i. Proposal number.# 2001-C-202*
ii. Short proposal title .# Geomorphic Stream Restoration Demonstration Project*****

APPLICABILITY TO CALFED ERP GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
1a1. Link to ERP Strategic Goals: What Strategic Goal(s) is /are addressed by this proposal? List the letter(s) of all that apply.

A. At-risk species
B. Rehabilitate natural processes
C. Maintain harvested species
D. Protect-restore functional habitats
E. Prevent non-native species and reduce impacts
F. Improve and maintain water quality# The proposed project might make an incremental contribution to Goal 1 (at-risk species); Goal 2 (rehabilitate natural processes); Goal 3 (harvested species); and Goal 4 (protect/restore functional habitats).*

1a2. Describe the degree to which the proposal will contribute to the relevant goal. Quantify your assessment and identify the contribution to ERP targets, when possible.# 0 pts. This project seems like it will actually degrade habitat and ecological processes rather than restore them. The project seems to be designed to prevent bank erosion, but bank erosion is a natural ecological process for a river. Similarly, the proposal suggests that exposed gravel bars are a problem, but gravel bars are an indicator of a healthy alluvial river system. The aerial photo in Attachment A seems to show a relatively healthy alluvial river system, with a meandering channel and riparian habitat. Similarly, the photo of the gravel bar in Attachment B looks like gorgeous spawning habitat.

The proposal suggests that channel incision is a problem. Incision is likely a function of the upstream bridge constricting flow, thereby increasing velocities and shear stress on the channel bed. Reconfiguring the channel will not eliminate the effects of the bridge-any reconstructed channel is likely to be scoured again. The proposal does not demonstrate a clear understanding of fluvial processes and how they are likely to affect the proposed project. *

1b. Objectives: What Strategic Objective(s) is/are addressed by this proposal? List Objective (from the table of 32 objectives) and describe potential contribution to ERP Goals. Quantify your assessment, when possible.# 0 pts. Again, the proposed project seems to run counter to the ERP 's objectives to restore ecological processes and habitats. The principal goal of the project seems to be "creating a stable channel." But rivers are

naturally dynamic. The existing conditions of the site seem to exemplify the river conditions the ERP is trying to restore.*

1c. Restoration Actions: Does the proposal address a Restoration Action identified in Section 3.5 of the PSP? Identify the action and describe how well the proposed action relates to the identified Restoration Action.# 0 pts. Again, the proposed project seems to run counter to the actions described in the PSP, which emphasize the restoration of ecosystem processes rather than the elimination of them through channel stabilization.*

1d. Stage 1 Actions: Is the proposal linked directly, indirectly or not linked to proposed
Stage 1 Actions? If linked, describe how the proposal will contribute to ERP actions during
Stage 1.# 0 pts. The proposed project does not address any Stage 1 actions. Again, the proposed project seems to run counter to the intent of the ERP to restore ecological processes and preserve healthy alluvial river systems.*

1e. MSCS: Describe how the proposal is linked to the Multi-Species Conservation Strategy and if it's consistent with the MSCS Conservation measures. Identify the species addressed and whether the proposal will "recover", "contribute to recovery" or "maintain" each species.# 1 pt. The proposed project suggests that bank erosion threatens riparian habitats used by various terrestrial species, such that the channel stabilization will preserve these habitats. But bank erosion and channel migration are important components of the riparian regeneration process. In the broader view, active riparian regeneration is more important to sensitive species than curtailing ecological process to "lock in" particular fragments of habitat.*

1f. Information Richness/Adaptive Probing related to the proposal: Describe the degree to which the proposal provides information to resolve one of the 12 scientific uncertainties (Section 3.3 of the PSP), and whether the proposal offers a prudent approach to answer these uncertainties.# 0 pts. Monitoring of the site's existing conditions would provide greater information than the proposed project, which aims to curtail ecological processes by stabilizing the channel. The existing site seems like it can serve as a reference condition for the ERP.*

1g. Summarize comments from section 1a through 1f related to applicability to CALFED goals and priorities. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# 0 pts. The basic assumption of the proposal seems to be that bank stabilization measures will be taken to prevent bank erosion, and so the project proponents are striving for a reconfigured channel that attempts to eliminate bank erosion while providing some measure of habitat. The attempt to develop an alternative to bank protection is laudable, but the proposed project is misguided because it will actually convert what seems to be a healthy, functioning alluvial river into something less valuable. Bank erosion and sediment deposition are the types of natural fluvial processes the ERP is trying to restore, not curtail. Modifying healthy fluvial processes and habitat to "stabilize" the channel runs contrary to the spirit and intent of the ERP.*

APPLICABILITY TO CVPIA PRIORITIES

1i. Describe the expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish. Specifically identify the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, the expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production for each species and race of anadromous fish, the certainty of the expected benefits, and the immediacy and duration of the expected contribution. Provide quantitative support where available (for example, expected increases in population indices, cohort replacement rates, or reductions in mortality rates).# This restoration would eliminate the eroding bank and would preclude the need for bank armoring
(riprap) and would restore natural processes to a 1 mile section of the river. Improving spawning gravels and riparian habitat and reducing sediment input in the immediate area would provide an immediate, but limited benefit to fall run chinook salmon, since this is a stand alone project and is not tied to future project. However, this type of action is a high priority action for the Cosumnes River and as such supports action 6, in the revised draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP*

