

i. Proposal number.# 2001-E202*

ii. Short proposal title.# Rhode Island Floodplain Management and Habitat Restoration*

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# D, A***

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 most directly will contribute to the goal of restoring functional habitats and the subsequent use by listed species. The proposal would provide a mosaic of habitats including fresh emergent wetland and riparian and riverine aquatic, with fresh emergent wetlands being the primary habitat covering about 65 acres and up to 7,000 lineal feet of riparian vegetation. The tidal marsh acres are valuable and the 7,000 acres of riparian vegetation are even more important considering the lack of riparian areas in the Delta.*

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 4, Objective 1; Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2. The ERP target for fresh emergent wetland in the Delta Ecological Management Zone is 30,000 to 45,000 acres and the target for riparian and riverine aquatic habitat is 53-96 miles. This project could provide 65 acres of fresh emergent wetlands and more than 1 mile of riparian and riverine aquatic.*

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 is not clearly requested in the PSP. The location of Rhode Island is below the northern portion of the Delta (requested in the PSP) and north of the southern portion of the Delta (also requested in the PSP). The PSP did not request shallow water, tidal and freshwater marsh habitat in the

Central and West Delta This proposal would provide the benefits requested in the PSP for species and habitat but not in the location requested.*

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 would be included as a Stage 1 action to provide 8,000 to 12,000 acres of fresh emergent wetlands and 25 miles of riparian and riverine aquatic habitat.*

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 proposal covers the NCCP habitat of tidal freshwater emergent vegetation and valley/foothill riparian habitats. Species which depend on these habitats in the Delta include Swainson's hawk, Mason's lilaepsis, Delta tule pea, Suisun marsh aster, neotropical migratory birds, delta smelt, splittail and all anadromous salmonids.*

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 is linked to shallow water, tidal and freshwater marsh habitat uncertainties. There are no indicator species or indicator conditions identified in the proposal to assess the success of the restoration effort. The only hypothesis is 'native plant and animal communities can be preserved and restored using available techniques.' The proposal would be improved by the addition of additional hypotheses such as the creation of high ground within the project site would serve as a key area for a riparian forest and dependent species, riparian vegetated levees are more sustainable than unvegetated levees (suggesting a paired type of study for vegetated vs unvegetated levees), or sediment accretion is measurable in a partially enclosed emergent marsh. The adaptive management section of this proposal is weak and could have been strengthened by presentation of a better narrative conceptual model regarding Delta hydrodynamics, sediment transport and deposition, erosional forces, and human interventions.*

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 proposed creation of a fresh emergent wetland partially surrounded by a levee supporting riparian species in the Central and West Delta is attractive. Generally, this portion of the Delta is deeply subsided so opportunities for shallow water habitats in the area are limited. The proposal could be improved in the areas of hypothesis and adaptive management. We need to capitalize the information base for these types of projects early in the CALFED implementation phase. These deficiencies can be resolved or corrected in the next phase as the project monitoring and assessment plans are developed.*

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).# Potentially all juvenile salmonids could benefit from shallow water habitat restoration in the Delta. The magnitude of benefits to salmonid, if realized at all, are likely small based on the area (67 acres) relative to larger area of the Delta. Monitoring plan specifics are not identified to estimate benefits, which is needed to identify the efficacy of such a pilot restoration activity, and would link this sort of effort to the Revised Draft Restoration Plan Delta Evaluation 6. Immediacy of benefits not known.*

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.# Delta Smelt, Splittail could benefit from the habitat restoration which are both endangered species in the Delta, although it's unclear whether we know how to design marsh habitat that is of value to Delta fisheries species. The project is likely to benefit overall emergent tidal wetland and shallow water aquatic habitat communities, but benefits are largely unknown and potentially uncertain. And the strength of the monitoring plan to assess this proposed project in an adaptive management context can not be evaluated from information presented.*

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 attempts to restore freshwater marsh habitat from a breached island by removing non-native vegetation, placing fill in near levees, and planting with native species. The project promotes natural channel values by planting native vegetation and possibly by creating more favorable depths in a greater portion of the island. The duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values should be long-term given that the restoration effort gives the native plant community a strong start and that the existing hydrology will maintain and improve on this initial start.*

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 will not contribute to efforts to modify CVP operation.*

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 could contribute to the implementation of the (b)(1) other, Habitat Restoration Program within the CVPIA based on the multi-aquatic and avian species that are identified as potential beneficiaries.*

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 program's benefits of habitat restoration in the Delta for anadromous fish and other endangered and threatened fish species are uncertain. A descriptive monitoring plan and adaptive management strategy that would help identify and reduce this uncertainty is not illustrative in this proposal. This effort could be consistent with Revised Draft Restoration Plan Delta Evaluation 6, but again, more would need to be known about the monitoring strategy. Habitat would be improved for terrestrial species such as shorebirds, waterfowl, Swainson's hawk, Mason's lilaeopsis, Delta tule pea, Suisun marsh aster and neotropical migrant songbirds. The program could potentially be funded by the AFRP or the (b)(1) other, Habitat Restoration Program of CVPIA.*

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.#Project will aid in recovery of listed species and protect and enhance neotrophic migrant bird habitats, consistent with goals of CVHJV and Delta Wildlife Habitat Protection and Restoration Plan. 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.#98F08 -Rhode Island Floodplain Management and Habitat Restoration, Phase 1*

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):#Most DFG projects are progressing well. Some have experienced contracting, permitting, and staffing delays. Work on Rhode Island Phase I, which is the first phase of this project is complete. Source: Proposal, 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.#98F08*

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

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#Have completed Phase I and are ready for Phase II.*

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 project does not discuss issues relating to support or opposition of the project by local entities or governments.*

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.# 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:# 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.# The California Department of Fish and Game is providing cost offsetting activities such as: 1.Contract Management; 2.Real property-the island itself; 3.Monitoring of the site in the long-term; 4.Property Management; 5.Limited equipment use such as boats and vehicles*