

**i. Proposal number:#** 2001-C213\*

**ii. Short proposal title .#** Understanding natural processes through active riparian restoration\*

**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 a measurable contribution to Goal 4 (protect/restore habitats), and an incremental contribution to Goal 1 (at-risk species), Goal 3 (harvested species), Goal 5 (manage non-native invasive species), and Goal 2 (rehabilitate ecological processes).\*

**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 proposed project would likely make a significant contribution to Goal 4 by restoring an important patch of degraded habitat to riparian forest and providing habitat connectivity. Successful restoration of the riparian habitat would likely contribute to recovery or maintenance of bird species, with possible incremental contributions to fish 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 would make incremental contributions to several species-oriented objectives (1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 3-1). The project would likely make significant contributions for habitat objectives (4-2, 4-4). The project would likely make a minor contribution to process-oriented objectives (2-6), and the project would make a dent in combating non-native plant species (Objective 5-6).\*

**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 directly addresses a restoration action defined in

the PSP by proposing to incorporate an experimental approach into a large-scale riparian re-vegetation project.\*

**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 generally address a Stage 1 action in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tributaries Bundle-Action 40 and riparian restoration work.\*

**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 proposal would likely make incremental contributions to several sensitive species, principally migratory birds.\*

**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

proposed restoration project does seem to incorporate an experimental approach. The sheer scale of the proposed restoration would be a good test of how experimental a large-scale riparian re-vegetation project can be.

Considering the level of funding requested, the project proponent should be encouraged to optimize the information yield of the project. The project proponent should also be encouraged to convene an advisory panel of scientific/technical experts to review the project's 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.**# 8 pts. This could be an important project that both restores an

important patch of degraded habitat to improve habitat connectivity and incorporates an experimental approach into a relatively large re-vegetation

project. Considering the potential information that this project could yield, the project proponent should be encouraged or required to convene a panel of expert scientists/technicians with experience in riparian experiments to review the conceptual re-vegetation plan.\*

#### **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).**

# Benefits are certain, immediate and of longterm duration. Upon completion, this project would repair a significant link along a 10 mile riparian corridor of the meander belt of the upper mainstem Sacramento River. Natural production of the following anadromous fish species are expected to directly benefit in the nearterm from this project: spring-run, fall-run and late-fall-run and winter-run chinook salmon, steelhead, American shad, striped bass and green and white sturgeon. Restoration of the upper mainstem Sacramento River's natural geomorphological processes, and riparian corridor contributes directly to production\*

**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.**

# Spring-run chinook salmon (threatened), fall-run and late-fall-run chinook salmon (candidate) and winter-run chinook salmon juveniles (endangered) and steelhead (threatened), white sturgeon, and green sturgeon (state species of concern). Splittail (threatened) and the non-anadromous fish species and habitats are also expected to benefit. Restoration of the natural meander and ecosystem functions to the upper mainstem Sacramento River will also benefit wildlife species.\*

**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 directly restores natural channel and riparian habitat values, protecting and restoring natural channel and riparian habitat values by providing organic inputs to the aquatic food chain, improving water quality, supplying large woody debris and providing critical shaded riverine aquatic habitat. The proposed riparian forest restoration protects and promotes natural processes and by stabilizing river channels, collecting debris and sediment during flood events and reducing erosion. This project will enhance riparian values in the upper mainstem Sacramento River within a three-year restoration period. This project has immediate positive longterm ecological effects on the mainstem Sacramento 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).# This project does not directly 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 the supporting measures of the CVPIA. It contributes to implementation of 3406(b)(1) other, 3406(b)(3) and 3406(e)(1).\***

**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 supports CVPIA priority actions for recovery of Sacramento River spring-run, fall-run and late-fall-run and winter-run chinook salmon, steelhead, American shad, striped bass and green and white sturgeon. A key limiting factor for these species is natural habitat and natural ecosystem functions associated with reestablishment of a Sacramento River meander zone. Restoration of riparian forests in the mainstem of the Sacramento River has long-term direct effects on supporting anadromous fish life history requirements, hence supporting production. Restoring the natural processes of the Sacramento River is key to supporting self-sustaining populations of anadromous fish. It should be pointed out that this proposal requests funding from both the CVPIA and CALFED to meet its total needs. The Anadromous Fish Restoration Program is an appropriate CVPIA funding source. This proposal supports AFRP Upper mainstem Sacramento River Action 9.\***

## **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 restoration project builds on existing conservation programs and complements riparian restoration efforts by FWS, COE, DWR, DFG and others. This Project will decrease bank erosion near the Princeton - Codora Glenn fish screen and is compatible with the goals of SB1086.

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.#** Loss of tax revenues to local governments from converting private agricultural lands to public environmental easements is of concern to local governments. This issue is being addressed through studies of Glenn, Tehama and Butte counties tax impacts through the California State University, Chico, Dr. David Gallo. Results of these studies are showing low or no impact when compared against other benefits on a long-term basis. However, tax issues are not well accepted by all the local stakeholders, as evidenced by the concern over recent draft reports on the Butte Creek, Butte County tax impacts. Presumably, this project has received SB1086 approval, since all signatories and partners to the MOU agreed to have this type of proposal reviewed by the SB1086 group before applying for a grant.

Another issue that may prevail is the difficulty in obtaining a California Reclamation Board (Board) permit to restore the floodplain to natural habitat. If the 26 acres proposed for restoration lies inside a State levee system (it's unclear if the levee in question comes under the jurisdiction of the Board), then it's possible that applicant will encounter delays up to two years and possibly more. Even if the permit is granted, the conditions put forth by the Board can be onerous enough to kill the project.\*

#### **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.#Yes, funding requested over 3 years\***

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

**5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#Yes, in Table 6\***

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

**5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.#All information requested has been provided by project proponent in a clear, concise, and understandable format\***

#### **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:#25,000 dollars in direct matching funds from the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge\***

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# SRNWR: 25,000 dollars; Local Conservation Groups: 15,360 dollars. Total: 40,360 dollars or 2.2% of total funding**

requested\*

**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\*