1998 Integration Panel Recommendations
Recommended Funding by Topic Area

A. Fish Passage Assessment (Bureau of Reclamation): Five projects were recommended for funding for a total of $734,225. This is over the budgeted amount of $500,000 for this topic area. Due to low attendance and limited representation at the Technical Review Panel (TRP) meeting, the Integration Panel felt that each of these proposal should be re-evaluated. A subgroup of the Integration Panel reviewed each of the proposals and concurred with the TRP recommendation except in the case of A1004 which is still under review and A1005 which was deemed ecologically important and recommended for funding. The Roundtable had concerns about A1005 which was an evaluation of the feasibility of removal of Englebright Dam on the Yuba River because of lack of coordination with several key local players. CALFED staff proposes that A1005 be funded as a directed program with local coordination including the original applicants, the South Yuba Citizens League, as well as with the Yuba County Water Agency, PG&E, and Yuba and Nevada counties.

B. Fish Passage and Related Screen Improvements (Bureau of Reclamation): Nine projects were recommended for funding for a total of $4,112,305. This is below the $5,750,000 budgeted for this topic area. The Integration Panel generally concurred with the TRP recommendation except in the case of B1001 and B1010. The Integration Panel felt that screens in the Suisun Marsh were of lower priority, relative to competing proposals and decided not to fund these screens.

C. Floodplain Management and Habitat Restoration (Fish and Wildlife Service): Eighteen proposals were recommended for funding for a total of $16,527,981. This is over the $13,850,000 budgeted for this topic area. This topic area was highly competitive, receiving 61 proposals requesting over $115 million in funding. The TRP identified both an A-List of the projects recommended with the budgeted amount, and a B-List of projects recommended for funding should additional monies become available. The Integration Panel recommended funding for projects from both the A and B-Lists, and recommended full or additional funding for projects which were recommended for partial funding by the TRP.

D. Sediment Management (CALFED/Resources Agency) and E. Fish Harvest Management Tools (CALFED/Resources Agency): No proposals were recommended for funding in either of these topic areas, both of which had $500,000 budgeted. Very few proposals were received in either of these topic areas. For each, only one was recommended for funding by the TRP, and upon further review by the Integration Panel, neither was recommended for funding. In Sediment Management, the request was for the second phase of a project that has not yet reported results from Phase I. Both the TRP and Integration Panel felt that they needed to see results from Phase I and increased local coordination before providing additional funding. For Fish Harvest Management, the Integration Panel felt the proposal was not responsive to the criteria outlined in

the Proposal Solicitation Package. The Integration Panel recommended developing a more focused solicitation on fish harvest management tools, and ensuring that it gets distributed to a broader audience including the marine fisheries management community.

F. Species Life History Studies (CALFED/Resources Agency): Five projects were recommended for funding for a total of $617,294, just over the $600,000 budgeted for this topic area. The Integration Panel supported the TRP recommendation for all five projects and suggested coordination between two green sturgeon proposals in the upper Sacramento River (F1002 and F1007). One proposal (F1005) was recommended contingent upon 50% funding from CVPIA's Anadromous Fish Restoration Program.

G. Local Watershed Stewardship (US Environmental Protection Agency): Fourteen projects were recommended for funding for a total of $2,860,266. This is over the budgeted amount of $2,300,000 budgeted for this topic area. This topic area was also highly competitive, receiving 55 proposals requesting almost $28 million in funding. The TRP identified both an A-List of the projects recommended with the budgeted amount, and a B-List of projects recommended for funding should additional monies become available. The Integration Panel recommended funding for projects from both the A and B-Lists, and recommended full or additional funding for projects which were recommended for partial funding by the TRP.

H. Environmental Education (US Forest Service): Eleven projects were recommended for funding for a total of $417,440, over the $300,000 budgeted for this topic area. The Integration Panel felt very confident with the TRP review and recommended funding for the projects or parts of projects identified on both the A-List and B-List presented by the TRP.

I. Small Screen Evaluations - Alternatives and Biological Priorities (Bureau of Reclamation): Two projects were recommended for funding for a total of $295,000, just over the $200,000 budgeted for this topic area. With additional money available, the Integration Panel recommended funding for A1003, which was not recommended by the TRP. They also recommended that A1003 coordinate with A1000.