i. Proposal number.# 2001-E205*
ii. Short proposal title.# Suisun Marsh Property Acquisition 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.# Restoration of Suisun Marsh will contribute to the restoration of saline emergent wetlands, which will support the recover of listed species in the marsh. This type of project in the Marsh will be important early steps in a longer-term restoration program. This proposal in directly on target for the types of actions needed in the Marsh to restore tidal marsh and recover listed species.*

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 4, Objective 1. The initial phase of this project is to acquire approximately 500 acres of land to be converted to saline emergent wetlands and upland transition lands. This acreage amounts to about 10% of the saline emergent wetland target in the Suisun Bay and Marsh Ecological Management Unit. Species to benefit include Suisun thistle, soft bird's-beak, Mason's lilaeopsis, delta smelt, Sacramento splittail, California clapper rail, California black rail, salt marsh harvest mouse and other species. This project is also linked to improving water quality in the Delta, which is a very important goal of the CALFED Program.*

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 is specifically mentioned in the PSP to "acquire and restore large tracts in

Suisun Marsh to tidal marsh...proposals should be focused in the western and northern portions of the marsh.*

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 a Stage 1 action: implement habitat restoration in Suisun Bay and Marsh to restore 1,200 to 2,300 acres of saline emergent wetlands. This proposal would provide 21 to 38 percent of the Stage 1 acreage of saline emergent wetlands in Suisun Marsh.*

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 closely linked to the MSCS and will "recover" delta smelt, splittail, Mason's lilaeopsis, soft bird's-beak, and Suisun thistle; "contribute to the recovery" of California black rail, California clapper rail, and other species; and will "maintain" a large number of species.*

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 will assist in resolving some of the uncertainties related to the restoration of tidal action to lands in the Suisun Marsh. This proposal is to conduct pilot level experiments to determine if larger scale restoration is appropriate and at what level future restoration should occur. Some of the uncertainties to be resolved by this project is the role of tidal marsh restoration in the Suisun Bay and Marsh Ecological Management Unit and the potential effects on water quality in the Delta. This proposal is a means to test the water quality/habitat restoration hypotheses which are central to the overall CALFED mission and the goals of the ERP. The conceptual models, hypotheses, and monitoring components will all fuel the adaptive management approach.*

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 appears to meet several critical requirement for Suisun Marsh restoration projects: it addresses saline emergent wetland restoration, it will convert existing non-tidal lands to tidal, it will provide transition upland habitats, it will improve habitat for numerous listed species, and is critical in the adaptive management approach to simultaneously improving tidal habitat in the Marsh and improving water quality in the Delta.*

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 winter-run and spring-run chinook salmon, and Central Valley steelhead should benefit from the actions in this proposal. The project is designed to restore land in the northern Suisun Marsh to tidal marshes that include a low-marsh, high-marsh and upland transition zone. One parcel of land, from a list of candidate sites, in the Suisun Marsh will be purchased to restore tidal marshes from a number of targeted seasonally-managed parcels, some of which are already identified (the 262-acre Black Mallard Club along Hill Slough; 300 acres along Chadbourne Slough) while others are only generally specified (parcels along Goodyear and Cordelia Sloughs). The expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production and the certainty of the expected benefits cannot be determined, but due to the relatively small amount of land involved the incremental benefit to anadromous fish would probably be small. The work proposed in this proposal would only cover Phases I (land purchase), II (pre-project monitoring), and possibly a small component of Phase III (complete environmental documentation and obtain necessary permits). The immediacy of the expected contribution will not be realized for at least three years until Phase IV is completed (execute the restoration plan by breaching the levee(s) and adaptive management is initiated). The remainder of Phase III and all of Phase IV work will be performed under terms of a separate fund source. This proposal would contribute toward a self-sustaining functional marsh ecosystem. Therefore, the duration of the expected contribution is long-term.*

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 winter-run and spring-run chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, Sacramento splittail, Suisun thistle, soft bird's beak, Mason's lilaeopsis, California clapper rail, California black rail, and salt marsh harvest mouse. The program is anticipated to result in improved ecological community benefits through the restoration of tidal marsh 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.# The project protects and restores both natural channel and riparian habitat values, and promotes natural processes. The project is designed to restore land in the northern Suisun Marsh to tidal marshes that include a low-marsh, high-marsh and upland transition zone. One parcel of land in the Suisun Marsh will be purchased to restore tidal marshes from a number of targeted seasonally-managed parcels, some of which are already identified (the 262-acre Black Mallard Club along Hill Slough; 300 acres along Chadbourne Slough) while others are only generally specified (parcels along Goodyear and Cordelia Sloughs). Following purchase of the parcels, the levee(s) will be breached according to restoration plan criteria. The flooding will restore tidal wetlands habitat which will be used by native fishes, waterfowl, and wildlife.
The work proposed in this proposal would only cover Phases I (land purchase), II (pre-project monitoring), and possibly a small component of Phase III (complete environmental documentation and obtain necessary permits). The immediacy of the benefits to the natural channel and riparian habitat values will not be realized for at least three years until Phase IV is completed (execute the restoration plan by breaching the levee(s) and adaptive management is initiated). The remainder of Phase III and all of Phase IV work will be performed under terms of a separate fund source. This proposal would contribute toward a self-sustaining functional marsh ecosystem. Therefore, the duration of the benefits to natural channel and habitat values is should be long- term.*

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 riparian habitat in the Suisun Marsh, thereby providing additional high-quality favorable habitat for juvenile salmonids as they migrate through the Delta. A basic premise of this proposal is that the existing seasonal wetland habitat can be converted to a tidal wetland ecosystem of varied habitat types (i.e. low-marsh, high-marsh and upland transition zone) capable of supporting a greater number and variety of desirable species. This project is consistent with Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Evaluation No.4 (Evaluate potential benefits of and opportunities for increasing salmonid and other anadromous fish production through improved riparian habitats in the Delta.) and No. 6 (Evaluate benefits of and opportunities for additional tidal shallow-water habitat as rearing habitat for anadromous fish in the Delta) in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, May 30, 1997; they are both identified as a high priority in the draft plan. The strength of the proposal is that new desirable habitat will be created at the expense of less desirable habitat, and this new habitat should be self-sustaining. The weakness of the proposal is that it only addresses the work to be accomplished in the early phases 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.#Property to be acquired is near Hill Slough Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project funded by CALFED and adjacent to wetlands owned by Department of Water Resources. Acquisition and restoration in the Western Marsh works toward ERPP objective for habitat restoration in the 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.#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. Once funding is secured a public involvement plan will be prepared.*

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.# DFG would be expected to support this proposal since at least one land parcel targeted for purchase is adjacent to marsh land owned and managed by that agency. No other specific supporters were identified. Property owners who would benefit from water quality improvements associated with this proposal would support implementation of the marsh restoration measures. Landowners willing to sell their property to enable implementation of the restoration measures in this proposal would support the proposal.*

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.# federal*

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:# $536,750.00*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 100%. $536,750 divided by $536,750.*

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