Detailed response to technical questions for the SRCD proposal:

A. **Long-term Viability:** in Section 6, we explained that the projects and infrastructure would have a lifespan of 15-20 years and would be constructed of proven corrosive resistant material such as HDPE pipes and stainless-steel gates. In Suisun Marsh, the landowners are responsible for seeing that their infrastructure functions at full capacity for its useful life (it is very hard to specify the percent reduction in function that would be allowed to occur before repairs are required), and they sign contracts to confirm that agreement. The information was then related to the specific sea-level rise estimate of 18-21 cm through 2050, and we noted that proposed continued development of the RMA modeling (but see below comment on use of the model and Readiness) would help to refine the infrastructure vulnerability to climate change. Thus, we specified the length of guaranteed viability, the potential risks of sea-level rise, and the efforts to assess further climate change risks with the planned refinement of the modeling, so we don’t know why there was inadequate scoring for this 5-point element.

B. **Readiness:** in Section 7.1 Project Readiness, 7.3 CEQA, Table 7.1, and Table 7.2, we provided extensive information that we had a process for the environmental permitting, could initiate the projects within 4 months from contracting (December 2019), and would complete most of the projects within one construction year. This streamlined programmatic permitting is extremely rare in the estuary, and it is only possible because SRCD retains and administers these permits for the landowners in the Marsh, supported by the recent completion of the Suisun Marsh Plan EIS/EIR (2014). This criterion should have had a top score of 12 points, so we have no idea why it received inadequate scoring. The email of reviewer’s comment suggested that the review panel thought the model still had to be developed to conduct the implementation project. This is not factually accurate. The model was developed under the 2018 “Suisun Marsh Improvement Assessment” Report and was used to select the best projects for the implementation, and this list of projects was specified in several areas of the proposal. There is no need for more modeling to select the projects, because the selection tool was developed during the Assessment Phase. Under the implementation, we have proposed to continue to refine this valuable tool, because we can use it to assess longer term project performance including ecosystem responses that may not be assessed satisfactorily under a 3-year project timeline, and we can examine long-term viability to projected sea-level rise of 18-21 cm through 2050.

C. **Scientific Merit and Performance Measures:** in the abstract and project description, we explained that the ecosystem value of managed wetlands that has been extensively covered in conceptual models (Barthman-Thompson, 2005) and the Suisun Marsh Plan EIS/EIR (2014). In the objectives and tasks, we noted that the Suisun Marsh Plan lists the CALFED goal of enhancing up to 50,000 acres of managed wetlands, and that drainage is critical factor allowing leaching of salts and wetland management actions for a healthy plant community. We did not repeat that information in this section, since it was already presented in the project description. In Section 8, we relied on the reviewers to consider the Suisun Marsh Improvement Assessment project results that provided the scientific basis for the project and was referenced several times throughout the text. Section 8 could have been much longer, but in the interest of brevity and to stay within proposal limits, we referred the reviewers to the report and provided some of the key figures that showed the results. Although we uploaded the Performance Measures table with a legend that discussed the monitoring approach (attached here), it was not in the final compilation. We are not sure why the table was not in the full proposal, but the August pre-proposal included an earlier version of the table which was modified for the full proposal. Also, we did follow the 9-step
framework of defining the problem (need for drainage), establish the goals (identify best wetlands to improve drainage), model linkages (RMA model results), select actions (Obj 1: 13 subprojects), design and implement (Obj 2), analyze and evaluate (Obj 3), communicate understanding (deliverables included results in presentations and meeting), and adapt (performance assessments would lead to next steps).

D. Proposal Scoring: despite omissions, we believe the proposal should score at 75 pts.
1. **Description (10-13 pts)** – we provided goals, objectives, tasks, and deliverables in Section 2.1 and referenced justifications including the conceptual model and EIS/EIR.
2. **Team (4-5 pts)** – we organized a team with decades of experience and described their roles and project coordination (Task #1; 4.1: Obj 1, Task 1).
3. **Budget (6-7 pts)** – all budget elements were included (Attachment 5.2) with 2 subcontracts (5.1a, b) and itemized costs for each of 13 infrastructure subprojects (5.2a).
4. **Cost Share (2 pts)** – cost share was 14% ($178,765; see Budget Attachment #6).
5. **Cost Leveraging (1 pt)** – leveraging funds were >1.4% ($38,072; see 4.2).
6. **Alignment with State Priorities (12-15 pts)** – we specified alignment with state priorities including the California Water Action Plan and Delta Conservancy’s plan.
7. **Long Term Viability (5 pts)** – we noted that the infrastructure was developed over decades and will last for at least 15-20 years (Task #3).
8. **Readiness (12 pts)** – Tasks #3 and #4 explain sites are shovel-ready and work can begin a few months after contracting with most completed in year 1. Sections 7.3, 7.3.2, and tables 7.1-7.2 explain SRCD has the needed permits or can rapidly obtain BCDC permits for new structures.
9. **Local Support (13-15 pts)** – We had letters from leads and 12 stakeholders agreeing to cover 10% of costs. A Solano County Supervisor’s letter failed to upload (attached).
10. **Scientific Merit (10-20 pts)** – a year-long planning project 2018 “Suisun Marsh Improvement Assessment” (Chappell et al. 2018) established the scientific merit. The performance table (attached) failed to upload, but the Climate Change section was inadvertently omitted. However, Dr. Takekawa with SRCD is a west coast expert of climate change effects on tidal wetlands and wildlife with several peer-reviewed publications, so we can provide extensive information on this issue.