**i. Proposal number.#** 2001-E204*

**ii. Short proposal title.#** Butte Creek/Sanborn Bifurcation Upgrade Project*

**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.#** Butte Creek is important for spring-run chinook salmon. This proposal is designed to improve both upstream and downstream fish passage at a significant water control structure in the creek. Water in the basin is also used to provide managed seasonal and permanent wetlands for migratory waterfowl and shorebirds. Management of spring-run chinook salmon is closely linked to management of the Butte Sink marshes. This proposal will improve management of Butte Creek hydrologic regimes for both elements: spring chinook and emergent wetlands.*

**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, Objective 1: Goal 4, Objective 2. The proposal will make a large contribution to recovering spring-run chinook salmon and a much lesser contribution to improving management of the Butte Sink permanent and seasonal marshes.*

**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 a Phase II funding request. It is best described as a natural flow regime project as it us designed to evaluate flow patterns to eliminate flow-related barriers to fish migration. The linkage to natural flow is weak but it should not be characterized as a shallow water, tidal and freshwater marsh habitat proposal.*

**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 identified in Appendix D of the Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration (e.g., improve fish passage at diversion dams either by providing alternative diversion structures that will allow removal of existing dams or by upgrading fish ladders and screen diversions).*

**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 is most strongly linked to anadromous salmonids, particularly spring-run chinook salmon. All anadromous salmonids are included in the MSCS as species designated for "Recovery." This proposal will provide an incremental step toward 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 not linked to the uncertainties in the PSP. The proposal's sections on conceptual models, hypotheses, and adaptive management are weak because the proposal is mechanical and not adaptive. The proposal is to replace an existing water control structure that functions poorly with a new structure. The adaptive component is more of a monitoring element: will the new structure function as planned or will operation of the structure need to be modified. This is not a weakness in the proposal, it just reflects the fact that this is a second phase construction project.*

**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 proposal will improve passage conditions for spring-run chinook salmon and will improve water operations that support managed and seasonal emergent marshes in the Butte Sink.*

**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).#** Completion of the Sanborn Slough bifurcation structure implements AFRP Action 22, and evaluation 5, and will provide immediate and long-term benefit to Butte Creek spring, fall, and late-fall run chinook salmon, and steelhead. Providing effective adult passage facilities that allows these species to access their spawning habitat in upper Butte Creek provides more adults on the spawning grounds resulting in the production of more eggs and juveniles.*

**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.#** Butte Creek, in the reach upstream of, and including the Butte Sink harbors the state/federally listed spring run chinook salmon (threatened) and steelhead (threatened), as well as fall and late-fall run chinook salmon which are federal candidate species. Also potentially impacted in this reach is the federally listed splittail (threatened). The Butte Sink is also an of area of significant wetlands valued, with virtually all of the wetlands dependent upon flow control at the Sanborn Slough bifurcation. Wetlands dependent species benefited by this projects include the federal/state listed giant garter snake (threatened) , willow fly catcher (state endangered), western yellow-billed cuckoo (state threatened), greater sandhill crane (state threatened) and the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (federal threatened). Federal and state species of concern include the western pond turtle, white-faced ibis, long-billed curlew, double crested cormorant, burrowing owl, and tri-colored blackbird.*

**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.#** Flows through the Butte Sink, other than flood flows, are controlled at the Sanborn Slough bifurcation structure. By managing the balance of Butte Creek flows through the Butte Sink, this structure is critical to protecting and maintaining natural channel and riparian habitat values and

important wetland areas along the various channels of Butte Creek.*

**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 Sanborn Slough bifurcation structure is important in controlling Butte Creek instream flows
acquired for fish and wildlife values (40 cfs) and which involve a U. S. Bureau of Reclamation Sacramento River Central Valley Project water exchange agreement. This exchange agreement provides for additional diversion of CVP water from the Sacramento River M&T Pumps near Chico, in exchange for waters being left in Butte Creek to return to the Sacramento River near Verona..*

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 supports the Waterfowl Incentives Program 3406(b)(22) by controlling flows
delivered to enrolled lands.*

**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 proposal is to fund the completion of a previous AFRP supported project that includes a
water control and fish passage structure in Butte Creek at the Butte Sink Sanborn Slough bifurcation. Project implements AFRP Action 22, and evaluation 5. The Sanborn Slough bifurcation structure controls Butte Creek flows through the
various channels of Butte Creek, and
is essential to providing fish passage while maintaining wetlands. Butte Creek currently supports the largest remaining population of the state and federally listed spring-run chinook salmon, as well as populations of the federally listed steelhead, and federal candidate species, fall and late-fall run chinook salmon. The Sanborn Slough bifurcation structure is one component of a multi-million dollar Butte Creek Watershed restoration program. Significant efforts have been completed in the reach above the Butte Sink, including modification of four dams and removal of five others. Additionally, instream flows of 40cfs have been provided through a BOR water

exchange, while a local watershed conservancy has formed and is providing local guidance and support. Multiple projects within the reach downstream of the Sanborn Slough bifurcation structure are in various stages of development. It is imperative that all actions be completed if Butte Creek is to be restored to recover and manage spring-run chinook salmon and other state and federally listed species.*

**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 is directly related to other ecosystem restoration projects in the Butte Creek Watershed. CALFED/CVPIA actions completed within the last 10 years have made significant improvements for fish passages in upper reaches with several fish ladders and fish screens. This project implements the first of many dams and diversions to be upgraded or remediated in lower Butte Creek. CALFED/CVPIA has funded planning and engineering on several Butte Creek projects. 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.#**CVPIA.*

**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.#**
AFRP Lower Butte Creek Project Phase 1b. #113328J024.*

**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 Ib completed and have final report. Many environmental/technical analyses have been completed for this reach of Butte Creek, as well as structural designs, inspection of completed structures and the associated environmental documents for the first phase of this project. It is supported by the onsite observations of the CVPIA AFRP staff reviewer.*

**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.#**
# 113328J024.*

**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):#**Have completed first phase satisfactorily in accordance with the plans and specifications developed in conjunction with the CVPIA AFRP, and they are ready for next phase. Information is derived from the many environmental technical analyses completed for this reach of Butte Creek, as well as the structural designs, inspection of the completed structure and the associated environmental documents for the first phase of this project, and personal knowledge of CVPIA staff reviewer. *

**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 only outstanding issues are the operations agreements that need to be signed by all parties (landowners, duck clubs, farmers and irrigation districts) involved in the operations and maintenance of the improved facilities. No major third party impacts are anticipated in this process.*

**ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.#** All compliance and access issues are addressed. Documentation is included. All pertinent permits are checked off.*

**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:#** $1,067,000.00*

**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.#** n/a*