

i. Proposal number.# 2001-D203*

ii. Short proposal title.# Yolo Bypass Management Strategy, Phase II*

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 will significantly advance goals relative to At-Risk species and the rehabilitation of natural processes. It could help in understanding alternatives which reduce the likelihood of non-native species utilization of 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.# Taken as a whole, this proposal and its sub-tasks address needs which are pre-requisite to projects which will meet many ERP strategic objectives*

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.# Yes, the PSP identified proposals to acquire and manage bypasses. This proposal continues the next phase to resolve the uncertainties associated with the role of floodplains and bypasses*

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.# The Yolo Bypass is a Stage 1 priority habitat corridor*

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.# Splittail, possibly delta smelt and salmonids may derive substantial benefits from projects and land use projects in the Yolo Bypass. This proposal is linked to 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.# Task 3, the hydrology and hydraulics modeling aspect of this proposal will generate important information needed for project development and adaptive management decisions*

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.# This proposal contains 5 tasks each of which is critical to the process of establishing a program to utilizing the Yolo Bypass to achieve several strategic objectives of the ERP*

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 proposal will not directly contribute to increasing the production of anadromous fish. Information gained by the project may help in ultimately improving habitat in the Yolo Bypass that would potentially benefit anadromous fish. All races of juvenile salmon and green and white sturgeon may benefit from habitat improvement in the Yolo Bypass.*

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.

No species would directly benefit from this proposal. This project would support Bypass working Group Meetings, evaluate fair market compensation for various ecological enhancements land-use changes, conduct hydrology and hydraulics modeling, develop a MOU with landowners, conduct benefit and cost analyses of ecological enhancement opportunities, conduct post-project monitoring and provide project management. These tasks may ultimately lead to ecological enhancements for fish and wildlife in the Bypass. Species that would benefit from ecological enhancement could include juvenile salmon of all races (listed or candidate species), sturgeon, delta smelt (listed species), splittail (listed species), waterfowl, shorebirds and migratory birds, but would be dependent on the nature and specifics of any habitat changes. *

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 project could lead toward restoration of natural channel or riparian habitat values in the Yolo Bypass by laying the socio-economic groundwork for restoration efforts.*

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 could ultimately lead to modified CVP operations if it leads to restoration actions that require water during non-flood conditions, for example.*

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.

If the project led to habitat improvements in the Yolo Bypass it would contribute to the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program.*

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.

No species would directly benefit from this proposal. This project would support Bypass working Group Meetings, evaluate fair market compensation for various ecological enhancements land-use changes, conduct hydrology and hydraulics modeling, develop a MOU with landowners, conduct a benefit and cost analyses of ecological enhancement opportunities, conduct post-project monitoring and provide project management. These tasks may ultimately lead to ecological enhancements for fish and wildlife in the Bypass. Species that would benefit from those ecological enhancements could include juvenile salmon of all races, sturgeon, delta smelt, splittail, waterfowl, shorebirds and migratory birds, but would be dependent on the nature and specifics of any habitat changes.

This project qualifies for funding consideration under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program or the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program.*

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 will continue work to develop a management strategy for the Yolo Bypass, to enhance wildlife populations and restore acquired habitats. Members of the Yolo Bypass Work Group are working on this locally driven process for habitat protection and management. 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.#CALFED.*

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.#
98-E11 - Ecosystem Restoration Strategy for the Yolo Bypass.*

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):#Phase I of the Yolo Bypass Management Strategy included development of a working group and determining issues for the Basin and development of long term strategy. Working group has formed and held meetings since November 1999 and work on the strategy is progressing. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4.#
98E11*

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or no.#yes.*

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.#yes.*

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including

source of information (proposal or other source):#In Phase I proponents have developed a workgroup, held several meetings on issues and developed a draft strategy for the Yolo Bypass and work in progressing on schedule. Phase II is development and completion of specific applied science to analyze specific technical economic and policy factors identified by the workgroup. These studies should be done.*

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 local entities and working group are likely to support project implementation because local landowners are involved in the process.*

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*