

**i. Proposal number.#** 2001-E203\*

**ii. Short proposal title.#** Fay Island Restoration Project Phase I\*

**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.#** This proposal includes the acquisition of two parcels in the Delta, Fay Island and a mid-channel island (referred to as a berm island in the proposal). Fay Island would be acquired and restored to a fresh emergent marsh and the berm island would be managed and protected as a mid-channel island. This proposal would provide an incremental step toward protecting and restoring functional habitats in the Delta such as fresh emergent wetlands and mid-channel islands. A wide variety of species are dependent on those types of habitats including delta smelt, chinook salmon, splittail, western pond turtle, and Mason's lilaeopsis. The ERP target for fresh emergent wetlands in the Delta Ecological Management Zone is 30,000 to 45,000 acres and the target for mid-channel islands in the Central and West Delta Ecological Management Zone is 50 to 200 acres. This proposal would provide an incremental step towards the fresh emergent wetland goal (98 acres) and a significant step toward the mid-channel island goal (17 acres or about 34 percent of the minimum target).\*

**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.\*

**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 Fay 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 50 to 200 acres of mid-channel island 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. Species which depend on these habitats in the Delta include Mason's lilaepsis, delta smelt, splittail and all anadromous salmonids, all of which are species designated for recovery.\*

**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. Restoration of this island could be a companion or comparison to the restoration of Fay Island. This would allow different treatments for restoration of fresh emergent vegetation and recolonization by fish and plant species. As this is primarily an acquisition proposal, the conceptual model, hypothesis, and adaptive management approach are not well developed but adequate for the stage of the project. It is recommended that if the proposal is funded that more complete conceptual models be presented that address sediment transport/deposition, hydrology and tides, and plant colonization. The hypothesis regarding the potential role of Fay Island as "interceptor habitat" for resident and anadromous fish is very interesting and extremely valuable to the CALFED approach to the Delta. Too little information is provided regarding management or restoration of the berm (mid-channel) island is presented and this information is equally as important as the restoration approach for Fay Island.\*

**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.** # Generally, this is a good proposal in that it identifies opportunities to acquire lands for developing fresh emergent wetlands and protecting an existing large berm island. Linking the implementation of this proposal with the similar Rhode Island proposal would increase the information richness of each project. This proposal would contribute to ERP goals and targets and is consistent with the Stage 1 actions.\*

#### **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 natural production of white sturgeon and primarily San

Joaquin River fall-run chinook salmon (although steelhead and all races of chinook salmon that spawn in the Central Valley Basin and subsequently migrate downriver and across to the southern central Delta) should benefit from the actions in this proposal. The project is designed to restore tidal action to Fay Island, a 98-acre island reclaimed for agriculture and seasonally managed wetland. Fay Island is situated on Old River in the southern central Delta. However, the actions in this proposal address only Phase I of a four-phase project. Phase I is limited to land purchase and plan preparation. Consequently, neither the expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production of anadromous fish, the certainty of the expected benefits, nor the duration of the expected contribution can be determined. The immediacy of the expected contribution will not be realized for at least several years; the phase I work is scheduled for completion within one year of initiation, but the time required for the subsequent work in phases II through IV is not identified.\*

**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.** # Listed species, anadromous species and special status species

expected to benefit from the implementation of the project include steelhead, all races of chinook salmon that spawn in the Central Valley Basin, delta smelt, Sacramento splittail, tricolor blackbird, western pond turtle and Mason's lilaeopsis. The actions in this proposal address only Phase I of a four-phase project. Phase I is limited to land purchase and plan preparation. The project will contribute to restoring functional

tidal freshwater emergent and shaded riverine aquatic habitats. Restoring these habitats will aid in the recovery and restoration of native species and biotic communities in the central Delta.\*

**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 will protect and restore natural channel and riparian habitat values, and will promote natural processes. The project is intended to restore tidal action to Fay Island, a 98-acre island reclaimed for agriculture and seasonally managed wetland. Fay Island is situated on Old River in the southern central Delta. The specific actions that will be implemented will not be identified until the habitat restoration plan is completed; this will occur at the end of Phase I within 1 year of contract finalization. Possible actions in Phase IV include creating breaches in the levees, excavating higher order channels to improve habitat quality and limit fish stranding, limited replanting of sensitive plant species, and a program of invasive species management. The immediacy of the benefits to the natural channel and riparian habitat values cannot be ascertained because no schedule for initiation of Phases II-IV is included in this proposal. The duration of the benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values should be long term because the natural processes that will be restored are anticipated to be self-sustaining.\*

**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).#**

No evidence is presented to indicate whether/how the project would contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations. No such relationship is apparent.\*

**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 does not contribute to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA.\*

**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 is appropriate for funding support from the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. The project could contribute to meeting the goal of the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program to increase the natural production of anadromous fish by increasing the amount and quality of available shallow water habitat in the Delta, thereby providing additional high-quality favorable habitat for juvenile salmonids as they migrate through the Delta. The strength of the project is that it will replace existing low quality habitat with high quality habitat that is in short supply. The weakness of the proposal is that it addresses only the first phase of a multi-phased project; there is no guarantee if/when funding of the work in the subsequent phases will be secured.\*

## **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 is consistent with achieving recovery of at-risk Delta species identified in the Endangered Species Recovery Plan, AFRP, CVPIA, and Delta Native Fishes Recovery 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.****#none\***

**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.****#\***

**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.#\***

**3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#\***

**3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#\***

**3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#\***

#### **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.# 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.#** There is no known opposition to this proposal.\*

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.#** None, this is Phase 1 of a multi phase project. It will need to comply with CEQA/NEPA for future actions.\*

**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.#\***