

**i. Proposal number.# 2001-E-200\***

**ii. Short proposal title.# Phase 2: Demonstration Project for the Protection and Enhancement of Delta In-Channel Islands (Construction and Monitoring)\***

**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, 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 project will make a minimal contribution to at-risk species, but will make an important contribution to the longer term restoration of in-channel islands (ICI). Key issues and uncertainties that will be resolved include means to reduce loss of ICIs through reduction of erosive processes, and rebuilding of ICI through sediment accretion. The project will not rely heavily on naturally occurring process but will require a high level of human intervention to reduce erosion and to capture sediment.\*

**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.#** Objective 1. Restore large expanses of all major habitat types, and sufficient connectivity among habitats, in the Delta, Suisun Bay, Suisun Marsh, and San Francisco Bay to support recovery and restoration of native species and biotic communities and rehabilitation of ecological processes. These habitat types include midchannel islands. This proposal would provide transferable methodology/technology to protect and restore ICIs throughout the Delta.\*

**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.#** The PSP requests proposals for shallow water, tidal and freshwater marsh habitat in the southern Delta region and lower San Joaquin River and in adjacent to the Sacramento River and Northern Delta sloughs and in the northern portion of the Yolo bypass. This proposal falls in between but does address a specific type of important shallow water and tidal marsh habitat.\*

**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.**# Yes. Restoration of 50 to 200 acres of mid-channel islands is identified as a Stage 1 action. This proposal will protect 6.24 acres.\*

**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.**# The MSCS includes mid-channel islands as tidal perennial aquatic habitat which is one of 18 NCCP habitats. Mid-channel islands contribute to many species including delta smelt, splittail, all anadromous salmonids, rose mallow, Mason's lilaeopsis, and Suisun Marsh aster.\*

**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.**# One critical uncertainty is the relationship of flow and sediments to accretion in the Delta. This is particularly important for maintaining or restoring mid-channel islands and shoals. The proposal is to use biotechnical means to capture sediments for rebuilding and protecting existing mid-channel islands. The focus is at a fine scale and appropriate. The monitoring program will provide the type of multi-year data necessary to better understand the relationship of mid-channel islands to erosive forces and the mitigating effects of sediment transport and deposition.\*

**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 is well conceived and will provide important information to better design strategies to protect and restore the unique and biologically important mid-channel islands. The question of sediment transport dynamics in the Delta is a subject for a much larger study. The results of larger scale sediment transport studies will mesh well with this

study and will have application for other restoration projects that require sediment deposition.\*

#### **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 is a pilot project (Phase 2) which is the construction and evaluation of biotechnical measures to protect in-channel islands (ICI) and restore tidal wetlands. Tidal wetlands and ICI's are important juvenile anadromous fish habitat and all anadromous species could potentially benefit. The amount of ICI and tidal wetlands restored by the project is small. Although, if successful biotechnical methods can be developed/proven that protect and restore this important habitat, those methods can be applied elsewhere to protect and restore those habitats and benefit anadromous fish in the long term. This project supports Delta evaluations 4 and 6, listed as high priority evaluations in the highest priority watershed in the revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program.\*

**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.#** All species and life stages (terrestrial, aquatic and plant) that are dependent/utilize tidal marsh and ICI habitat will benefit. This includes spring-run chinook salmon, state and federal threatened, winter-run chinook salmon, state and federal endangered, steelhead, federal threatened, Delta smelt, state and federal threatened, split tail, federal threatened, giant garter snake, state and federal threatened, California black rail, state threatened, Mason's lilaeposis, state rare, and other priority species, rose mallow, Suisun marsh aster, western pond turtle, are expected to benefit as well as all other species associated with tidal marsh and ICI habitat.\*

**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 construct and evaluate specific treatment methods to prevent erosion of ICI's and increase tidal harsh, all of which protect and restore natural channel and riparian habitats\*

**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 address nor is intended 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 AFRP (3406(b)(1) other) by restoring and protecting riparian and tidal marsh habitats in the Delta.\***

**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 constructs and evaluates methods to protect and promote ICI, riparian and tidal marsh habitat, all of which benefits anadromous fish as well as many other aquatic, terrestrial and plant species associated with those habitats. Although, benefits are not immediate, long-term restoration of ICI and tidal marsh habitat could result. This project supports Delta evaluations 4 and 6, listed as high priority evaluations in the highest priority watershed in the revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish 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 proposal complements the Habitat Enhancement component of DWR's Delta Levees Flood Protection Program, (AB361) which seeks to improve habitat goals on levees and associated structures. 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.**#97-N11 - Demonstration Project for the Protection and Enhancement of Delta In Channel Islands.\*

**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).**#Project planning and permitting is complete; all of Phase I is complete. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports\*

### **REQUESTS FOR NET-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.**#

97-N11.\*

**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):#Proponents have successfully completed Phase 1 and are ready for the next phase of the project.\***

#### **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.#** Appears to be broadly supported. Large stakeholder group consisting of local, state, and federal agencies, nonprofit groups, land owners, and special districts in the Delta. There does not appear to be any adverse third-party impacts\*

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.#** Negative Declaration has been submitted and reviewed. All permitting questioned filled out correctly.\*

**4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.#** None, everything looks good and on schedule.\*

## **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, need to specify that it is 32%, however\***

**5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# Yes, it is identified under Task 1\***

**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:# DCI partners will provide in-kind services in the amount of 25,925 dollars\***

**6c2. Matching funds:# n/a\***

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# State Levee Flood Protection Program: 368,350 dollars or 35.5%; Association of Bay area Governments: 25,925 dollars or 2.5%; and Delta Channel Island Work Group members: 63,000 dollars or 6%. Total: 457,275 dollars or 44%\***

**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\*