i. Proposal number.# 2001-E201*

ii. Short proposal title.# Hill Slough West Demo Project, 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, 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.# The proposal will lead to the restoration of 200 acres of saline emergent wetland habitat in the Suisun Marsh. This restored habitat will contribute to the ERP target of 5,000 to 7,000 acres of saline emergent wetland habitat and will support the recovery of Suisun Marsh aster, Suisun thistle, delta smelt, splittail, clapper rail, black rail and salt marsh harvest mouse. The contributions to recovering listed species could be very important.*

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.# Goal 1, objectives 1 and 2; Goal 2,Objective 3; Goal 4, Objective 1. Overall, this project will contribute 4 percent of the total target of 5,000 acres of saline emergent wetland habitat. This project could also contribute to improved water quality in the Delta, although this was not mentioned in the proposal. The habitats recreated by this proposal would support the recovery of anadromous salmonids, delta smelt, salt marsh harvest mouse, and other marsh dependent species.*

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 clearly request proposals to restore a large tracts in the Suisun Marsh to tidal marsh. This proposal meets that request directly.*

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 is directly linked to Stage 1 actions which specify the restoration of 1,200 to 2,300 acres of saline emergent wetland habitat. This proposal will provide 9 to 17 percent of the Stage 1 goal.*

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 provides multiple benefits to the MSCS and is completely consistent with many MSCS conservation measures that benefit Suisun ornate shrew, Suisun song sparrow, delta smelt, longfin smelt, chinook salmon, splittail, Suisun thistle, salt marsh harvest mouse,and California black rail. This proposal also restores a NCCP habitat classified as tidal perennial aquatic.*

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.# The adaptive management and monitoring components of the project is being developed under Phase 1 funding. This include the development of dynamic hydrologic and topographic conditions. This site-specific model will allow managers to best predict habitat development and species use. This approach will have broad applicability to other restoration projects in the Suisun Marsh and elsewhere in the Northern portion of San Francisco Bay. This project will contribute to reducing the uncertainty identified with shallow water, and tidal and freshwater marsh habitat restoration and species utilization.*

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.# The Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Proposal is a multiphase

program. It appears to have a high probability of success in meeting or contributing to CALFED goals and targets. The strength of the proposal is that DFG owns the property to be developed, DFG has organized an interdisciplinary interagency team, and is building on the experience of other restoration programs.*

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).# The project is soliciting funds for its second Phase. (Phase I was funded by CALFED).
Ultimately the project will restore habitat near Hill Slough, in northeastern Suisun Marsh. Second phase of the project includes completing permits and environmental documentation necessary to proceed with construction in the marsh. The expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish of the wetland restoration is unknown. Specifically, fall, late-fall, winter and spring run juvenile chinook salmon could benefit to some, likely small, unknown degree from the marsh restoration planned in later phases of the project. If there are benefits they are likely small, since most rearing of juvenile salmon occurs upstream and in the Delta and the area restored within Suisun Marsh is relatively small (200 acres).*

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.# Potentially, Delta smelt and splittail, both threatened species, could benefit from marsh
restoration in Suisun Bay. Also, listed Suisun Marsh plant species, California clapper rail, black rail and the salt marsh harvest mouse would benefit from the project. The proposed restoration will take an encompassing tidal marsh ecosystem approach. Benefits to listed and candidate salmonids are not expected to be much based on the response to question 1i. The tidal community overall would likely experience benefits from this action.*

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 benefit the system by connecting tidal wetland habitats in the north central

Suisun Marsh to Hill Slough. By connecting this restoration area with existing tidal habitat, the project has more value than if it were isolated. The basic approach of the project is to promote a self-sustaining marsh ecosystem through restoration of natural edaphic, topographic and tidal conditions within an area that has been leveed off from tidal influence. The project will rely on natural abiotic and biological successional processes to promote gradual marsh regeneration, rather than employing an aggressive approach that would entail extensive planting and seeding.*

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).# The project states based on preliminary data presented by the CALFED Suisun Marsh Levee
Breach Modeling Study, a narrow breach in the northern Suisun Marsh, such as the type likely needed to restore tidal action to Hill Slough West, will improve water quality by lowering salinity levels in the Delta. If this occurs to any measurable extent then it is conceivable that less (b)(2) water would be needed to maintain X2.*

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.# The project would contribute to the implementation of the (b)(1) other Habitat Restoration
Program of the CVPIA because of the natural tidal community that would likely benefit.*

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 project is soliciting funds for its second Phase. (Phase I was funded by CALFED).
Ultimately the project will restore habitat near Hill Slough, in northeastern Suisun Marsh. Second phase of the project includes completing permits and environmental documentation necessary to proceed with restoration in the marsh. The expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish of the wetland restoration is unknown. Specifically, fall, late-fall, winter and spring run juvenile chinook salmon could benefit to some, likely small, unknown

degree from the marsh restoration planned in later phases of the project because most rearing of juvenile salmon occurs upstream and in the Delta and the area restored within Suisun Marsh is relatively small (200 acres).* Potentially, Delta smelt and splittail, both listed species, could benefit from marsh restoration in Suisun Bay. Listed Suisun Marsh plant species, California clapper rail, black rail and the salt marsh harvest mouse would benefit from the project. Funding could be justifiable through the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program or the Habitat Restoration program (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 proposal is consistent with wetland goals set for the Central Valley and Delta by the NACVHJV Program and is the first step in developing large scale, contiguous restoration to join Hill Slough, Peytonia Slough, Joice Island, and Rush Ranch. When complete this project will provide a baseline to allow CALFED to forecast costs of meeting restoration targets in the Suisun Marsh. 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-F08 - Hill Slough Wetland Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project; Phase II.*

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):#Have formed an interdisciplinary integration team to guide planning and hired consultant to complete surveys, develop restoration plan, monitoring plan, and habitat mosaic, and start environmental compliance. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

REQUESTS FOR NOXT-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.#98F08.*

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):#See section 3c2.*

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.# This proposal is submitted for completing environmental documentation, therefore, there are no issues.*

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.#*

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.#*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.#*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.#*

COST SHARING

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

6b. Are applicants specifically requesting either state or federal cost share dollars? Type state, federal, or 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:#*

6c2. Matching funds:#*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#*