

**i. Proposal number:#** 2001-C214\*

**ii. Short proposal title .#** Sacramento River floodplain acquisition and 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 incremental contributions to Goal 1 (at-risk species); Goal 2 (rehabilitate natural processes); Goal 3 (harvested species); Goal 4 (protect/restore habitats); and Goal 6.\*

**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

Considering the advance work done to acquire the property and the location of the parcel in relationship to other public or protected lands, the acquisition phase of the project would likely make a significant contribution to Goal 4 by protecting existing riparian habitat and providing an opportunity for restoration of orchards. The proposal also offers an intriguing potential to quantify water quality benefits (Goal 6) of wildlife-friendly agricultural practices, provided that there is some pre-project monitoring to enable comparisons before and after treatments.\*

**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. Acquisition of the property would likely make a significant contribution to habitat-oriented objectives (Objectives 4-2, 4-3, 4-4). The preservation and restoration component of the project could also make an incremental contribution to the species-oriented objectives (Objectives 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.#** 7

pts. The proposal does directly address a restoration action identified in the PSP-acquisition and restoration of floodplain lands in the active meander belt of the Sacramento River.\*

**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 proposal does generally address a Stage 1 action in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tributaries Bundle: Action 40-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.**# 7 pts. The project would likely make incremental contribution to recovering or maintaining both aquatic (salmonids) and terrestrial species (migratory birds, giant garter snake).\*

**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

proposal attempts to incorporate an experimental approach, but there are some important details missing from the proposal. The proposal does not specify if there is any baseline water quality monitoring to facilitate pre- and post-project comparisons following conversion to wildlife-friendly agricultural practices. Neither does the proposal clearly describe the hydrologic conditions under which the different parcels will flood, which is important for evaluating riparian vegetation vs. orchard responses to conveyance. The project proponent should be encouraged to convene a panel of scientific experts to strengthen the experimental approach of the proposed project.\*

**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. Acquisition of the parcel seems like a good opportunity and a high priority. The project-proponent should be encouraged to compare process-based restoration and cultivated restoration, since this project seems like a good opportunity for such a comparison. Project proponent should also be encouraged or required to convene a panel of scientific/technical experts to assist in developing, or in reviewing, the re-vegetation plan to improve the information yield of the project.\*

#### **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).**#

Natural production of the following anadromous fish species are expected to directly benefit from this project: spring-run, fall-run and late-fall-run and winter-run chinook salmon, steelhead, American shad, striped bass and green sturgeon and white sturgeon. This project will also benefit splittail and all other native fish and wildlife species.

This project proposes to protect 27 acres of high quality existing riparian vegetation which is located within the Sacramento River meander zone. It proposes to actively restore another 222 acres of almond and walnut orchards to wetland and riparian forest which is subject to flooding by the Sacramento River but are located on the outside of an extensive levee system which prevents flood waters from receding downstream and immediately back into the Sacramento River. The flood waters would retreat down Angel slough and benefits arising from restoration of these 222 acres would be lost to the mainstem Sacramento River. This analysis is based on both the content of the proposal and enlarged geographical maps acquired to understand the contribution of the proposed restoration to production of anadromous fish in the mainstem Sacramento River.

The benefits are certain, immediate and of longterm duration for the 27 acre parcel (approximately 10% of the project lands). The remaining 222 acres, having no immediate return connection to the mainstem Sacramento River, would have no contribution of restoration benefits to anadromous fish. In summary, about 10% of the proposed lands to be restored will contribute directly and on a longterm basis to production of anadromous fish. This contribution to anadromous fish production is low given the size of the parcel. However, it should be noted that cumulative acquisitions of lands to be restored to natural conditions contribute to fixing the whole Sacramento River meander system, and eventually it is possible that levees can be set back or even eliminated when meander belt land acquisition goals are accomplished. It's possible to eventually reestablish a connection of the remaining 222 acres to the Sacramento River.\*

**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 (California species of concern). Restoration of the natural meander and ecosystem functions to the upper mainstem Sacramento River will also benefit other fish and 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 immediately protects 27 acres of riparian forest within the Sacramento River meander zone which contributes to protecting the natural channel and riparian habitat values of the Sacramento River. It also proposes to restore 222 acres to riparian forests located on the outside of an existing levee system, not connected immediately downstream to the Sacramento River. Although subject to flooding, receding flood waters on the the 222 acres proceed down Angel Slough and do not contribute to the natural processes of 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 the implementation of the supporting measures of the CVPIA, 3406(b)(1) other, 3406(b)(13) 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 weakness of this proposal in the nearterm is that only 10% of the proposed acquisition contributes to production of anadromous fish and to habitat channel values on the Mainstem Sacramento River. Restoring the other 90% may have future value to the mainstem Sacramento River if levees were eventually set back or eliminating, restoring an immediate downstream connection to the Sacramento River. This proposal could be funded under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Upper mainstem Sacramento River Action 9 3406(b)(1) and 3406(b)(1) other.\*

## **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 efforts by FWS, COE, DWR, DFG, and others. Project will reduce bank erosion near newly constructed fish screens. This work is compatible with the goals of SB1086.\*

## **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, a very detailed budget is included for each year in Table 5\***

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

**5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.# Yes,it is charged at a rate of 20% and captures office rent, office supplies, utilities, phones, accounting and legal services, and insurance\***

**5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# No, it is not clearly identified. It is assumed to be listed under project directors costs in Table 5\***

**5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.# Need to clearly identify the project management costs\***

#### **COST SHARING**

**6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.# No\***

**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.# n/a\***

**6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#** The two cost shares presented in this project are the lease income that will be generated from the farming activity and the staff commitment of the USFWS.\*