

Proposal Reviews

#166: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

The Nature Conservancy

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Land Acquisition

Sacramento Regional Review

External Scientific Review

#1

#2

#3

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

#1

#2

#3

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 166

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

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: **\$2,200,000.00**

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 value of Battle Creek to the ERP and the role of conservation easements to protect and restore this critical watershed. However, the Selection Panel agrees with the comments of the Technical Review Panel. The current proposal would benefit from a better developed monitoring and stewardship plan. The Panel recommends the applicant revise the proposal to address these issues and resubmit for consideration as a directed action.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 166

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

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

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

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

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	This proposal is supported for funding by the panel. The proposal was criticized for not having a strong research component, however, the panel agreed that it is not a research project and the main strong point is it would protect a very important creek that supports all four runs of salmon. The monitoring and stewardship plans do need to be better developed before funding.
XAbove average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?
A. Poor to good, "Goals and objectives are clearly stated, there is no testable hypothesis" B. Yes

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. Good likelihood of success. B. Yes and no, "no designs for monitoring, evaluation nor reporting are included"

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. No B. Not enough information in the proposal on this. C. No, the main product form this proposal will be perpetual conservation easements.

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

The cost per acre is reasonable; however, the same amount of tax money could also buy a lot of natural resources improvements throughout this watershed.

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

Sacramento - High - No local constraints, "would preserve existing habitat of the only creek that supports all four salmon runs". Negatives were the unclear nature of threats of mining, logging and development; fencing and restoration is uncertain; no post burn planting; no monitoring that will prove success.

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?

Good except for prior performance, "unanticipated negotiations over terms not raised during the PSP process which diverted considerable time as well as state resources" and environmental compliance, "local burn or other permits are required"

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Land Acquisition:

Proposal Number: 166

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

1. Is the site's ecological importance documented in the proposal?

XYes -No

If yes, please import relevant text and citations here:

Battle Creek is unique among Sacramento River tributaries because of its capability to support all four runs of Chinook salmon. Specifically, there are only two remaining suitable spawning habitats for winter run salmon: Battle Creek and the upper Sacramento River. Battle Creek is the only habitat that can consistently provide the cold waters that winter run salmon need for spawning success. Because Battle Creek is recognized as having the best potential for restoring all four runs of Chinook salmon as well as Steelhead trout populations, a historic agreement known as the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project (Battle Creek Restoration Project) was signed by the California Department of Fish and Game, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, collectively, the Resource Agencies and PG&E to remove dams, restore in-stream flows and install fish ladders and screens. Significant financial support was provided by CALFED for that project.

Lazy R Bahr Ranch (approx. 3,000 acres) is located on the South Fork of Battle Creek near the community of Manton. The property is bisected by Ripley Creek which is a fish-bearing tributary into the South Fork. The riparian habitat along the South Fork and Ripley Creek is relatively undisturbed. This property is located in an area of Battle Creek considered to be critical spawning and holding areas for Steelhead trout and Chinook salmon (particularly Winter and Spring runs). This property surrounds PG&E's property containing the South Powerhouse and Inskip Dam and a portion of the property may be impacted by the installation of a fish screen and ladder at Inskip Dam. The ranch has blue oak woodlands, chaparral, and several important springs which feed the South Fork. Over 2 miles of frontage on the north side of the South Fork would be protected. The ranch also provides habitat for the largest migratory deer herd in California. This property is considered a high priority by The Nature Conservancy and is adjacent to the recently protected Eagle Canyon (Pelton) Ranch (TNC closed conservation easement on July 9, 2001 as part of CALFED Award # 01-N24 and CVPIA Grant Agreement # 113300G104).

McC Campbell Ranch (approx. 2,000 acres) is on the mainstem of Battle Creek with over 2 miles of frontage on both sides of the creek. The ranch has blue oak woodlands, chaparral, grasslands and springs that benefit Battle Creek. This stretch of the creek serves as a spawning area for Fall-run and Late Fall-run Chinook salmon and as a holding area for Spring-run Chinook salmon. The riparian habitat along the creek is in a pristine condition. The ranch also has frontage on Baldwin Creek where restoration for Steelhead is being discussed. This high priority property is adjacent to the approximately 1,500 acre Miller Ranch (conservation easement negotiations currently under way as part of CALFED Award # 01-N24).

Wildcat Ranch (a.k.a. Trans-Universal Property -- approx. 1,844 acres) is located on the North Fork of Battle Creek. This property features pristine blue oak woodlands, springs, grasslands, chaparral and high-quality aquatic and riparian habitat including approximately 2 miles of frontage on the North Fork of Battle Creek. The riparian habitat along the North Fork is relatively undisturbed. This property is located in an area of Battle Creek that has critical Winter- and Springrun Chinook salmon spawning and holding areas. The property includes a critical cold water spring that feeds the North Fork. The easement will help ensure that the spring is not diverted for other purposes. Additionally, the property surrounds PG&E lands containing Wildcat Dam which is scheduled for removal as part of the Battle Creek Restoration Project. TNC will cooperate with the Resources Agencies regarding Wildcat Dam. This tract is a high priority for protection as it is just downstream from another priority acquisition, the approximately 990-acre Eagle Canyon (Pelton) Ranch (conservation easement closed on July 9, 2001).’,

2. Is the owner’s willingness to sell the site documented in the proposal?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Is evidence of local government support for the purchase included in the proposal?

Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

According to the applicant, Peggy McNutt of The Nature Conservancys Red Bluff office generally discussed this proposal with the Tehama County Supervisors on October 2, 2001. No concerns were raised, and, in the past, the Supervisors have supported conservation easement land protection that helped maintain the existing land use and payment of property taxes. Peggy McNutt also spoke to Patricia Clarke, the Shasta County Supervisor representing the Battle Creek region of Shasta County. Clarke stated that she supports this proposal to CALFED.

4. Is the use proposed for the site after its purchase clearly consistent with the site’s general plan designation and zoning?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Is the land mapped as prime farmland, farmland of statewide significance, unique farmland, or farmland of local importance?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain the classification:

x

Is the site under a Williamson Act contract?

Yes -No

Will use of the site change from agriculture after its purchase?

-Yes No -Not Currently in Agriculture

6. Is this a time-sensitive acquisition opportunity, according to the proposal?

Yes -No

If yes, please import relevant text here:

'According to the applicant, development trends in the area point to increased loss of agricultural lands, as residential demands from Redding grow. Already there have been purchases of land along the creek for speculative purposes, and subdivisions have occurred. Groundwater extraction, well development, and septic tank use are increasing in this region and could eventually have devastating effects on in-stream flows and water quality. Although the owners of the targeted properties are currently willing sellers, they are considering other options including subdivision and/or development.'

Other Comments:

The applicants statements about development threats to the property seem a bit at odds with current protection against development afforded by Williamson Act contracts at this site. The contracts would seem to at least forestall development opportunities. Longer term threats maight arise should the owners allow choose not to renew the contracts or to seek their cancellation.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 166

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

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

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

Very important stream because of it's anadromous fish use and condition.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

No local constraints. Expansion of previous acquisitions funded by CALFED, CVPIA & others. Local partnerships, connections to downstream BLM protected lands. TNC has lots of technical experience & a number of similar, successful projects.

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

XYes -No

How?

The proposal meets goals 1 & 4 of the ERP; Habitat protection for anadromous fish - CVPIA & B-1 "Other." Would preserve existing habitat (some pristine) of the only creek that supports all four salmon runs. Also, a stream & tribs that support steelhead. Additional watershed baseline data will be acquired.

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

XYes -No

How?