1j. List the threatened or endangered species that are expected to benefit from the project. Specifically identify the status of the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, any other special-status species that are expected to benefit, and the ecological community or multiple-species benefits that are expected to occur as a result of implementing the project.# There are no listed species benefits, although, east-side Delta tributary fall-run chinook salmon
(federal candidate) along with species (aquatic and terrestrial) associated with riparian habitat would benefit.*

1k. Identify if and describe how the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values. Specifically address whether the

project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values, whether the project promotes natural processes, and the immediacy and duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values.# This project would restore natural channel and riparian habitat values by using physical and geological/geomorphic principals that promotes a stable stream channel thereby reducing bank erosion/sloughing while encouraging natural regeneration and maintenance of riparian vegetation. This project could promote use of non-traditional banks stabilization elsewhere in the watershed.*

1l. Identify if and how the project contributes to efforts to modify CVP operations. Identify the effort(s) to modify CVP operations to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Efforts to modify CVP operations include modifications to provide flows of suitable quality, quantity, and timing to protect all life stages of anadromous fish as directed by Section 3406 (b)(1)(B) of the CVPIA, including flows provided through management of water dedicated under Section 3406(b)(2) and water acquired pursuant to Section 3406(b)(3).# This project does not contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations.*

1m. Identify if and how the project contributes to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA. Identify the supporting measure(s) to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Supporting measures include the Water Acquisition Program, the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, and others.# This project contributes to implementation of supporting measure in the CVPIA, particular the **AFRP.***

1n. Summarize comments from section 1i through 1m related to applicability to CVPIA priorities (if applicable, identify the CVPIA program appropriate to consider as the source of CVPIA funding [for example, the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Habitat Restoration Program, Water Acquisition Program, Tracy Pumping Plant Mitigation Program, Clear Creek Restoration Program, Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, and Anadromous Fish Screen Program]). Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# This project would restore natural channel and riparian habitat values by reducing bank erosion/sloughing while encouraging natural regeneration and maintenance of riparian vegetation. The project would not modify CVP operations, but contributes to supporting measure in the CVPIA. This project would, to a limited extent, benefit the natural production of east-side Delta tributary fall-run chinook salmon. Should this project not be undertaken it is likely that the least cost method to stabilize the eroding banks will be implemented and that method is bank armoring.

However there is a general lack of a watershed management plan/strategy outside The Nature Conservancy's Cosumnes River Preserve plan. The lack of an upper river management plan does not assure additional projects will be implemented and ultimately increases in fall-run chinook salmon populations. This project is appropriate for funding under the AFRP.*

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS

2a. Did the applicant explain how the proposed project relates to other past and future ecosystem restoration projects, as required on page 57 in the PSP? Type in yes or no.#yes*

2b. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on other information on restoration projects available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, describe how the proposed project complements other ecosystem restoration projects, including CALFED and CVPIA. Identify projects or types of projects that the proposed project would complement, now or in the future. Identify source of information.#Project proponents are part of Cosumnes River Task Force developing a coordinated resource management plan for the Cosumnes watershed. The Nature Conservancy is working in the lower watershed on habitat preservation and the Fishery Foundation of California is working on upstream passage, making spawning habitat improvements critical. Source: Proposal and quarterly reports.*

RESULTS AND PROGRESS ON PREVIOUSLY FUNDED CALFED AND CVPIA PROJECTS, INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3a1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports and data available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, has the applicant previously received CALFED or CVPIA funding? Type CALFED, CVPIA, both, or none.#none*

3a2. If the answer is yes, list the project number(s), project name(s) and whether CALFED or CVPIA funding. If the answer is none, move on to item 4.#

3b1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, did the applicant accurately state the current status of the project(s) and the progress and accomplishments of the project(s) to date? Type yes or no.#

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING
3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#

3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4.#

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or no.#

3e2. Based on the information presented in the summary and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, is the project ready for next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT
4a. Does the proposal describe a plan for public outreach, as required on page 61 of the PSP? Type yes or no.# Yes*

4b. Based on the information in the proposal, highlight outstanding issues related to support or opposition for the project by local entities including watershed groups and local governments, and the expected magnitude of any potential third-party impacts.# It appears that adjacent landowners and most agencies are aware of and support the project and
general stakeholder coordination is through the Cosumnes River Task Force. The project is supported because it would preclude the need for bank stabilization using traditional methods, armoring/riprap.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE
4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as

identified in the PSP checklists.# The applicant should apply for a Reclamation Board - Encroachment Permit.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# The proposal contradicts itself in that at the bottom of page 7 the applicant states that the US Army Corps has jurisdictional authority over the project. However, later on page 8 the applicant states that " no permit application is required for Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (see above)". This should be resolved.*

COST

5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.#Yes, Staff estimates are by year, as well as lump sum Tasks. However, the budget table is not very detailed*

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.#Yes, lump sum items for Tasks*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#Yes, overhead is listed at 10% of project costs in cost summary*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.#No mention of project management costs*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.#A more detailed budget table is needed, and project management costs need to be clearly identified*

COST SHARING

6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.#No*

6b. Are applicants specifically requesting either state or federal cost share dollars? Type state, federal, or doesn't matter.#Doesn't matter*

6c. List cost share given in proposal and note whether listed cost share is identified (in hand) or proposed.

6c1. In-kind:#n/a*

6c2. Matching funds:#n/a*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#n/a*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#n/a*