

Proposal Reviews

#167: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

The Nature Conservancy

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Sacramento Regional Review

External Scientific Review

#1

#2

#3

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

#1

#2

#3

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 167

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$1,927,032**

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

none

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This project's weak regional support precipitated negative public comments questioning the merit of this project's inclusion for directed action. But because the goals of the project have merit for ecosystem management, the panel recommends that the Nature Conservancy attempt to build regional support, carefully consider reducing costs of the project, and develop a sound research plan. The panel's recommendation to include this project as a directed actions stands.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 167

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

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

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

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

Note on "Amount":

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

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

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

Amount: **\$1,927,032.00**

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

none

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This is a research proposal directed at understanding the linkages between water flow and ecosystem function. The applicant proposes to develop strategies to achieve multi-species conservation benefits through a number of means. The ratings of this proposal were mixed and it received weak support from the regional reviewers because it lacked specific details for key sections of the proposed effort. The reviewers that supported the proposal with a high rating recognized the value of the proposed effort and the importance of this type of effort in restoration activities, not just in the CALFED area. The proposal has several technical drawbacks. They proposed hypotheses that are untestable and the investigators need to acknowledge that some elements may be at odds regardless of the flow condition. Although this project is directed at many CALFED and CVPIA goals, it lacks the specificity to properly evaluate the contributions it will make to improved management of at-risk species, riparian habitats or river processes. Weak public involvement and poor local support were noted by the regional reviewers. Those drawbacks combined with a need to interface with other efforts that have relevance to the proposed one and a large and poorly justified budget make this a strong candidate for possible reconsideration at a future date. If The Nature Conservancy carefully considers the remarks of the reviewers and develops a strategy to improve the basis for the scientific and technical merits of this proposal in collaboration with regional experts and the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study effort to model ecosystem function along the Sacramento River, this effort will be considered for a directed action. CALFED ERP staff, the ERP Independent Science Board and Science Program are available to help foster the collaboration necessary to make this proposal more acceptable.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 167

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

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

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

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

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	Technical reviewers rated this proposal as poor to excellent. The regional review rated it as low. However, they stated that the experimental component is important, particularly the components evaluating the importance of ecosystem processes in restoration efforts. To assure a more holistic and even consideration across disciplines the building block method approach should be separated from the geomorphology and cottonwood field studies. Future proposals would better address these shortcomings.
-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 are to use interdisciplinary workshops to identify multi-species flow regime recommendations, identify uncertainties, and develop quantitative models in order to generate testable hypotheses and study designs for addressing the uncertainties. Their stated hypothesis is to develop recommendations on the Sacramento River that will improve the viability of key, at risk species, riparian habitat communities, and river processes while meeting human demands. That is not testable. Rather they propose to generate hypotheses for further testing. The tasks listed appear to be specific objectives.

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 project strength is the fact that it illustrates how existing study results on fluvial geomorphology and riparian vegetation can help improve conceptual models. The technical reviewers felt that the project is feasible and likely to produce meaningful results. However the project does not document how success would be evaluated. The proposal presents a very uneven approach across disciplines. Fieldwork is focused only to getting better geomorphic data by building on some existing studies. Little attention is directed to other ecosystem components. For example the fluvial geomorphic processes are also very important to spawning selection and egg incubation by salmon, limited attention to invertebrates, etc., etc.

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?

The useful products would be developed hypotheses, recommendations for future studies proposed study designs. Applicants refer to a reduction in scientific uncertainty as a performance measure, but do not identify what uncertainty or give specific examples.

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

Appears reasonable but is hard to assess.

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?

Regional panel rated this project as low. They expressed concerns over the lack of local involvement and stated that many ecosystem models are being developed within the Sacramento River Conservation Area and it is important to integrate these efforts. Involvement of the local interests is vital in the building block method.

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?

Excellent prior performance reports. No budget or environmental compliance issues.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 167

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

Overall Ranking: XLow -Medium -High

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

The panel felt the research and scientific components of this model were excellent. However, the gaming and workshop processes were not clearly designed to achieve stakeholder involvement. The panel also felt the price tag for this project was too high.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

Yes -No

How?

Our yes is qualified. The proposal outlines scientifically feasible research. However, the panel was concerned with the design of the gaming model and workshop approach.

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

Yes -No

How?

