Proposal Reviews

#252: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

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	

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 252

Applicant Organization: Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

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	**-**
Not Recommended	**X**

Amount: **$0**

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

none

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

Many aspects of this proposal received high marks from reviewers. The clarity of the proposal, the experience and expertise of the restoration team and the worthy goals of the project earned it high marks among some reviewers. The weakness in this effort relates to uncertainties regarding the quality of the material they propose to use in the restoration, the lack of innovation and high costs of the proposed methods and the lack of adequate background information on flow and sediment transport to sustain the restoration. The project as proposed was judged by reviewers to be too risky to fund at this time given the uncertainty regarding the quality of the restoration problems and the uncertain long-term benefits to the habitat. The Panel recommends waiting for ongoing analyses of the restoration materials to determine their suitability for use in stream restoration before proceeding with this project. It is also recommended that the applicant evaluate the problems of sediment budgets for the stream and explore the possibility of less expensive, but effective restoration strategies for this site. It is also recommended that this group foster additional regional support for this effort prior to resubmission.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

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

Proposal Number: 252

Applicant Organization: Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;
Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;
Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;
Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Superior	**The focus of the project was streambed nourishment and fluvial mechanics. These elements are essential for the proposed habitat development. Yet, long term streambed stability and grade controls were not clearly addressed. For the area being restored, the costs were extremely high. Other restoration techniques need to be explored.**
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-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 and objectives are clearly identified and defined. The hypotheses are well formed and explained. The proposed tests relate well to the hypotheses. As far as the expressed understanding of fluvial mechanics, the concepts are well argued. The study is timely and important. Most every aspect of the study is supported by theoretical or field experience, current research or CALFED's goals and objectives. What is missing is an understanding of the pre-settlement conditions and the role that biological life played in forming the stream systems. Biological feedback is not considered. The effects of extreme hydrologic events (e.g., >100-year floods) are not given enough attention. Relative to recent experience and more traditional engineering principles, the approach is reasonable. However, the role and effects of natural grade controls need to be better explained and incorporated into the design program. Still, the results of the project will be useful even if all of the habitat goals are not achieved. Since neither new nor innovative techniques are being used, the project results will

assess the traditional design approach.

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 documentation is excellent and the approach is feasible. The greatest risk of failure lies in the realm of hydrology. If sufficient inundation of the new landscapes is achieved, the proposed habitats will prosper. If a catastrophic flood occurs, the new channel and floodplain could be dramatically altered and the constructed habitats washed away. Both administrative and scientific measures are presented. The design, data base, and created landscapes are promised tangible products. The success (or failure) measures are presented and explained in detail.

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 products described above are clearly specified in the proposal and the delivery schedule is reasonable but a bit tight. The product of highest worth is the created landscape. Next in value is the assessment of the restoration approach. This result should be highly transferable.

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

   The project costs are high because grading is being used so extensively. The unit cost of the landscape is $84,000/acre. Accordingly, a greater effort should be made to reduce the need for grading. A plan might be formulated to restore only the land nearest the stream channel leaving lands further away as uplands. the power of the stream might be used to move bed material across the site. This may take more time but the results may be more natural in appearance and function. Structural grade controls should be reconsidered. The may be much less expensive and more effective in creating and sustaining the proper hydrologic conditions on the floodplain.

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

   The Sacramento Regional Review is low. Concern was raised over the cost. Alternative site was suggested where monitoring could be done without the expense of restoration.

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

   No administrative issues have been raised.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 252

Applicant Organization: Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

Overall Ranking: **X**Low **-**Medium **-**High

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

The committee recognized that Clear Ck is a demonstration stream for CALFED, but the committee also felt that the costs shown in this proposal were high for the type of work that is proposed.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

   -Yes **X**No

   How?

   The true benefits to Clear Ck restoration activities could be better ascertained by monitoring Saeltzer Dam.

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

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Yes, the floodway would be rehabilitated.

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?

   The project is linked with a variety of ongoing efforts.

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

   XYes **-**No

   How?

Multiple other agencies/institutions are involved in this project.

Other Comments:

So many projects have been occuring on Clear Ck that this project could be re-considered in the near future. Some panel members wondered if this phase of the project was ready.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **252**

Applicant Organization: **Western Shasta Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3**

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:

<u>Excellent:</u> outstanding in all respects;
<u>Good:</u> quality but some deficiencies;
<u>Poor:</u> serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Excellent	**The proposal is well organized and well written. Given the systematic application of scientific principles and a robust monitoring program, much useful information should flow from the project. And, some very diverse habitats should be created.**
XGood	
-Poor	

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

   The goals and objectives are clearly identified and defined. The hypotheses are well formed and explained. The proposed tests relate well to the hypotheses. As far as the expressed understanding of fluvial mechanics, the concepts are well argued. The study is timely and important.

2. **<u>Justification.</u>** 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?

Most every aspect of the study is supported by theoretical or field experience, current research or CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Plan. What is missing is an understanding of the pre-settlement conditions and the role that biological life played in forming the stream systems. Biological feedback is not considered. The effects of extreme hydrologic events (e.g., >100-year floods) are not given enough attention.

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?

   Relative to recent experience and more traditional engineering principles, the approach is reasonable. However, the role and effects of natural grade controls need to be better explained and incorporated into the design program. Still, the results of the project will be useful even if all of the habitat goals are not achieved. Since neither new nor innovative techniques are being used, the project results will assess the traditional design approach.

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 documentation is excellent and the approach is feasible. The greatest risk of failure lies in the realm of hydrology. If sufficient inundation of the new landscapes is achieved, the proposed habitats will prosper. If a catastrophic flood occurs, the new channel and floodplain could be dramatically altered and the constructed habitats washed away.

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

   Both administrative and scientific measures are presented. The design, data base, and created landscapes are promised tangible products. The success (or failure) measures pre presented and explained in detail.

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

   The products described above are clearly specified in the proposal and the delivery schedule is reasonable but a bit tight. The product of highest worth is the created landscape. Next in value is the assessment of the restoration approach. This result should be highly transferable.

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

   The project team is well qualified. They have worked together on similar project. They appear to have or have access to the necessary tools and facilities to accomplish the necessary work.

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

   The project costs are high because grading is being used so extensively. The unit cost of the landscape is $84,000/acre. Accordingly, a greater effort should be made to reduce the need for grading. A plan might be formulated to restore only the land nearest the stream channel leaving lands further away as uplands. the power of the stream might be used to move bed material across the site. This may take more time but the results may be more natural in appearance and function. Structural grade controls should be reconsidered. The may be much less expensive and more effective in creating and sustaining the proper hydrologic conditions on the floodplain.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **252**

Applicant Organization: **Western Shasta Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3**

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:

<u>Excellent:</u> outstanding in all respects;
<u>Good:</u> quality but some deficiencies;
<u>Poor:</u> serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**-comprehensive listing of hypotheses cross-referenced to monitoring program -peer-reviewed conceptual plan founded in sound science -broad participation of multiple agencies and volunteer groups -excellent matching funds with potential for more matching -follows through on substantial commitments from prior projects -broad base of public support from previous educational efforts -good ratio of on the ground work to management except in consultants fees for revegetation efforts.**
-Good	
-Poor	

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

   The project goal was developed using a team approach and has support of local, state, and federal agencies. The goal will be met by achieving five specific objectives, which are clearly identified and described. The interesting and important hypothesis as to whether a highly regulated river can be successfully restored at a lower potential energy level than before dam construction is spelled out in detail. The overall hypothesis is supported by six primary hypotheses, each of which is clearly defined by sub-tasks. The project appears to be internally consistent. It is timely because (1) Saeltzer dam has been removed; (2) lands adjoining the project are not currently under private control, and (3) objectives have been

combined from previous CALFED proposals.

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?

   Sufficient prior work, planning, coordination, and peer review justify this full-scale implementation project. The conceptual plan explains in a simple way why a river reach downstream from a large dam will change. The statements, based on a mature understanding of hydraulics, sediment transport, and geomorphology, naturally lead to the project objectives. The justification has been peer-reviewed, as is apparent from the logic and soundness of the scientific statements.

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 a logical extension of previously completed phases of the overall restoration project. Because the approach is so well documented with sub-hypotheses and tasks, the information generated during monitoring will be present new looks at increased sediment mobility in a scaled-down geomorphic environment. Each of the three parts of the project will likely contribute separate and useful information for decision-makers. The project as a whole may become a landmark in restoration strategy.

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?

   Feasibility includes overcoming technical, regulatory, and cooperative hurdles. The project should be a technical success based upon the sound understanding of Lower Creek and the bases described in the conceptual plan. Because regulations can be complex, overlapping and even conflicting, the writers have done a careful job to show how each applicable regulatory prescription will be met. Finally, because budgetary and technical tasks have been so carefully assigned to appropriate agencies, there is an excellent chance that all involved will cooperate instead of create obstacles.

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?

   A separate monitoring plan has already been submitted previously for all phases of the overall project. In addition, detailed monitoring for channel processes is described for this specific phase of the project. The monitoring activities are a logical outgrowth of the detailed sub-hypotheses and should provide adequate measures of project performance. Perhaps because of referring to Appendices E and F, no mention is made in the proposal about (1) continuing monitoring after the three year project, and (2) as to why year one monitoring expresses ($235K) are so high.

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?

A generous budget is allocated for education. Past activities were described (brochures, workshops, tours, forums), but no specific activities are described for this project. The product, of course, is expected to be a fully restored river/riparian zone. Documenting the product receives only passing attention in the proposal.

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

   The project team includes experts with proven restoration experience in all phases of the proposed work: geomorphology, fisheries, hydraulics, aquatic biota, and riparian vegetation. Continued participation through the entire project is likely because several key personnel work in the agencies that are mandated to do this kind of work. Previous cooperative efforts ensure that organizational infrastructure will work to help, and not hinder, the project. The track record of the principals includes several completed projects in the Lower Creek and nearby watersheds. Peer review of all phases will evidently continue with assistance from scientific contributors. Minimal but competent overall project management is provided without costly payments made to each agency.

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

   The large budget is made more palatable by (1) matching of more than $1 million and (2) the completion of several significant projects in the reach. However, the services and consultants portion of the riparian revegetation budget appears to be excessive ($175K) without more detailed descriptions of the services provided.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **252**

Applicant Organization: **Western Shasta Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3**

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:

<u>Excellent:</u> outstanding in all respects;
<u>Good:</u> quality but some deficiencies;
<u>Poor:</u> serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Excellent	**This proposal is intriguing but I have major concerns over the geomorphic aspects. The site is extremely important ecologically but I am not convinced that the sediment delivery to the restored reach will be adequate to maintain the channel and floodplain.**
-Good	
XPoor	

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

   The PIs are clear about what they propose. They provide nice documents from work done previously e.g., 20 page brochure Conceptual Plan for Restoration of the Lower Creek Floodway; although the proposal was excessively long with lots of small print and images that did not download well from the website). The idea is timely - with the removal of Saeltzer Dam, steelhead now have access to move upstream into Clear Creek. The goals, objective and hypotheses are consistent. My concern is not with these but with the methods and details of the plan.

2. **<u>Justification.</u>** 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?

I am not convinced this work is justified. While the conceptual model is very clearly stated what they lack is any serious attention to sediment sources. Certainly refilling areas of Clear Creek that were mined will be an interesting project (especially to see how the floodplain continues to develop and how much lateral bar migration there is) BUT with no sediment sources from upstream (Whiskeytown Dam traps the sediment), I find it hard to believe their restoration will be anything more than a temporary fix obviously they must realize this but they pay inadequate attention to documenting how temporary it is using geomorphic and hydrologic measurements. I have no idea how long it will take for the sediment they infill to be transported downstream, but for them to assume mostly lateral migration and that they can restore an equilibrium grade (their words) to minimize downstream sediment transport seems very naïve. It is actually rather surprising especially given the apparent prior input from several geomorphologists. I found myself wondering two things: 1) to they have plans to continue the inputs of sediment over long periods to time? 2) with out doing a sediment budget, how will they know how long the restored channel is likely to persist and how much of an input is required and over what time?

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?

   I think the idea of asking: can a scaled-down dynamic alluvial river be restored under a highly regulated setting is an excellent question. Unfortunately without a detailed study of sediment transport at the sites and taking into account how sediment starved their 1.8 mile stretch is, they are setting themselves up for failure over some unknown time. It is not clear how they can restore sediment transport processes (their works; see page 3 of their objective list) when there is no upstream source of sediment?. I worry that this is an example of the incredible desire to restore a reach that is very important ecologically, without doing the requisite physical studies. They mention gemorphic measurements and even once mention at 2D model but do not detail how or if these will be used to determine grading and instream restoration. At the very least, they need to document sediment transport out of the reach (downstream) and determine how much sediment is required to maintain the channel.

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?

   They can certainly do the infilling by using the mining tailings. They do not indicate the level of mercury in this material (but do admit it may be a problem) and that seems like something that should be done prior to moving the material. Further, as pointed out in 3) above, I do not think the scale is appropriate. It is hard to imagine them restoring an equilibrium grade to discourage future channel downcutting (page 7) without an upstream sediment source.

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

   Yes, they are measuring habitats features, particle size distribution on the bed, etc. and this all looks sound except for the claim that they are restoring sediment transport processes (page 3).

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?

   They will know if they can maintain a small reach that is part of a larger regulated river system. If they add the sediment budget to this, perhaps it will be of great value to other work in the area.

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 directors seem well qualified

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

   A very expensive restoration project given that it is likely to have a finite (and maybe short)lifespan and the mercury issue may be significant.

Miscellaneous comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 252

New Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

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

   99-N16, A Clear Creek Prescription, 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?

   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:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 252

New Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

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

   98- F15, Lower Clear Creek Floodway Restoration Project, Phase II, 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?

   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:

Cooperator submits timely and accurate quarterly reports and is very responsive to Project Officer inquiries.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 252

New Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

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

   98-F15 Lower Clear Creek Floodway Restoration Project Restoration 99N16 Clear Creek Prescription Restoration

   (We are not the project manager/s.)

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

   #19 on the PSP form PROJECT INFORMATION lists the following projects (we note that NONE of these projects were funded with AFRP program funds; we were not the project manager for any of these projects): 8-FG-20-16890 Phase 1 Lower Clear Creek Channel AFRP 7-FG-20-14610 Lower Clear Creek Fuel Inventory AFRP 7-FG-20-14720 Lower Clear Creek Photographic Survey AFRP 7-FG-20-15290 Lower Clear Creek Spawing Gravel AFRP 6-FG-20-14249 Lower Clear Creek CRMP AFRP 7-FG-20-14560 Lower Clear Creek Erosion Inventory AFRP Have you previously received funding from CVPIA for other projects not listed above? Yes If yes, identify project number(s), title(s) and CVPIA program. 00FG200079 Lower Clear Creek Spawning Gravel AFRP 01FG23718 Lower Clear Creek Spawing Gravel AFRP 01FG2000131 Lower Clear Creek Phase 3 Designs and Permits AFRP

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact 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?

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

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

   The projects listed as being funded by AFRP are incorrect; we believe that these projects were funded by CVPIA b (12) Clear Ck program.

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

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

If no, please explain deficiencies:

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

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

   If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

We are not the project managers for this project, so we cannot speak specifically on the project readiness-for-next phase funding, etc; we can say that our other dealings with WSRCD (Battle Ck projects funded with AFRP $ have been excellent).

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 252

Applicant Organization: Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

   Obtaining a 2081/Incidental Take Permit also requires obtaining a Scientific Collecting Permit.

   All other required permits and environmental documents will be obtained and filed.

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

   Budget and timeline for permits and environmental documents adequate.

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

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 252

Applicant Organization: Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

Proposal Title: Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Phase 3

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

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

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

   XYes **-**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?

   XYes **-**No

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

   17A = $6,798,641.00 Total Requested = $6,798,641.00

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

   XYes **-**No

If no, please explain:

There's a lot of explanatory text in the Budget Justification.

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes **X**No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: