will be in.

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

Yes -No

How?

The proponents are deeply involved in the Merced River Stakeholders Group and Technical Advisory Committee. There is a good working relationship with other local agencies and the landowners and other stakeholders have been involved in all aspects of the planning.

Other Comments:

This is a very well thought out project and while extremely ambitious, the proponents have access to enough talent and resources to successfully complete the project. They are scientifically rigorous and the project will provide a great deal of data concerning large scale river channel habitat restoration.

The one reservation the committee had was that the prime mover of this project is no longer with Stillwater Sciences, the proponent of the project. It is probable, though, that they have enough institutional commitment and resources to continue this.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **158**

Applicant Organization: **Stillwater Sciences**

Proposal Title: **Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach**

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	I thought this was a great proposal, and showed the skill and experience of the project team.
<input type="checkbox"/> -Good	It was interesting to review a proposal that eschewed written text. For the most part it worked fine, but see my questions about the dam, and about project team bio's, which are topics I wish they had addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/> -Poor	

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

yes.

Tables 2 and 3 present hypotheses clearly and with in well-structured sub-areas (hydraulics, geomorph (lots of detail here), biotic response, and vegetation.

Objectives are stated clearly in the executive summary: 1) increase coarse sediment in reach, 2) balance sediment supply with transport competence and 3) establish a flood plain that functions under current regulated flow conditions.

I find the specific hypotheses to be an excellent and specific extension of these broad objectives.

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 conceptual models are presented as figures 5, 6 and 7. These strike me as extremely well thought out, scientifically grounded, and comprehensive.

This is a full-scale implementation project, well-justified in my opinion by the quality of the overall proposal and by the need to restore channel and floodplain conditions altered by long-ago gold-mining.

An interesting aspect of this proposal, which I will comment on below, is its reliance on tables, figures and flow charts to convey _all_ information.

I think they did a heckuva good job. But one does have to do some interpretation.

A small complaint. Captions on figure 4 and 5 look like they were cut off. Empty boxes in the flow charts are not explained, and although I tried to guess what went in those boxes, I couldn't. Then there are shaded vs unshaded boxes, and solid vs dotted lines. Presumably these have meaning to the project proposers.....

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?

yes

I infer the approach from tables 2 and 3, based on hypothesis and monitoring columns. I think the approach will meet the objectives, the monitoring will lead to useful learning, and the work will be well done. I base that on the logical and concise yet complete information presented in these tables, as well as the careful thinking outlined in the conceptual model flowcharts.

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?

yes

I think the feasibility is very strong. I base that on the extensive past work by this team, on the Merced and elsewhere (table 5), and on my sense that the monitoring methods described look appropriate and thorough. All in all, this proposal conveys a sense of people who know what they are doing.

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

I've addressed most of this in above boxes. All of the hypotheses, objectives, monitoring etc looks first-rate. They should have numerous concrete performance measures from their monitoring work.

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?

Yes

I view this project (compared to several others I have reviewed) as very likely to produce reports and scientific publications that will inform comparable work in the future. I also think they are highly likely to achieve their direct goals of improving the channel and floodplain conditions of this section of the Merced, and to achieve significant recovery based on biological measures.

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?

Yes

this is an accomplished group, based on their past work and the quality of the proposal. Their organization chart (fig 10) is convincing as well. However, the document does not provide any direct way to evaluate credentials (no bio's, resumes, etc)

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

I think so

well, \$8.5 m is starting to look like real money. I cannot evaluate the costs associated with this project. However, I think the benefits of restoring a 7-mile reach of the Merced are considerable, and I think this is one of the best-looking restoration plans I've seen. Moreover, there is evidence of future plans to restore additional reaches, and so I think this is a valuable step towards recovery of a larger river segment.

Miscellaneous comments:

I have only one other thought:

apparently the Crocker-Huffman dam is staying put, and the flood plain restoration is intended to "establish a floodplain at an elevation that functions under the current regulated flow conditions". So if the dam is removed or fails, will this reach have to be re-engineered? I would like to have had some discussion of the role of this dam, which look pretty small in the photo. Is it run-of-river, or might it become so? Does it really have the storage capacity to affect floods significantly? And what is its role in trapping sediments?