2001-CALFED-funded acquisition project on Battle Creek which is proceeding successfully; watershed assessment program conducted by Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy; BLM, PG&E & previously funded projects.

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

XYes -No

How?

Board of Supervisors are on line, as is the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy. TNC has a history of public outreach. No specific plan was identified or groups targeted, however.

Other Comments:

Positives: Very strong proposal in terms of parcels to be acquired on stream and tribs, which are critical for all salmon runs and to steelhead. This protects good habitat rather than restoring it. Project builds on others and has local support. Big picture activities are coming together successfully here. Negatives: Primarily in the unclear nature of the following: a) Actual threats to these properties from mining, logging & development. How imminent? b) By the budget & lack of description, it would appear fencing & restoration of native habitat is uncertain. There's no mention of what will happen to grazing land, post-burn. Planting? c) No monitoring was mentioned that will prove success or lack of it. (Adaptive Management?) Baseline "initial" monitoring of biological & physical conditions is planned within the project budget to track future changes. However, it is unclear when, if, & how long in the future monitoring will occur. It is critical this type of project on a threatened stream have a clear restoration and monitoring plan. It is recognized that TNC will monitor long-term & will seek outside funding for the project beyond CALFED. Some panel members felt fencing may not be needed, as the banks are very steep and not prone to cattle use. d) No clear outreach or public education plan is in the project. e) TNC does not plan to make monitoring reports public because land will remain in private hands- panel does not believe this will be acceptable to CALFED.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **166**

Applicant Organization: **The Nature Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship**

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	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	To goal preserving ecologically significant habitat is excellent. The documentation weak making the overall rating good.
-Poor	

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

Goals are clear and timely: Acquire conservation easements in Battle Creek watershed in SE Shasta County. Where appropriate fence riparian zones, control invasive weeds, restore natural plant communities, and on-going monitoring. The project is timely since urban development and land prices generally increase over time. The parcels are not being purchase, only the conservation easements. Exactly what is covered in a conservation easement is not clearly defined in the proposal.

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 proposal focuses on this watershed because it apparently supports all runs of chinook and is one of two remaining habitats for winter run chinook. The watershed now is relatively pristine and increased development and pressure from Redding is increasing, although no quantitative information was provided to assess the significance of development. This is a full implementation project. Many significant details are not included in the justification, including the seasonal flows and temperatures, population trends, estimates of existing populations or the percent of the water under public and private control and how the purchase will alter the mix. Since TNC claims to have been working on protecting these properties for two decades, the lack of quantitative information of the stream status is surprising. The lack of adequate maps and photos showing the state of the habitat made it difficult to assess exactly what was to be purchased.

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?

TNC determined the three properties identified are biologically important, have important ecosystem function, and are in danger of development. To establish this claim some general principles of riparian management restoration are discussed but no specifics are given for Battle Creek area. Specifics are limited. Monitoring and maintenance are not detailed. The proposed purchase could be useful since the habitats, with urban development stopped; they become reference sites for other regions. However, since the easements generally cover only one stream bank, so they do not provide full riparian protection. Therefore, status of the riparian zones as references sites will be compromised.

The approach of identifying thee easements without alternatives puts the TNC at a negotiating disadvantage. It would seems a better approach might be to include alternative plans which would provide the TNC with a stronger position.

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?

Securing easements is technically feasible. However, no specific information was provided showing landowner or stakeholder support for the actions of TNC. It is difficult to determine if the scale of purchases is adequate, since the fraction of the creek affected is not noted. Furthermore, the land purchases appear to extend mostly outside the area creeks with the parcels, for the most part only on one side of the creek, so the stream reaches will only be partially protected with conservation easements. Full protection of the riparian zones is uncertain.

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?

Performance measure is successfully achieving the easements. No details are given on quantifying stewardship activities (fencing, weed control) other than they are easy.

