i. Proposal number.# 2001-C206*****

ii. Short proposal title .# Murphy Creek Watershed Protection and Restoration Feasibility Plan*****

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 has the potential to contribute 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.# The proposed project would likely make only a minor contribution to ERP goals and objectives. The greatest contribution would likely be to fall-run salmon by providing some additional spawning habitat. Considering the small-size of the watershed, the contribution of coarse sediment to the mainstem Mokelumne would likely be minimal. A more likely contribution of the proposed project would be reducing the tributary's fine sediment contribution to the mainstem Mokelumne, which could be important since it is the most upstream tributary below Camanche Dam and because it empties into a spawning reach maintained by coarse gravel augmentation. Again, the project's contribution to species- and process-oriented goals and objectives would likely be minimal.*

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.# 6 pts. By potentially enhancing spawning habitat in the primary spawning reach of the Mokelumne, the proposed project could make some minor contributions to species-oriented goals (1-1, 3-1). If the proposed project were successful in developing a functional channel, it could also make minor contributions to restoring sediment processes--likely small contributions of coarse sediment to the mainstem, more value by reducing fine sediment input into the primary spawning reach in the mainstem. The project could also make a minor contribution to habitat-oriented objectives (4-) by restoring riparian habitat and excluding cattle from the riparian zone.*

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.# 4 pts. The proposed project indirectly addresses a restoration action identified in the PSP under Channel Dynamnics--sediment transport. The project could provide an opportunity to quantify discharge-sediment relationships, both fine and coarse sediment.*

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.# 2 pts. The proposed project addresses a general action identified in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tributaries Bundle of the Implementation Plan: Action 42--develop sediment management plans. However, Murphy Creek is not really a priority watershed in the context of the overall Bay-Delta system.*

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.# 5 pts. The proposed project would likely provide a minor enhancement to spawning habitat for fall-run chinook and possibly steelhead. If the riparian zones are planned to be sufficiently robust, they could also provide some benefits to listed bird and amphibian 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.# 3 pts. The proposed project offers some limited potential to quantify the coarse sediment contribution to the mainstem, and to evaluate different mechanisms for reducing fine sediment input to the mainstem--sediment traps; fencing to exclude cattle; riparian buffer strips, etc. But the proposal has little description of an experimental approach.*

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.# 5 pts. This seems like an overly expensive planning project for a relatively small watershed. The proposal discusses acquiring what seem to be agricultural easements, rather than conservation easements, which raises the issue of whether it is appropriate to dedicate restoration funds to planning processes targeted toward agricultural easements. The proposed project would make only minor coarse sediment contributions to the mainsteam. The greatest potential benefits of restoration in this watershed would be reducing fine sediment input to the mainsteam, which is important considering it empties into the spawning reach. Similarly, the riparian restoration, if designed properly, could provide some benefits to amphibian and bird species.*

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).# #Project would benefit fall run chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead trout. The project would set the stage for the addition of 24,200 linear feet of salmonid spawning habitat in the Mokelumne River downstream of Camanche Dam. The certainty of the project's benefits is unknown because its success depends on how many Murphy Creek catchment landowners are willing to negotiate conservation easements and the degree to which easement conditions include measures that benefit salmonid production needs. If the project led to adequate participation, its benefits to natural production could be quantifiable within a year of plan implementation. The duration of these benefits to natural salmonid production, however, would be limited by the life span of Camanche Reservoir because baseflow in Murphy Creek is sustained mostly by seepage from this reservoir.*

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.# The project would benefit Central Valley steelhead trout (threatened) and fall chinook salmon (candidate). By helping to preserve the rural character of the catchment and actively restore riparian vegetation along the Murphy Creek corridor, a number of terrestrial listed species would presumably also benefit from this project.*

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.# The project would provide all the planning steps required to: obtain conservation easements, remove 3 dams and any other barriers to salmonid migration or bedload transport; fence out cattle and restore natural vegetation to the riparian corridor; and develop an alternative water supply for cattle and irrigation. All of these actions would promote natural geomorphologic and ecological processes with benefits of almost immediate effect and long term duration to fish and wildlife resources.*

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).# The project would have no effect on 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.# Project would contribute to "b(1) other" efforts by facilitating the preservation of existing habitat and the creation and protection of additional habitat for wildlife, especially wildlife associated with riparian corridors.*

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 planning effort is designed to lay the groundwork (i.e., land appraisals, negotiated easements, design specifications, costing, etc.) for full-scale implementation of a whole-watershed protection and restoration effort. If successful, it would restore natural channel and riparian habitat values to the only tributary of the Mokelumne River that is still accessible to salmonids. This effort could lead to the addition of at least two miles of high quality spawning habitat to a system that has lost over 80% of its historic spawning habitat. It would also create excellent rearing habitat. Restoration of natural channel and riparian habitat values would contribute not only to salmonid production, but to other fish and widlife populations. These potential benefits would help fulfill several high priority Mokelumne River actions identified in the 1997 Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP) This project would thus qualify for funding consideration under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program.*

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 project will assist implementation of the lower Mokelumne River Watershed Stewardship Plan, particularly with CALFED funded projects completed by East Bay MUD, and East Bay MUD's salmon restoration work adjacent to and downstream of Murphy Creek. 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 .#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 NOXT-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.# The proposed project enjoys local support, no apparent opposition, and would have no direct third party impacts.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# None*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# None*

COST

5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.#No, it does not include a breakdown of the budget for each year.*

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.#Yes, it is at 10% for the ALC Budget, and 40% for the Wildlands budget.*

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.#Detailed budget tables included, however, some necessary information is missing such as the project management costs and a breakdown for each year of requested support.*

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:#EBMUD: 44,000 dollars worth of inkind services. A breakdown of the estimates are under Table 2*

6c2. Matching funds:#n/a*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#EBMUD: 44,000 dollars; Woodbridge River Company: 5,000 dollars. Total: 7.4% 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.*