i. Proposal number.#2001-C205*
ii. Short proposal title.# SJRNWR Riparian Habitat Protection and Floodplain Restoration - Phase II*

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 would likely make an incremental contribution to Goal 1 (at-risk species); Goal 2 (rehabilitate natural processes); Goal 3 (harvested species); and Goal 4 (protect/restore 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.# 8 pts. The project will likely make a measurable contribution to restoring aquatic and floodplain habitats by injecting spawning-size sediments and removing dredger tailings from floodplains, which will also be re-graded to inundate more frequently within the contest of the regulated flow regime. In this respect, the proposed project will contribute to Goals 2 and 4. Restoration of spawning sized gravels, channel-floodplain connectivity, and sediment routing will likely provide incremental contributions to Goal 1 (at-risk species) and Goal 3 (harvested species).*

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.# 8 pts. The project will likely make a measurable contribution to process- and habitat-oriented objectives (Objective 2-5, 2-6, 2-7,4-2) for the Stanislaus River. The project will likely make incremental contributions to species-oriented objectives (Objective 1-1, 1-3, 3-1).*

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.# 8 pts. The proposed project does address a restoration action identified in the PSP, including acquisition and re-grading of floodplains to inundate more frequently within the context of a regulated flow regime.*

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.# 5 pts. The proposed action does generally address a Stage 1 action in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tributaries Bundle: Action 43-sediment management plans.*

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.# 7 pts. The project would likely contribute to the recovery or maintenance of sensitive species, especially salmonids. If designed properly, the floodplain reconstruction component of the proposed project could also benefit amphibians and migratory bird species.*

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.# 8 pts. The project offers some good potential to address several restoration issues and uncertainties, including process-habitat-species interactions. With proper monitoring, the gravel augmentation component can help us get a better understanding of geomorphic threshold flows. As suggested in the PSP, the riparian re-vegetation component, following the floodplain re-grading, should incorporate an experimental approach to address process-habitat interactions. Considering that the proposed project can yield information about process-habitat-species linkages for both aquatic and riparian habitats, the project proponent should be encouraged or required to convene a panel of scientific experts to assist in developing the experimental approach incorporated into the restoration.*

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.# 8 pts. If designed properly, this project represents a good opportunity to both make a significant contribution to ERP goals and objectives while simultaneously testing hypotheses to address the mechanisms underlying process-habitat-species interactions. Again, considering the potential information richness of the project, the proponent should be encouraged or required to convene and expert panel to help refine the project's experimental approach. The proposal does a relatively good job of describing the amount and source of fill material.*

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 project will acquire flood-prone lands, breach levees and restore floodplain riparian vegetation. Based on recent floodplain and bypass studies, if the project is done properly, it could enhance juvenile rearing habitat for San Joaquin River fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead trout. Tasks C and E involve breaching of levees to allow flood waters to inundate recently acquired (or to be acquired) properties. The properties in question have been leveled for agricultural use and contain water conveyance ditches and other topography which could pose a stranding threat to juvenile salmonids. The proposal claims to benefit anadromous fish species, but does not acknowledge the potential threats of the project. Based on the current level of analysis of the project, the effect on natural production could be positive, neutral or negative**.***

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.# Listed species to benefit: Riparian Brush Rabbit (E) {noteworthy proposal for this species}, Riparian wood rat (E), Greater Sandhill Crane (ST), Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo (ST), Swainson's Hawk (ST), Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (E), Sacramento Splittail (T), Aleutian Canada Goose (recently de-listed), and , if designed properly, San Joaquin River tributaries fall-run chinook salmon (candidate), steelhead trout (T). The floodplain, riparian and wetland habitat enhancements will re-establish a critically reduced community and benefit: shorebirds, waterfowl, herons, and neotropical migratory birds.*

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 will acquire flood-prone lands and breach levees which will allow re-creation of functional flood plain area on the lower San Joaquin River. Current levee breaks allow floodwaters to access both refuge lands (desired) and non refuge lands (not desired). The acquisition tasks will secure a block of land sufficient to allow flooding to commence immediately. Sufficient potential riparian habitat will be secured to allow re-introduction of the severely endangered Riparian Brush Rabbit. The non-structural alternative concept will allow restoration of natural floodplain processes and, if designed properly, could provide significant improvements in juvenile fish rearing habitat in perpetuity. This would support SJR evaluation 6, a high priority evaluation in a high priority river.*

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).# Not likely to affect, except that flood flows could potentially modify refuge water supply
needs.*

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.# Supports 3406 (b) (1) other, possibly 3406 (b)(2) and the water acquisition program.*

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 proposed project, if implemented in a fashion that considers anadromous salmonid needs could provide substantial long-term benefits by creating productive rearing habitat in a system where this has been limited by flood control activities. In large part this depends on how levee breech, plantings, and de-leveling is done. Other wetland and riparian species will benefit due to the large size and mix of habitats that will be restored. This action is consistent with San Joaquin Mainstem Evaluation 6 in the AFRP?s Revised Draft Restoration Plan. The Habitat Restoration Program, 3406 (b)(1) other, is probably the most applicable source of CVPIA funds because of the multi-terrestrial and riparian dependent species, for instance riparian brush rabbit, that will benefit from this action if implemented. It is important to insure that this proposed project is coordinated with a hydraulic analysis of the levee breech proposal funded by the AFRP in FY 2000 (see comments under Section 2) to reduce the potential for stranding of juvenile salmonids or creation of habitat for non-native predatory fish.*

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.#This SJR NWR project builds on previous habitat and floodplain restoration efforts on the SJR funded by CALFED and CVPIA, including salmon restoration projects on the SJR and it's tributaries
(CVPIA),a draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan to expand the refuge, conservation easements, land acquisition, restoration planning, and pilot projects (CALFED, DFG, NRCS, Friends of the Tuolumne), and meets National and state goals for alternative flood protection and habitat restoration and endangered species protection. Source: Proposal*

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.#CALFED*

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.#
97B05 - Feasibility Analysis for SJR - Bear Creek Floodplain Restoration Project - San Luis NWR.
98F21 - Lower SJR Floodplain Protection and Restoration Project.
97B04 - San Joaquin River NWR Riparian Habitat Protection and Floodplain Restoration (Phase I).*

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.#yes*

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

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

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#Project proponents have satisfactorily completed work on the land acquisition (98F21) a restoration feasibility study (97B05) and phase one of this proposed phase II work (97B04). Source: Quarterly progress reports, contract information.*

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#yes*

3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4.#97B04*

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

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.#yes*
3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#The acquisition, feasibility study and baseline monitoring report (Phase I) completed and they are ready for phase II. Source: Proposal, quarterly progress reports, completed reports.*

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.# Refuge planning process is dealing with landowners and sensitive flood management issues.
AFRP staff is concerned that if the levee breaching component moves forward before full analysis of fish impacts is complete, there could be subsequent and significant costs to remediate impacts to anadromous fish.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE
4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Project proponent should seek CESA/CEQA and a Streambed Alteration Agreement for any and all actions. Proponent will also need to comply with federal NEPA and ESA.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# See above*

COST
5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.#No, it is a three year project but the budget table is not broken down by year but by task.*

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

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#No, the overhead is not clearly identified in the budget tables.*

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

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.#Need to create a more detailed budget table with the necessary information.*

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

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.#US Army Corp or Engineers: 1.4 million dollars; US Bureau of Reclamation: 360,000 dollars; USFWS: 125,000 dollars. Total: 1,885,000 dollars or 24.6% of total requested funds.*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#All information requested has been provided by project proponent in a clear, concise, and understandable format**.***