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

The final outcome is some protection of the creek from further development. This is inherently valuable, although the actual impact on salmon and other species is unknown, as is the current status of the fish. Appraisals, surveys and other documents for real estate transactions will be confidential, appropriate documents will be shared with CALFED.

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?

TNC has acquired considerable land within California and has a reputation for safeguarding lands. The identified staff has technical capabilities and experience with TNC. However, details were sparse and CVs were missing. The projects internal reviewers within TNC and their qualifications were not identified, nor were external reviews, if any.

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

The overhead is reasonable. I cannot evaluate if the anticipated value of the easements is reasonable, since not comparative data was a provided.

Miscellaneous comments:

Preserving pristine habitats is of course an excellent expenditure of CALFED resources, if the habitats are important ecologically to the fish. The proposal makes these statements but does not substantiate them. I was thus unable to adequately evaluate the ecological value of the proposed acquisitions and the impact of the conservation easements on their riparian habitats.

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **166**

Applicant Organization: **The Nature Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship**

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 type="checkbox"/> -Excellent	The cost of this project is high; However, it does provide for long term protection of this resource. It would be best if this project could be done with the same amount of money being spent in the whole watershed for BMP installation.
<input checked="" 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?

Very good 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?

Good yes, yes, yes.

It takes a lot of tax money to buy easements for this project. An alternative is to spend the same amount of tax money on the whole watershed costsharing on fencing, buffers and other BMPs.

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?

Very good yes, yes, yes, yes.

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

Excellent yes, good, yes.

The NC has a good record for obtaining easements and managing easement elements.

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?

Very good 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 Excellent, yes, yes.

The NC is one of the best groups to do this type of project.

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

Good yes.

The same amount of tax money could also buy a lot of natural resources improvements throughout this watershed.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **166**

Applicant Organization: **The Nature Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship**

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	Does not met the criteria for a research project.
-Good	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor	

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

goals, objectives are clearly stated. there is no testable hypothesis, since this is a conservation easement acquisition of several parcels of land that abut segments of a stream system. conservation easement acquisition is strongly argued to be timely due to other pressures of expanding population. The acquisition concept is well proven and the imprimatur of The Nature Conservancy. The proposal successfully argues that this acquisition is important. However, it is questionable, to this reviewer if a funding program for scientific studies is the appropriate venue for these goals and objectives.

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?

This is not a research proposal. The literature review is plausible, however, many of the citations are not appropriate to N. Ca. mediterranean ecosystems. The conceptual model, that conservation easements will meet the needs of the stream systems of the upper Sacramento cannot be evaluated, since the impact of these segments (what % total stream system is impacted by \$2.2 million in conservation easements) has no scientific design. The proposers argue that this is a full scale implementation project, however it is only conservation easement acquisition and not research.

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 for conservation easement acquisition is The Nature Conservancy's tested and proven approach. There is no design, it is simply finding willing sellers and hoping over time to connect the land parcels into a somewhat contiguous system that, hopefully, will lead to adequate habitat to meet the goals of this proposal to maintain existing fisheries habitat. This proposal will not generate any new information, has not consideration of methodology or approaches that are new. The information to decision makers is already available. Conservation easements, unfortunately, do not fit into the scheme of scientific studies, research or even land management or natural resource decision making. This proposal has not quantification of the percentage of the stream systems that will be enhanced by this additional acquisition of habitat. this reviewer finds a significant amount of "trust me" in this proposal.

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 of conservation easements by The Nature Conservancy is documented, fully. It is simply, get funding, negotiate for easements and over time purchase the title to those easements. Technically this approach is feasible and has been used to acquire easements on other properties in the local area. Based on statements in the proposal, the likelihood of success appears to be relative high. The scale of the project relative to the cost appears to be small. There is no indication as to what percentage of the total aquatic habitat is involved in this easement, nor is there any indication of the percentage of aquatic habitat all easements, to date, are to the total stream system. therefore it is difficult to evaluate feasibility. Again, this is not a research project, nor is there any scientific design to the project. None is needed to meet the goals.

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 measures section of this proposal is sorely lacking. No sections on designs for monitoring, evaluating nor reporting are included. No detail is included about how the measures will be quantified other than a statement that transects will be established and surveys conducted and reported. Statistical design is non-existent. The restoration projects are only covered in passing. there is no broad assessment of the design criteria based on soil series, habitat types, successional stages, levels of existing natural resource management or even land use, except in broad sweeping terms.

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 only product from this proposal will be perpetual conservation easements, separating some rights of land use from the existing titles to the properties. The restoration projects are weakly defined with controlled burns as one of the primary tools for restoration, without any costing for management of controlled burns on medusa head wildrye and yellow starthistle. the assumption that extant grazing by current livestock will be used to manage areas that are not or cannot be burned is only implied. If it is cattle that will be used, then nothing will be accomplished. Use of sheep are required as part of any management system to control these Mediterranean origin species. it is further assumed that riparian zone fencing on the stream segments will solve the stream system channel needs. this is questionable, but cannot be evaluated because there is scarce information on which to base analysis

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 Nature Conservancy as a multi-national non-governmental organization has an excellent track record on past projects. The team proposing to implement this project has no published history in scientific journals, has no academic background, stated, that indicates they can conduct the scientific component of this conservation easement acquisition, if a scientific component was proposed. It is assumed that the team has access to the TNC infrastructure and significant local support, based on previous acquisitions and ongoing negotiations to meet their objectives, over time. they appear to be very good to excellent fund raisers, however.

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

This proposal is to acquire 6,844 acres of range and forest land containing part or all of 6 miles of stream frontage. the proposed project is to obtain \$2,045,230.00 to buy the conservation easements which is a little less than \$300 per acre for a perpetual easement on range and forest land and (depending on which side of the stream you are on) access to 4 or 6 miles of riparian zone. The per acre cost appears reasonable. However, this is not a scientific study or a research project and therefore, does not appear to fit the solicitation and clearly will not produce publishable reports on the ecosystems of the upper Sacramento

Miscellaneous comments:

This reviewer cannot rate this as a research project, scientific study or even an evaluation of existing habitat. It is simply an acquisition project to acquire and separate the rights of development from range and forest land along an stream that contains anadromous fisheries. Without further knowledge of the total extent of the streams, this reviewer cannot even assess the extent of impact on the total habitat for these fish species.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 166

New Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

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

01-N24, Battle Creek Riparian Protection, ERP.

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:

There were two related difficulties: first, after outlining six terms during the PSP process to be reconsidered, applicant raised several additional terms for renegotiation; and second, the State brought several terms back to the table as well. Both difficulties resulted in unanticipated negotiations over terms not raised during the PSP process which diverted considerable time as well as State resources. This situation was amplified due to NFWF's limited ability to negotiate contract terms.

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:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 166

New Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

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

98-F20, Deer and Mill Creeks Acquisition and Enhancement, 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:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 166

New Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

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)*

Acquisition of Southam Orchard Properties for Preservation of Riparian Habitat, CVPIA grant Hartley Island Acquisition, CVPIA 11332-7-G017 Singh Walnut Orchard, 11223-0-G014 L&L/Hamilton, 11332-7-G030 Birkes, 11332-8-G124 Dana, 11332-8-G048 Latimer, 11332-8-G123 Deer Creek Fencing, 11332-0-G016 Eagle Canyon (Pelton) Ranch, 11332-0-G104 Leininger easement, 11332-7-G030

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:

Other Comments:

Although none of the above AFRP funded projects were cited in this proposal, I have listed all the projects funded by the AFRP through The Nature Conservancy. Excellent contractor to work with. Always on time and within budget and provides high level products.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 166

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

Applicant must check with local agencies about whether local burn or other permits are 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:

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

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

If necessary permits are obtained, project is feasible.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 166

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship

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: