i. Proposal number.# 2001-C207*****

ii. Short proposal title .# Spawning Habitat and Floodplain Restoration on the Stanislaus River - Phase I*

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).# The proposal applicant has identified that existing available spawning habitat in the Stanislaus River is only sufficient to support 2,000 spawning adults. Evaluation of gravel addition sites from the 1999 Knights Ferry Gravel Replenishment project has indicated a 100% increase in redd counts on certain riffles where gravel enhancement has occurred. Evaluations of that project are still continuing. This project proposes to continue gravel replenishment in combination with floodplain restoration, which based on the Knights Ferry project preliminary results, will provide significant and immediate increases in spawning success of natural fall run chinook salmon, steelhead trout. Both juvenile salmon and steelhead production is projected to benefit from both floodplain expansion and gravel additions that will provide added rearing habitat and food supply. Although the floodplain restoration components appear to be more experimental, the project contains a sound monitoring plan that will better quantify the magnitude and duration of the benefits.*

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.# This proposal will benefit fall-run Chinook salmon, which is a Federal Candidate species in the San Joaquin River Basin, and steelhead trout, which is federally listed as threatened. Other riparian dependent species will likely benefit in areas where tailings or floodplain surfaces are brought back to a more natural and functional state.*

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 proposes to remove dredger tailings from historic flood-plain areas and use this material to replenish coarse sediment and reduce channel incision, as well as lower or expose floodplain surfaces to be inundated at moderate flows. Additionally, coarse sediment will be introduced into specific riffles to enhance spawning habitat as well as providing material for a sediment starved river. These actions will promote natural processes immediately and in the former case, make the floodplain more accessible to fluvial processes at the river's current impeded flows. Because floodplain recreation work is largely new on sediment starved rivers the duration of the benefit is unknown but will be evaluated through the strong adaptive management monitoring component of the project.*

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).# Although this project is on a CVP-controlled stream, it should have no direct effect on effort to modify CVP operation. It could also provide better information on flow needs for channel maintenance which could ultimately lead to different flow objectives under the (b)(2) program.*

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 specifically supports Section 3406 (b) (13) - enhancement of spawning gravels on the Stanislaus River. It also supports AFRP Stanislaus River - Action 2, a high priority action on a high priority river.*

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 proposal is consistent with Stanislaus River Action 2 in the AFRP?s 1997 Revised Draft Restoration Plan and supports Section 3406 (b)(13); either program could potentially fund elements of this project. Benefits to anadromous salmonids

could be high based on evaluations from past work by the proponent. Duration of the benefit remains unknown and will be addressed in the monitoring component of the project. This proposal is highly attractive in that it addresses many key needed actions on the Stanislaus River and it builds upon a recent successful project. However, each of the five reaches in this proposal seem to have unique implementation and design features, so that the proposal is a composite of several individual projects. In some cases the site proposal is confusing in that the project proposes to develop plans to restore floodplain function at the site while in the same paragraph specific actions to modify floodplain function are identified (e.g. pg 4, Knights Ferry description). This confusion may be because there appear to be two distinct programs (flood plain reconfiguration and gravel replenishment) implemented at five sites with unique implementation features. Perhaps it is a limitation of my ability to grasp the complexity of the design, but it appears that there is sufficient variability within and among sites to preclude statistical analysis of the results. Also the gravel replenishment actions may or may not interact with floodplain manipulations. Perhaps it would be more effective to sequentially implement the program: Secure remaining acquisition needs, develop the floodplain restoration designs, and then develop the gravel replenishment study design.*

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 continues the efforts to restore Spawning habitat and floodplain processes in the Stanislaus River. Three riffles were constructed utilizing Four Pumps Agreement funding with poor results. With lessons learned from those projects, a Replenishment Project (97N21) on the Stanislaus was initiated and results of that work helped to design proposed work. CVPIA has funded gravel augmentation in Goodwin Canyon approximately 1 mile upstream. One of the proposed sites here is currently planning a list of restoration actions in the Stanislaus River. 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.#
97N21 Knights Ferry Gravel Replenishment Project*

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 has been constructed, pre project monitoring completed and post project monitor on going and on schedule.*

REQUESTS FOR NOXT-PHASE FUNDING
3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#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 applicant has established contacts on the Stanislaus River and appears to have identified key stakeholders to involve. The road development proposed for the Six-Mile Bar Reach seems to facilitate commercial aggregate mining in this reach which could create third party concerns, or potential concerns about the longevity of the gravel enhancements.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# County Conditional Use Permit may be required for the movement of heavy vehicles on County roads.*

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.#Yes, for three years*****

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.#Yes, under Tables 5 and 6*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#No, in tables 5 and 6 it is stated that certain items are subject to overhead but it does not specify which ones nor what the overhead rate is.*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.#Yes, under Tables 3a and 5.*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.#Very detailed tables; only item lacking is the exact amount of overhead.*

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:# National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (proposed matching): 100,000 dollars.*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#National Fish and Wildlife Foundation: 100,000 dollars; Carl Mesick Consultants: 82,030 dollars; USACE: 14,496 dollars; CVPIA: 200,000 dollars; CVPIA Anadromous Fish Restoration Program: 50,000 dollars. Total: 446,526 dollars or 18%*

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.*