

i. Proposal number.#2001-D201*

ii. Short proposal title. # Habitat Acquisition for Riparian Brush Rabbit*

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 #A, B, E***

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. # This proposal has high potential for habitat for at-risk species, rehabilitation of natural processes and to aid in management of non-native 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. # This proposal advances strategic objectives associated with riparian and floodplain habitat.*

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.# This proposal does address targets and objectives in the PSP.*

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.# Restoration of floodplain habitat along the San Joaquin River and its tributaries is a Stage 1 action.*

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. # This proposal targets critical species in the MSCS and the milestones.*

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. #This proposal could incorporate substantial adaptive management learning opportunities.*

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.# Overall this proposal will advance several goals and Stage 1 strategic objectives. Its strongest benefit is the potential to facilitate the recovery of two highly endangered species: riparian brush rabbit and the San Joaquin Valley woodrat.*

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).# Fall-run Chinook salmon and Steelhead trout utilize this portion of the Stanislaus river for adult migratory passage and juvenile outmigrant passage and, potentially, rearing. The focus of this proposal is to protect and restore habitat values for riparian brush rabbit and riparian woodrat. Native fishes will benefit in that the proposed land acquisition would be intended to protect and enhance floodplain values. The protection benefit is immediate in that it will prevent encroachment on the floodplain from agricultural and other land uses. However, protection alone maintains the status quo and does not substantially increase natural production. The applicant is not well informed of appropriate salmonid habitat

enhancements for this property, as the enhancements they propose focus on introduction of coarse sediment in the sand-bedded reach of the Stanislaus River. Enhancement of floodplain rearing areas, which is mentioned as a potential in the future, would likely be more appropriate. Quantitative benefits of this are difficult to measure, but a subjective estimate would value the emphasis on anadromous fish benefits at less than 10 % of the total project habitat value, but these benefits should be durable and if manipulations such as levee breaching occurs in the future then the benefits to anadromous fish would further accrue.*

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 project would protect riparian edge vegetation on the opposite bank to Caswell State Park

thus maintaining riparian edge shading. Species benefited include: Riparian Brush Rabbit (E), Riparian Woodrat (E), giant garter snake (T), Central Valley Steelhead Trout (T), Mountain plover (PT), Little Willow Flycatcher (Candidate), Western pond turtle (species of concern), Aleutian Canada Goose and Bald Eagle (both recently de-listed). The riparian community overall should benefit from the 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.# If phase 3 is funded the restoration plan for the site may consider actions to set-back levees and restore natural floodplain processes. The primary objective of this proposal is to focus habitat management to address terrestrial species needs.*

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 proposal does not have a clear nexus to modification to 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 contribute substantially to Section 3406 (1) (b) other: address other identified adverse environmental aspects of CVP.*

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 not a strong candidate for AFRP funding. It does provide floodplain habitat protection which could benefit salmonids, however the driving objective for the acquisition and long-term management will focus on non-fish habitat improvements. The benefits to the riparian corridor and other listed species and species of concern would be substantial. Thus this project would contribute substantially to Section 3406 (1) (b) other Habitat Restoration Program The AFRP could be a future project partner in efforts to further restore floodplain function through interventions such as floodplain re-contouring and levee setbacks which would be anticipated to provide more direct benefits to anadromous fish.*

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.#Compliments other efforts for habitat protection and management for listed species. Floodplain lands acquired under Phase 1 are just upstream and adjacent to the San Joaquin River NWR, which also manages for the listed species. Parcels are directly across from Caswell Memorial State Park where brush rabbit is protected and recovery activities are ongoing. 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.# No*

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 proposal contains no information on issues relating to support or opposition to the project by local entities. This proposal states it has an interpretive component, which will allow for public access and recreation at the restoration sites, it is not clear in this proposal what the component would include or how extensive it would be.*

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*

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*

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.# 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.# n/a*