i. Proposal number.#2001-D202*

ii. Short proposal title.# Non-structural Alternative - SJRNWR: Refinement for Habitat Enhancement*

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#B, D*

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 is a demonstration project for channel and floodplain reconstruction. It will facilitate rehabilitation for natural processes and will restore functional habitats.*

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 will advance several strategic objectives associated with the San Joaquin River.*

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 PSP actions relative to floodplains.*

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.# This proposal addresses high priority stage 1 actions and stage 1 coordination with the Army Corps Comprehensive study.*

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 should benefit a number of "R species and several maintenance species in the MSCS.*

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 has important adaptive management benefits relative to floodplains and riparian habitat as well as the role of floodplains in flood management.*

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 project addresses important goals and objectives and has an adaptive management orientation.*

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 project will complete analyses to evaluate the potential benefits or impacts of the proposed San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge non-structural alternative (breaching levees for flood management) on fall run chinook salmon and steelhead trout. The models also could be used to evaluate potential ecological benefits to sturgeon in the future. The properties to be inundated have been leveled for agricultural use and contain water conveyance ditches and other topography which could pose a stranding threat to juvenile salmonids or create habitat for non-native predatory fish. The hydraulic and habitat analysis proposed in this project will assess whether, the effect of the non-structural alternative on natural production could be positive, neutral or negative.

The non-structural alternative could contribute to San Joaquin River Evaluation 6, identified in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan as a high priority evaluation in a high priority river. This analysis is meant to inform

the implementation of a levee breech and riparian restoration plan proposed by the San Joaquin National Wildlife Refuge (C205 in this year?s PSP). The hydraulic evaluation will inform biologists about the potential hydraulic outcome of levee breech alternatives for the Refuge, and its relationship to anadromous fish resources. Assuming that this analysis could help guide the levee breech activity it should provide information that will lead to durable benefits to anadromous and resident fish species that use the San Joaquin River in the vicinity of the San Joaquin National Wildlife Refuge.*

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.# The focus of this evaluation is fall-run Chinook salmon, which is a Federal Candidate species in the San Joaquin River Basin. However, the hydraulic evaluation can be used to assess impacts on, and make recommendations for, additional species such as the federally listed splittail and Delta smelt, and active restoration strategies for the riparian community.*

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 will provide guidance to modify or implement the proposed non-structural alternative on the SJRNWR. The proposed non-structural alternative on the SJRNWR would acquire flood-prone lands and breach levees which will allow re-creation of functional flood plain area on the lower San Joaquin River. The non-structural alternative concept will allow restoration of natural floodplain processes and, if designed properly, could provide significant improvements in juvenile fish rearing habitat in perpetuity. This would support SJR evaluation 6, a high priority evaluation in a high priority 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).# Not likely to affect, except that flood flows could potentially modify refuge water supply needs.*

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.# Because this evaluation is important to the proposed non-structural alternative (NSA) on the SJRNWR it also supports 3406 (b) (1) other in that it will provide information that will help assess hydraulic and hydraulic benefits to other riparian-dependent and wetland species as a result of a given NSA alternative.*

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.# The non-structural alternative could contribute to San Joaquin River Evaluation 6, identified in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan as a high priority evaluation in a high priority river. This proposal is the next phase in developing a hydraulic model and GIS interface to assess potential effects of the proposed non-structural alternative on the SJRNWR on fall-run chinook salmon and other fish resources. The first phase of this analysis, building the initial data foundation for the model, has been funded by AFRP (FY 2000). The funds have only recently been awarded. Funding to breach the levees is being requested as a portion of the project in this PSP (C-205). It is critical that levees not be further breached nor plantings and de-leveling activity be done before impacts to anadromous fishes are analyzed. If not done properly, the breaching could result in stranding of juvenile salmonids or creation of habitat for non-native predatory fish. Thus it is critical to move forward with the analysis proposed in this project.*

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 proposal builds on earlier CALFED funded habitat protection and non-structural flood control alternatives being studied. Proposed will directly support and feed into another proposal on the river if both are funded at the San Joaquin River NWR and lower San Joaquin 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.#both.*

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.#
Lower Butte Creek Project: Phase II - Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Analysis for Butte Sink Structural Modifications and Flow - through system - 99-B02.
CALFED:
Gorrill Dam Fish Screen - 96-M22.
M & T/Parrott, Pumping Station and Fish Screen - 95-M05.
Rancho Esquon/Adamas Dam Fish Screen - 96-M21.
San Pablo Bay NWR, Cullinan Ranch - 97-N18.
San Pablo Bay NWR, Tolay Creek - 97-N19.
CVPIA:
Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase III - Butte Creek, Drumheller Exclusion Barrier Final Engineering, Permitting and Construction - 1448-11332-9J006.
Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Butte Creek, Butte Sink/Sutter Bypass Stakeholder Coordination/Facilitation - 113329-9-J135.
Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass East - West Diversion Dam Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review - 113329-9-J122.
Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #5 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review - 11332-9-J122.
Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #3 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review - 113329-J136.*

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):#Proponent listed status of ongoing CALFED/CVPIA funded work mostly in the Butte Creek Basin (in attachment A of proposal) which has either been completed or is progressing satisfactorily. Source: proposal, quarterly reports*

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-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 public outreach for this analysis will be conducted in concert with the Community Forum process already instituted by the Refuge. The proposed analysis will provide additional information on expected hydrologic and hydraulic effects of the NSA which may assist in addressing potential third party concerns. AFRP staff is concerned that if the levee breaching component moves forward before full analysis of fish impacts is complete, there could be subsequent and significant costs to remediate impacts to anadromous fish.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# They will need to consult with CDFG for a 1600 agreement for breeching the levee.*

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.# Non-Matching FY 2000 - AFRP: 57,465

dollars*

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*