The project addresses regional PSP priority 3, to develop mechanistic models as restoration tools, and priority 4, to conduct riparian vegetation research projects.

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?

Our no is qualified. This project is well coordinated with The Nature Conservancy's Sacramento River project. However, the project has not been approved by the Sacramento Conservation Area Non-Profit Organization. As in the case of other modeling project proposals, the panel was concerned that this effort might duplicate the Integrated Storage Investigation, or the Sacramento River or San Joaquin River comprehensive flood control studies. There are many ecosystem flow regime models being developed within the Sacramento River Conservation Area, and the panel felt it would be important to integrate these efforts.

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

-Yes XNo

How?

The workshop at the outset of the project seems designed more for scientists than stakeholders. Several panel members mentioned that the project had not been reviewed by local water users. The proposal did not identify other local people or institutions involved in the project.

Other Comments:

The panel felt the experimental component of this project is important, particularly components evaluating the importance of ecosystem process in restoration efforts.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **167**

Applicant Organization: **The Nature Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-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
X Excellent	This is a highly qualified group of people that have proposed a reasonable approach to an extremely important problem with relevance not only to the Sacramento River, but also to rivers in other parts of the world. Further experience with approaches such as this will enhance river restoration work around the globe.
-Good	
-Poor	

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

The goal of the proposal is to quantify the flow needs for a more naturalized flow regime in the Sacramento River between Red Bluff and Colusa. The goal is to determine a set of flow regimes that will meet human needs while also meeting ecosystem flow requirements such as improving viability of species at risk, improving riparian communities and allowing natural channel-forming processes to occur. This proposal deals with establishing ecosystem flow requirements and does not address human needs, which are being addressed in other research. The need to establish flow requirements that meet ecosystem needs is timely, important, and of interest to individuals working in other river basins. This is a very active area of research in the world today.

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?

Current flow regime work has focused on establishing baseflows, but this ignores other important aspects of the flow regime and has not adequately incorporated the Sacramento River. The need for the proposed research has been clearly identified, and it builds on existing knowledge of the ecosystem. Conceptual models of the process and of the ecosystem form the basis for the proposed 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 goals will be accomplished using facilitated workshops, targeted field work, and modeling. The field work seems focused on getting better geomorphic data, which is clearly needed. But they are not tackling the biological processes other than cottonwood growth and the usual attention to salmonids. This is what is commonly considered, but it would be useful to push the envelope and think about needs of other species and ecological processes. Some mention is made of centrarchids and amphibians, but this appears to be a minor part of what is being done. I note in Table 1, that there is very limited knowledge of invertebrates. Attention to ecosystem components other than salmonids and cottonwood would set this study apart from many others. The proposed workshop approach has a proven track record elsewhere and appears appropriate. The information being generated seems essential to decision-makers to enable them to balance human and ecosystem flow needs.

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 study builds on an existing study that examined impacts of flow on riverine geomorphology including riparian habitats. It also proposes using workshop and analytical approaches (e.g. building block methodology) that have been proven workable in other watersheds. It utilizes existing data and identifies area where further research is needed. It is clearly feasible with a fairly high likelihood of success. The scale seems appropriate for the project.

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

These are clearly indicated in Table 2.

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?

An assessment of ecosystem flow needs for the Sacramento River is a likely outcome of the project with very high value.

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 individuals involved in this proposal are all highly qualified for the work proposed. Nature Conservancy has been involved in similar efforts in other parts of the country and hence has considerable expertise in this field. The others involved have extensive experience both in the ecosystem and in the modeling expertise. The only weakness appears to be in the ecology of parts of the ecosystem other than salmonids and cottonwoods.

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

It seems to be.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **167**

Applicant Organization: **The Nature Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

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

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	Justification is weak for the goals, objectives, and hypotheses presented. Goals and objectives are only loosely related and tasks that are listed appear to be specific objectives.
-Good	
XPoor	

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

Goals, objectives, and one hypothesis are stated in this proposal. One goal listed focuses on the "naturalized flow regime", but objectives that follow are much broader than this specific goal. The goals listed are to evaluate recommendations, initiate (but not complete) research to reduce unlisted scientific uncertainties, and initiate (but not complete) quantitative modeling. The differentiation between objective 2 and 3 is not clear to me. A fourth goal is then listed in an additional paragraph to build on previous work, but it is also unclear how this previous work relates to the goal stated. Furthermore, the hypothesis posed is not testable or linked to the 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?

There is a broad justification section presented, but again, I am not sure how it is linked to the listed goals and objectives (perhaps very loosely, but not specifically). Furthermore, the applicants' promoting a "natural flow regime" (which I'm assuming refers to a paradigm rather than a general quality based on the citations listed) seems contradictory to a goal of determining flows based on environmental needs.

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 performance objectives listed involve presenting results to steering committees, stakeholders, and workshops, but I fail to see how these activities will document success. The author refers to a reduction in scientific uncertainty as a performance measure, but what uncertainty? What is considered a reduction?

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?

Unable to assess. While several of the subcontractors are highly regarded in their fields and no doubt capable of producing usable results, the proposal does not clearly articulate the application of these results.

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 objectives listed involve presenting results to steering committees, stakeholders, and workshops, but I fail to see how these activities will document success. The author refers to a reduction in scientific uncertainty as a performance measure, but what uncertainty? What is considered a reduction?

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?

Maybe.

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?

Again, several of the co-applicants/subcontractors listed are highly regarded scientists with a proven track record. However a project this large will require very careful coordination and project management. Its unclear to me who will be responsible for this and how it will be accomplished.

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

Difficult to assess.

Miscellaneous comments:

I'm sure that applicants put a significant amount of thought into this proposal, however it is riddled with spelling and grammar errors. I would be reluctant to give nearly 2 million dollars to an investigator or investigators that were not rigorous with detail at the proposal level.

A recommendation for the future for this proposal would be to narrow in on specific objectives rather than to try and tackle a large number of highly complex issues all at once. I was also surprised at the number of previously funded projects in the proposed study area (work undertaken by the applicants) when compared to the very few references to results from this work listed in the proposal justification.

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 167

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: **Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

Correct

Incorrect

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

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent	Very good proposal that is likely to generate Sacramento River specific testable hypotheses that decision-makers can use for evaluating the next round of proposals
<input type="checkbox"/> -Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> -Poor	

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

The goals are to use interdisciplinary workshops to identify multi-species flow regime recommendations, identify scientific uncertainties, develop quantitative models and generate testable hypotheses with study designs for addressing the uncertainties. Their stated hypothesis is to develop recommendations on the Sacramento River that will improve the viability of key, at risk species, riparian habitat communities, and river processes while meeting human demands. However this is not testable as parts of this project. Rather they propose to generate hypotheses as a result of workshops, field studies and computer based modeling This project is timely and important for improving understand of ecological processes in the Sacramento River.

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?

Their conceptual model is clear and justified. This builds upon previous work that identified information gaps by conducting field research and quantitative modeling.

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 is well designed to meet the objectives stated and should generate considerable information to increase the base of knowledge for stream corridor dynamics. This will be useful to decision-makers during future restoration efforts.

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 very feasible and likely to have a high degree 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?

Performance measures are clearly stated.

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 most useful product is likely to be recommendations for ecological flow needs along with hypotheses and information needs for filling scientific information gaps.

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?

Project investigators are experts in their fields and are experienced in the work proposed. Highly capable.

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

The proposed budget seems very reasonable for the level of effort proposed.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 167

New Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

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

97-N02, Sacramento River Floodplain Acquisition and Riparian Forest Restoration 97-N03, Sacramento River and Riparian Forest Restoration 97-N04, Sacramento River Meander Restoration 97-N08, Lower Mill Creek Riparian Restoration 97-N14a, Cosumnes Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration 01-N10, Cosumnes/Mokelumne Corridor Floodplain Acquisitions, Management, and Restoration Planning 01-N23, Staten Island Acquisition All 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?

-Yes XNo -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?

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?

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:

This is not a next phase project.

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 167

New Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

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

00-F03, Floodplain Acquisition and Sub-Reach/Site Specific Management Planning: Sac River (Red Bluff to Colusa); 98- F18 Floodplain Acquisition, Management and Monitoring on the Sac River; 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?

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?

-Yes -No XN/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Applicant has performed well in implementing previous projects.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 167

New Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

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 Leiningen 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?

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?

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: 167

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

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

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

Will have US Fish and Wildlife Service Special Use Permit for field work. No other permits or environmental documentation required.

***For the above permit, put "required" or "obtained" next to "Other" under the Federal Permits and Approvals on the Environmental Compliance Checklist**

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:

N/A

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: 167

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

Yes -No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: