

i. Proposal number:# 2001-C-210*

ii. Short proposal title .# San Joaquin River Research and Riparian Restoration 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 4 (protect/restore functional habitats); Goal 5 (prevent non-native invasive species).*

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.# 6 pts. The project would likely make its greatest contribution to ERP Goal 4 by restoring riparian habitats. While the proposed project does not include any actual restoration, it does represent a potentially valuable pre-cursor to restoration, including what appears to be some pre-project monitoring, and the development of a plan to assume an experimental approach to riparian restoration. The really nice potential of this project is the development of an experimentally-oriented riparian restoration plan-of course, the value of the project will be determined in large measure by the quality of the riparian re-vegetation plan. The proposal seems to acknowledge the need for quality assurance of the riparian re-vegetation plan by proposing to organize an advisory panel, which is encouraging.*

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. The project could make an incremental contribution to objectives related to at-risk species such as migratory birds and the SJ woodrat (Objectives 1-2, 1-3, and 1-4) by laying the groundwork for riparian restoration in what seems to be a very good location for habitat. The proposal could also make an incremental contribution to objectives related to restoration of habitats (Objectives 4-2, 4-4).*

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.# 7

pts. The proposal seems to directly address a restoration action identified in the PSP-to take an experimental approach to riparian re-vegetation to optimize the information gained. Unfortunately, the proposal only seems to parrot the language in the PSP, and does not provide any description of specific issues or hypotheses to be tested on this particular parcel-there doesn't seem to be any original thinking here. The included diagram shows that the parcel is located in a pronounced meander bend of the river-which should stimulate some site-specific questions to be addressed by the restoration project. The project proponents should be encouraged to develop more specific issues to be addressed, hypotheses to be tested, and criteria for selecting among the competitive bids for the riparian re-vegetation plan.*

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.# 7 pts. The proposed project does not directly address a Stage 1 actions. The proposal does serve as a complement to the Stage 1 action to acquire fee title or easement to riparian lands in the San Joaquin River. The land has already been acquired, but restoration of the degraded habitat represents a contribution to the intent of the Stage 1 action for San Joaquin riparian habitats.*

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.# 6 pts. As an important pre-cursor to riparian restoration, the proposed project could benefit several sensitive species, including SJ woodrat, migratory birds, and sensitive invertebrates and amphibians. Project proponents should be encouraged to develop the riparian re-vegetation plan with many different species in mind.*

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.# 7 pts. The

information yield of the project will depend in large measure upon the quality of the riparian re-vegetation plan that is developed/selected. To improve the quality of the project, the project proponents should be encouraged to work with ERP and CALFED Science Program staff to help refine the experimental components of the restoration/research plan. Project proponents should also be encouraged to select members of the advisory panel who are experienced in designing and conducting riparian habitat experiments, including independent/academic scientists. Such measures will likely ensure a high-quality, experimental approach. Project proponents should also be encouraged to test process-based restoration vs. cultivated 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.

7 pts. The proposed project has the potential to develop a very informative riparian experiment. Again, the quality of the riparian re-vegetation plan and the experimental approach it embodies will dictate the value of the proposed project, so project proponents should take great care in partnering with experienced scientists to guide the bidding and selection process. The potential value of this project seems well worth the amount of funding requested.*

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 phase (phase 1) of the project does not contribute to natural production of anadromous fish, specifically fall-run chinook salmon. Development of a better understanding of the factors influencing riparian revegetation success and improved performance of future revegetation efforts would improve shaded riparian aquatic habitat, benefitting all anadromous fish, including San Joaquin fall-run chinook salmon in the long term after future phases of the project are completed.*

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.# Fall-run chinook salmon, federal candidate, potentially steelhead, federal threatened, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, federal threatened, Swainson's hawk, state threatened, yellow-billed cuckoo, state endangered, and possibly the riparian bush rabbit, state and federal endangered, are expected to benefit. While the proposal does not indicate that it would contribute to natural production of anadromous fish, development of a better understanding of the factors influencing riparian revegetation success and improved performance of future revegetation efforts could improve riparian habitat for all anadromous fish along with other multi-species benefits (terrestrial and aquatic). *

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 first phase of this project does not affect natural channel habitat values. It will develop a better understanding of the factors influencing riparian revegetation success in order to improve performance of future restoration efforts. This phase would document existing conditions and develop a riparian research and restoration plan. This project supports mainstem San Joaquin River evaluation 1, listed as a high priority evaluation in the revised Draft Anadromous Fish Restoration Program *

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 is not intended or directed toward 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 would potentially contribute to implementation of supporting measures [(b)(1) other] in the CVPIA.*

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.# While the proposal would not contribute to natural production of anadromous fish in this phase, development of a better understanding of the factors influencing riparian revegetation success and improved performance of future revegetation efforts would improve shaded riparian aquatic habitat, potentially benefitting all anadromous fish and multi species (terrestrial, plant, and aquatic). This project supports mainstem San Joaquin River evaluation 1, listed as a high priority evaluation in the revised Draft Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. However, there is a questionable need for additional research. A restoration/implementation plan that incorporates information gained in other evaluations and restorations would allow direct application of funding to begin implementation and an adaptive management would allow for future adjustments.*

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 is a pilot riparian restoration project designed to identify successful restoration techniques to implement the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan for restoration along the Mokelumne, Calaveras, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers. Complements restoration efforts in the Lower Mokelumne River Watershed Stewardship Plan and results of this would be incorporated into both plans.*

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 project has been coordinated/formulated through a county-wide biological resources management plan. There appears to be broad based acceptance. *

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, the budget table is not divided up by years*

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 7.5%*

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.#Some necessary information missing such as project management costs and a cost breakdown of the budget by year*

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.#San Joaquin Open Space and Farmland Trust:
Estimated land value at 48,150 dollars or 82% of total funds requested*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#San Joaquin Open Space and Farmland Trust is donating a 32.1 acre island worth 48,150 dollars*