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **158**

Applicant Organization: **Stillwater Sciences**

Proposal Title: **Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

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

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	This is a very expensive project for a small amount of restoration. While it has the potential to lead to positive outcomes and learn from the effort, it is a large investment with little justification.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	
-Poor	

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

The project proposed to restore 60 acres and 3,600 feet of river. The attached table contained clearly stated hypotheses and measures, but the information provided was exceedingly brief and difficult to link to the text.

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 presented in the figures appeared to be scientifically rigorous.

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 project has a reasonable likelihood of success.

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

no comment

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

The hypotheses and measurements seem appropriate. The brief description of implementation and monitoring is interesting and includes several important measures. The budget summary requests \$19,301, which clearly is not adequate to fund all the measurements listed in the table. Attachment A gives a budget of \$4.7 million. I assume that the latter number is correct.

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 hypothesis listed would clearly add to the understanding of the Bay Delta 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?

no comment

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

The budget of \$4.7 million attached at the end of the proposal is high for only 60 acres of restoration (318 acres of planning).

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **158**

Applicant Organization: **Stillwater Sciences**

Proposal Title: **Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach**

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	The proposal is will written if not well organized. The restoration concept and the monitoring program are well specified. If the ultimate design can bring forth more effective and efficient restoration techniques, the investment in the design phase will be worthwhile.
XGood	
-Poor	

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 clearly stated once they are located within the proposal. In fact, they are given in great detail. Given the degree of disturbance at the project site, the project is not one of restoration but, rather, it is one of creation.

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

Justification is well stated. Assuming that there is need for wildlife habitat at this location, the site is outstanding. However, given the scale of the project, it might be best divided into two phases: design coupled with baseline data collection and implementation coupled with monitoring.

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?

Since the restoration approach has not yet been defined, the following comments apply only to the design process. This process seems to be well thought out. The critical elements of hydrology, hydraulics, sedimentology and habitat structure have all been considered. Although this is a creation process, at this point in the watershed, given the up- and downstream controls, an understanding of the pre-settle geomorphology and biological controls would facilitate a more effective and efficient design. Natural grade controls should be given careful attention. The design should rely less on channel and bank armoring.

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 technically feasible. Given the grading and establishment of the appropriate hydrology, the probability of success is good.

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?

Both the administrative and scientific measures of performance are well established and articulated.

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, from reports to landscapes, are identified and well qualified.

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

The project team seem will qualified and very familiar with the subject stream and proposed site. They seem to have or have access to the necessary equipment and facilities

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

Ways of reducing the costs of grading and filling should be explored. The unit cost for restoring the 60- acre demonstration is over \$140,000/acre. This cost would limit the application of the methods developed by this project. Perhaps, the grading could be limited to the more critical locations on the site leaving the mined surface in other areas. These remnants could then be managed as upland habitats. Given the magnitude of the project and the uncertainty of the design methods, the project should be separated into two phases: design and implementation.

This would allow the project team to explore cost saving techniques and alternative ways to create the proper hydrologic conditions for the target plants and animals.

Miscellaneous comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 158

New Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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

98-E09, Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan, Phase II, 2000-E05, Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan, Phase III 01-N49, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek, and Sutter Bypass Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Evaluation

Ecosystem Restoration

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

N/A

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Phase III is essentially complete (2000-E05). Stakeholder Group meetings continue.

Other Comments:

Contractor for CALFED project #01-N49 is the Dept. of Fish & Game, not Stillwater Sciences.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 158

New Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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

98-C16 Developing a Method to Accurately Simulate Entrainment of Fish

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:

The link between this project and the applicant is not clear in the project file.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 158

New Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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

00-F04, A Mechanistic Approach to Riparian to Riparian Restoration in the San Joaquin Basin; CALFED ERP

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

Applicant has performed well in implementing previous project.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #4

New Proposal Number: 158

New Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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

11332-0-MO09 - Stanislaus River: Smolt Survival

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 158

Applicant Organization: Stillwater Sciences

Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

Applicant should indicate on Environmental Compliance Checklist that County permits will be obtained if necessary (this is stated in the text of the proposal).

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

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

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 158

Applicant Organization: Stillwater Sciences

Proposal Title: Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach

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 program did not carry forward totals and budget summary sheets attached at the end do not add up.

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: