

# Proposal Reviews

## #172: Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

The Nature Conservancy

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

#1

**External Scientific Review**

#2

#3

#4

#1

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding**

#2

#3

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Final Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 172

**Applicant Organization:** The Nature Conservancy

**Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

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

Amount: **\$1,488,009**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The Sacramento Valley Landowners Association's support for funding of this project is noted.**

**Comments have been received requesting more time for public input on this proposal. The CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program remains fully committed to local input and has provided opportunity for public involvement at multiple steps in the 2002 proposal solicitation and review process. Proposals have been available to the public since last fall, and local governments and watershed groups, including the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum (whose comments asked for more time to review this proposal), were notified of proposals in their area. The process also included regional review panels comprised of individuals with local expertise and perspectives. Because of the extensive technical and regional reviews, and the unexpectedly large number of proposals this year, the process has taken longer than anticipated. The final recommendation and subsequent funding decisions are long overdue. The 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package identified a 30-day public review period, and the ERP honored that commitment. While the Selection Panel agrees that additional time would help some parties, the panel does not recommend extending the comment period for this years process**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 172

**Applicant Organization:** The Nature Conservancy

**Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

#### **Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund**

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

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

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

#### **Note on "Amount":**

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

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

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

Amount: **\$1,488,009**

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

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**Protection of the Sacramento River meanderbelt is a CALFED Record of Decision Stage 1 action. This proposal represents an important planning phase in implementing riparian corridor protection and restoration in the context of floodplain management, for a 20 mile sub-reach of the river. The stakeholder involvement process is a major strength of the sub-reach planning approach, especially in the subject reach. Applicants are encouraged at this stage to take steps to strengthen adaptive management - research design for future implementation plan phases.**

# Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

**Proposal Number:** 172

**Applicant Organization:** The Nature Conservancy

**Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

**Review:**

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

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

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

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

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

<b>Overall Evaluation Summary Rating</b>	<b>Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating</b>
-Superior	<b>All reviews were excellent to good. The proposed project will plan the restoration of a large reach of the Sacramento River. The potential for influencing a large area or long reach of floodplain is a strength of this proposal. The proposed data collection will support more effective planning. Careful attention to the stakeholder process described in the proposal would enhance the project. The panel strongly encourages the applicants to devote substantial time and effort in the planning phase to developing explicit hypotheses as well as plans for actions. These hypotheses are essential for 1) developing appropriate actions and 2) capturing the greatest benefit of this substantial investment for regional restoration.</b>
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?

**The proposal calls for planning protection and restoration of a 20-mi reach of the Sacramento River. The potential for influencing a large area or long reach of floodplain is a strength of this proposal. Objectives for planning and stakeholder involvement are generally defined. The proposal justifies the project based on prior assessment. It involves flood control, riparian restoration, and stakeholder participation. This was one of the few proposals that addressed a continuous riparian corridor of substantial length. The hypotheses are vague, weakly related, and not testable. The applicants could strengthen this aspect in their planning process. There is an explicit conceptual framework, but it is not clear to what extent that framework influences the study.**

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?

**There is a reasonable likelihood that the proposed restoration efforts will be a success. The measures of performance are generally adequate from a planning perspective. They are mostly based on planning performance. Stakeholder processes are poorly described, and this is a critical but complex task.**

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 project will moderately increase the understanding of the Bay Delta Watershed. The project has a high likelihood of contributing to the restoration of floodplain vegetation and function. The project has potential for contributing to the recovery of sensitive species in this reach of the Sacramento River. The outcome of this proposal has substantial significance to decision makers involved in this section of the river. Ecologists and environmental scientists will gain from the proposed restoration project, especially if additional study funds are available and implementation includes statistically sound monitoring programs or experimental manipulations.**

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

**The budget is extremely large at \$1.5 million (or \$1.3 million, see budget discrepancy). For a planning effort, this seems disproportionate to the task. Roughly a third of the budget is allocated for coordination and outreach. This is a central element of the proposed actions, but this seems to be an enormous budget for outreach and coordination. Many successful projects accomplish these tasks for far less.**

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 review ranked the proposal as High.**

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?

**Administrative reviews noted prior problems with renegotiation of past projects. Most comments were favorable. Proposal lacked sufficient detail to assess need for permits. There are several budgetary discrepancies and a difference of \$144,965.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**None**

## Sacramento Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 172

**Applicant Organization:** The Nature Conservancy

**Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

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

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

**The panel felt this was high priority for the region. Multi-faceted planning effort on 22 miles of the Sacramento River. There is a high level of stakeholder involvement.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**This proposal closely involves the Sacramento River Conservation Area (SRCA) Board and TAC. Very open process and involves locals at all levels.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Directly addresses CALFEDs ERP priority #1 for the Sacramento Region to develop and implement habitat management and restoration actions in collaboration with local groups such as the Sacramento River Conservation Area Non-Profit Organization.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**All restoration activities within the SRCA are presented to the SRCA Technical Advisory Committee and the Board of Directors for input and guidance. Will also closely coordinate with the COE Comp Study and USFWS CCP.**

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

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The proposed planning effort involves the SRCA Board and TAC which is comprised of many local land owners and local institutional representatives. Proposes public outreach meetings for review and input.**

Other Comments:

**Essential "next step" in SRCA development.**



# External Scientific: #1

## Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 172

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: **Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164**

### 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
XExcellent	<b>The overall assessment of the project is ;°Excellent.;± This is a project with high merit and large potential benefits for the Colusa to Princeton sub-reach and as a model for collaborative planning on other river sub-reaches. Involvement of local stakeholders, consideration of both flood control and ecological benefits, and use of models to provide technical assessments all will be important components of planning for riparian corridor restoration. Gaining support from local interests will be especially important if one goal of the Sacramento River Conservation Area is to re-establish a limited active meander belt throughout the riparian corridor. Comprehensive planning, with coordination among the various interests, is a necessary first step. Although the cost seems relatively high for a planning project, this project appears to be a good investment.</b>
-Good	
-Poor	

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

**The goal is relatively clear: To engage in sub-reach scale restoration planning with high input and involvement of stakeholders, in order to develop alternative plans specifically tailored to the physical, political, economic, and ecological conditions of this 20-mile sub-reach and that balance various uses/interests on the river. To help achieve this, TNC will**

directly collaborate with the Sacramento River Conservation Area Nonprofit Organization (SRCA NPO) a locally-based citizens group set up in the management plan (from the California State Legislature) for the river. This goal will have several component objectives: ensure an open and inclusive planning process where stakeholder concerns are well-represented (through meetings, workshops, etc.), collect/synthesize baseline and existing data for planning, build tools and models used in the assessment or development of alternative plans, develop the design alternatives and seek support for implementation projects in the sub-reach, and conduct research (on large woody debris) to address questions/concerns of stakeholders. The applicants state as their hypothesis that this approach will improve local support for restoration efforts and will help design projects that balance multiple floodplain use concerns.

A larger goal is to preserve the existing riparian habitat within this reach, restore a continuous riparian corridor, and reestablish natural fluvial/geomorphic/ecological dynamics through limited channel meander within the inner river zone (IRZ). The focus of this proposal appears to be on planning for process restoration in the IRZ. Clearly, accomplishment of this task over the scale of 20 river miles, with most of the land in private ownership and with important political and agricultural concerns, will require closely working with stakeholders to determine mutually acceptable/beneficial river restoration and management plans. This strategic approach, which will try to incorporate various interests on the river and will work directly with the SRCA NPO, is a timely and important one for achieving restoration on 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?

The conceptual basis for this project seems sound. The underlying conceptual model is that comprehensive planning for large-scale restoration initiatives must take into account the interests and input of the people and political entities on the land. There appears to be interest by many of the involved parties in developing a comprehensive plan for restoration and management of the area, rather than a piecemeal, uncoordinated approach. As indicated above, management of a continuous riparian corridor with restoration of natural channel processes (including limited meandering) will require careful consideration of human land uses, infrastructure, etc. TNC will integrate stakeholder involvement to a much greater degree than in previous projects, based on lessons learned from two earlier CALFED-funded sub-reach planning projects. A full-scale implementation project is justified, based on the need for comprehensive planning that will lay the groundwork for future sub-reach specific restoration projects.

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?

Each task in the approach directly corresponds to and addresses one of the stated objectives of the project. These are: (1) coordination/outreach and plan development, (2) baseline assessment, (3) modeling of alternatives, (4) planning for specific sites or projects, and (5) conducting research to address landowner concerns. Overall, the approach seems well-designed and appropriate for incorporating public involvement, as well as technical and strategic aspects of sub-reach planning. Collaboration of TNC with the SRCA NPO, a group of citizens who live and work in the area, will provide a direct link to stakeholder interests. Much of the public involvement will be achieved through coordination with the SRCA NPO in the form of an Advisory group made up of private interests, quarterly meetings of the advisory group, outreach

and education activities directed toward landowners, as well as meetings with other agencies involved in planning and conservation on the river. Many of the details of this are not spelled out in the proposal, but this may be by necessity an evolving process. The coordination and outreach phase of the project will require a consultant with strong abilities in committee leadership/facilitation and public outreach. TNC will collaborate with SRCA to develop ideas for possible restoration projects, and will be responsible for taking the lead on technical aspects of the work (including hiring consultants) and will oversee the project.

One minor criticism is that more detail could have been given on technical aspects of the project, such as the proposed hydraulic, vegetation, and land use models, particularly since these comprise a large part (about 1/3) of the project budget.

The approach is designed primarily to develop a comprehensive plan on this particular sub-reach. However, this approach could lead to innovative restoration initiatives that balance ecological and human/economic interests in the floodplain. Other lessons learned from project coordination, outreach, and stakeholder involvement could be useful in future restoration planning. The collaboration of TNC with the SRCA also seems to be a plus, and could help to develop the SRCA capabilities for planning management and restoration of the river corridor.

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

The approach is well-documented overall and appears to be technically feasible. The feasibility or likelihood of success of specific restoration projects that arise out of the planning effort cannot be known prior to their development. But, the outlined approach for engaging stakeholder input and coming up with restoration plans tailored to this particular sub-reach seems sound, and a necessary step for ensuring the success of future restoration projects. Strong public involvement and support would be a real plus to long-term restoration work on the river.

TNC staff have strong technical, ecological, and project management expertise and will be contracting hydraulic modeling out to Ayres Associates, an engineering firm with extensive experience on the Sacramento River and elsewhere in hydraulic modeling.

The scale of the project is consistent with the objectives, in terms of laying the groundwork for restoration projects and creation of a riparian corridor over a 20-mile stretch of river.

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

The performance measures are appropriate to the project objectives. Most of these are primarily to measure or document attainment of project management goals (i.e., that certain tasks have been completed). Some performance measures are difficult to quantify, such as agency support. Ultimately, the project will be successful if it results in plans for ecosystem restoration/flood management projects that are approved by the citizen advisory board and the agencies. This project will also evaluate the success of outreach by surveying landowners attitudes and concerns before and after initiation of outreach. Citizen participation will be assessed by quantifying attendance of advisory group meetings. Few details are given for how the success of technical aspects of the project will be assessed, other than the completion of reports and the assessment of sensitivity and accuracy for the hydraulic, land use, and vegetation models. Specific measures for these may be difficult to define prior to project initiation. Since this will be

purely a planning project, there is no monitoring proposed, although some baseline ecological and other data will be collected.

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 primary products will be technical reports, quarterly newsletters and meetings, a sub-reach plan that evaluates different alternative management actions, and surveys of landowner concerns and attitudes pre- and post-project. Development of good hydraulic, land use, and vegetation models and linkage of model projections with the GIS database will provide useful tools for the planning process and for evaluating different project designs. The most important products will be implementation and testing of a planning process that involves input by local stakeholders to come up with balanced floodplain restoration/management plans. If successful, this approach could serve as a model for sub-reach planning elsewhere. Development of an actual plan for restoring and managing a riparian corridor within this sub-reach, with both local and agency support, would in itself be an important product.

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 track record of TNC on past projects appears to be strong. TNC has been involved with conservation/management issues on the Sacramento River for more than 10 years through their Sacramento River Project. The Sacramento River project has helped protect more than 18,000 acres of riparian land within the Sacramento River Conservation area and helped restore more than 2,800 acres to riparian habitats. TNC's project team has expertise in restoration, planning, project management, economic development, and technical issues of hydrology and ecology. The project leader, Mike Roberts, has extensive experience with restoration planning and implementation on the Sacramento River. The SRCA NPO has the necessary structure, local stakeholder representation, and the legislative mandate to coordinate floodplain restoration and management on the Sacramento River and to incorporate the input of various stakeholders. Technical oversight is also provided by the organization's technical advisory subcommittee. Although not all technical subcontractors are named in the proposal, Ayres Associates has strong expertise in hydraulic modeling, with other projects on the Sacramento and elsewhere

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

There seems to be a discrepancy in the amount requested. The budget shows a total of 1.34 million, while the rest of the proposal asks for about \$1.49 million. The budget is split nearly equally among the various project tasks, with modeling, baseline assessment, site-specific planning, and research on landowner questions each costing about \$220,000 (about \$150,000 each for services and consultants directly). Coordination and outreach makes up the biggest part of the budget, at about \$450,000. This phase of the project involves the most salary support (for TNC?) and contractor costs (\$180,000). Funds allocated to each of the modeling activities are as follows: \$50,000 for vegetation modeling, \$50,000 for land use modeling, and \$75,000 for hydraulic modeling. There may be opportunities for cutting cost on some of the modeling, although there is not adequate detail in the report to assess this. The land use and hydraulic modeling components of the study appear to be particularly valuable.

**All in all, this is a project with high merit and high potential benefits for management of this 20-mile sub-reach of the river and as a model for sub-reach planning elsewhere. It also sets a good precedent in terms of stakeholder input and collaboration. Although this seems relatively expensive for a planning project, the potential payoffs are high, making this project a good investment for CALFED.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**No details are given about TNC's Conservation by Design process. How will Conservation by Design be implemented in this project?**

**It might be useful to have more details about the approaches used in the modeling component of this project. While much of this will need to be flexible to project needs, a more detailed description would be helpful for reviewing the cost-benefit of the modeling and its usefulness in assessing different project plans.**

## External Scientific: #2

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 172

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: **Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164**

#### 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
-Excellent	<b>This proposal will address restoration of a large area of the Sacramento River floodplain. That is its major strength. . The planners should consider sequencing their efforts to take advantage of natural processes of floodplain inundation and vegetative recolonization. We have included stakeholders in planning alternative future scenarios. This is a critical process and more attention to an interactive processes rather than a series of meetings could strengthen the effort. This effort could yield valuable information if the design, hypotheses, and reference systems are carefully considered.</b>
XGood	
-Poor	

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

**The proposal clearly calls for planning protection, and restoration of a 20-mi reach of the Sacramento River. Objectives for planning and stakeholder involvement are generally defined.**

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 justifies the project based on prior assessment. There is an explicit conceptual framework, but it is not clear to what extent that framework influences the study.**

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?

**There is a reasonable likelihood that the proposed restoration efforts will be a 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 measures of performance are generally adequate from a planning perspective.**

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 project will moderately increase the understanding of the Bay Delta Watershed. The project has a high likelihood of contributing to the restoration of floodplain forests. The project has potential for contributing to the recovery of sensitive species. The outcome of this proposal has substantial significance to decision makers. Ecologists and environmental scientists will gain from the proposed restoration project, especially if additional study funds are available.**

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 is extremely large at \$1.3 million. This is generally consistent with the scope of the work.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

# External Scientific: #3

## Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 172

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: **Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164**

### 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	<b>The planning process needs to be reconsidered. The proposed level of effort seems to exceed the import of the results. Much is already known about public attitudes, and should be known about the attitudes of those affected by the project, so less effort should be required.</b>
<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 goals and objectives are clear but the hypotheses make no sense. They make no sense in the context of a planning study. Whether the hypotheses are true or false, if such a determination can be made, is largely subjective and may change from one time period to another.**

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?



**Enough evidence is presented to justify the proposed work. The planning model is reasonable and, given my experience, has a solid basis. The success of such planning models would argue that a full-scale planning effort be undertaken.**

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

**The approach is reasonably standard. It is not likely to generate novel results but it will result in the development of a plan that can be implemented. The plan should be useful to other planners and decision-makers.**

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

**The proposed plan development is feasible. Baring conflict with adjoining landowners or trade associations, the plan should be a 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?

**The performance measures are the products. The nature of the plan, at this point is necessarily vague. The number and types of meetings are outlined and the reports defined. Performance only can be measured by the quality of these products.**

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?

**These are described in Section 5.**

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

**The staff seems well qualified and familiar with the region and the resource base.**

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

**This is an extremely expensive planning process. One task that seems out of line is the coordination and outreach. It accounts for a third of the total \$1.5 million budget.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## External Scientific: #4

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: 172

Applicant Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Proposal Title: **Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164**

#### 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
XExcellent	<b>The strategy and resources to be employed are well suited to the goals and objectives of the project, which are themselves of great import and urgency. If we are to preserve as much of the remaining 18% of the historic riparian zone, carefully crafted, stakeholder-supported, and well-informed programs such as those likely to result from this proposal are needed. I am impressed with the stakeholder participation strategy and I am confident that the approach incorporates lessons derived from the prior pilot projects.</b>
-Good	
-Poor	

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

**The goals are stated very clearly and are internally consistent. Goals: To provide planning information to support informed decision-making regarding restoration efforts; To provide for stakeholder participation in the planning process; To gather relevant and necessary information for planning purposes; To evaluate potential approaches and alternatives for restoration; develop and build stakeholder support for restoration projects.**

**The stated objectives, put simply, are to generate site-specific planning information, taking third party impacts into account, such that a sound restoration projects can be designed and implemented with the cooperation/input from stakeholders. The**

**Hypotheses: Good science combined with an open participatory process will produce both a technically effective, and a publically supported project, thus enhancing the likelihood of project success.**

**A potential weakness/obstacle to the approach is that while the advisory role of stakeholders does increase opportunities for stakeholder input, but it is not clear how much influence stakeholders can or should have in order to realize the stated goals. How will they manage efforts to build stakeholder support for the implementation of a specific restoration project when they come into conflict with restoration objectives?**

**An outreach and education program is proposed, as well as the facilitation of an Advisory Group. The emphasis is properly place on local stakeholder participation. However, this approach has the greatest potential for success if the outreach is appropriately sustained and if the Advisory Group is sufficiently large enough to include stakeholders within the local ae and representatives from outside the immediate area that face similar issues.**

**Concept: The need for the project is made apparent, given the cited loss of habitat, and the concept is clearly important and timely.**

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 full scale implementation project is warranted given the prior pilot projects undertaken to form the basis of the sub reach planning project. There is a clear need for site specific information and planning, and a clear need for the development of approaches that successfully integrate stakeholders and to address their concerns. The need and the prior work justify the project being undertaken as a full scale implementation project.**

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

**As discussed above the project's approach has great potential for the success of the current project and future projects that must navigate the morass of stakeholder participation in planning processes. I expect the resulting information to be very useful to decision-makers and to go a long way towards the development of a practical restoration effort for the sites involved. I would like to see as inclusive an Advisory Group as can be managed with the available staff resources(consultants included). I believe this would have benefits for the immediate project and for the development of similar approaches for other projects.**

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 in its information gathering aspects, but success of the outreach, and support building aspects will depends upon the demands of the stakeholders and upon diverse representation (technical diversity and interest diversity)within the advisory group.**

**Given sufficient depth and diversity the approach is also feasible in this aspect. Effective implementation of the education and outreach component is also critical.**

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?

**I have no significant concerns here given the detail provided.**

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 resulting products will be of great value to restoration efforts. The considerable undertaking of gathering planning information and developing designs in a cooperative structure, with stakeholders, will produce valueable products. Specifically, the development of environmental evaluation models, the generation of site-specific planning information, and information gathering techniques, and public/stakeholder participation strategies will all prove valueable to monitoring and interpretive efforts.**

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

**The partnership has the technical expertise and experience to succeed with the project. They will hire presumable highly qualified consultants for certain portions of the work which therefore need not be a concern. The project is complex but the partnership has the experience and professional background to manage it.**

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

**The budget is well proportioned and takes the critical role of outreach and coordination seriously. It seems sufficient for the tasks identified over the three year period.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 172

New Proposal Title: Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

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 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:

**The proposed project is not a next phase project.**

Other Comments:

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

**New Proposal Number:** 172

**New Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

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

**00-F03 Flood plain acquisition and sub-reach/site specific management planning: Sacramento River (Red Bluff to Colusa); 98-F18, Flood plain 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 contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

-Yes -No N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**This cooperator as performed well. Submission of quarterly reports and billings have been timely and complete, and the Project Officer has been kept well informed of project status and issues.**



## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3**

**New Proposal Number:** 172

**New Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

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?

**X**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?

**X**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?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

**X**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?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**Excellent contractor to work with. Always on time and within budget and provides high level products.**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 172

**Applicant Organization:** The Nature Conservancy

**Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

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

-Yes No

If no, please explain:

**Not sure:**

**Task 2 and task 4 data collection activities are not described in sufficient detail to ascertain whether or not permitting and/or environmental documentation would be required.**

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

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

**If there are no environmental permitting or documentation requirements.**

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:** 172

**Applicant Organization:** The Nature Conservancy

**Proposal Title:** Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164

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:

**The Budget Summary does not reflect costs for Program Management, however, the Budget Justification briefly lists costs for Program Management as contracting, inspections, and reporting. Program Management costs are calculated as part of the Salaries.**

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).

**\$144,965 difference**

**No Cost Share partners identified.**

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: