

i. Proposal number.# 2001-E206*

ii. Short proposal title.# Peytonia Slough 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# 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.# Small projects like this proposal will provide incremental progress towards the overall goal. This proposal could provide additional tidal marsh habitat. It is unclear if the proposal would also provide the necessary transitional habitat so that a wider variety of species would use the restored marsh habitat such as terrestrial animal and plant 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, Objective 1; Goal 4, Objective 1. The contribution of this proposal to ERP objectives will be small.*

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 related to restoration actions in the Suisun Marsh to create tidal marsh. The PSP requests proposals for large tracts (without specifying the size of a large tract). This proposal does not include a large tract, rather a very small parcel.*

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 proposed action would be identified as a Stage 1 action as it would contribute to the restoration of saline emergent vegetation and tidal perennial aquatic habitat in the Suisun Bay and 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 could provide improved habitat for several species addressed in the MSCS: delta smelt, splittail, and longfin smelt. There are probably other terrestrial species not mentioned in the proposal that could include Suisun ornate shrew, Suisun song sparrow, salt marsh harvest mouse, Suisun thistle, Suisun Marsh aster, and variety of other plant species. The small size of the restoration plot indicates that the potential benefits to listed species will be minimal.*

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.# It was difficult to identify hypotheses in the proposal. Clear hypotheses should have been developed that addressed the uncertainties of non-native invasive plants, natural versus artificial channel creation in restored marshes, species utilization of restored marshes including use by aquatic and terrestrial species. Likewise, there is no conceptual model even though the proponents have experience in marsh restoration. Overall, the amount of information and usefulness of the information to be generated by this proposal is unclear. The proponents mistakenly view adaptive management as the monitoring component of restoration. The proposal could have been improved if the proponents had described how they would use the information gained from this effort in the next restoration project they might develop for the Peytonia Slough area.*

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 has a good link to public education. However, this link is overshadowed by the overall cost of the project, the few acres to be improved, and poor understanding of the need for conceptual models, hypotheses, and adaptive management.*

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).# There is no expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish from this project since Peytonia Slough is not in an area where anadromous fish could easily use the area for rearing or migration.*

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.# Possibly listed species; Delta smelt, longfin smelt and Sacramento splittail could benefit from restoration in Peytonia Slough, although benefits are uncertain it could provide additional wetland habitat for spawning and rearing.*

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 relies on restoration through natural edaphic topographic and tidal conditions within areas that have been filled or otherwise disturbed. Natural biotic and biological successional process will be relied upon to promote gradual marsh regeneration. The immediacy of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values is unknown, but if successful the duration of any realized benefits should be good.*

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).# This project will not contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations.*

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 implementation of the (b)(1) other, Habitat Restoration Program for its potential benefits to splittail and Delta smelt, and migratory, waterfowl and shore birds.*

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 restores altered flows, reduces marsh plain isolation, reduces migration barriers, manages invasive exotic plants and protects natural areas from land use/urbanization impacts. It does not likely provide habitat for anadromous fish, but does provide additional habitat for other listed or candidate fisheries species in the Delta. It also provides habitat for salt marsh harvest mouse and reduce the presence of invasive exotic pant species in the marsh. It could be funded by the (b)(1) other, Habitat Restoration Program for Central Valley fish and wildlife. Benefits are largely uncertain, but the monitoring and adaptive management components would help clarify these issues.*

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. Proposed project continues a recently completed marsh restoration plan for 2.5 acres of perennial marsh and saline wetland habitat in Peytonia Slough. Contributes to CALFED's goals to enhance and restore Suisun Marsh/Grizzly Island Ecosystem complex. 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.

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.# 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 project is near an urban area (Suisun City) where visibility is high. The project represents a continuation of a recently completed restoration area of 2.52 acres. The proposal states that they will collaborate with local schools and colleges to create an atmosphere of learning and involvement. There is no other discussion relating to support or opposition of local entities supporting or opposing the project.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Everything is identified except 1600 agreement with CDFG.*

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, for 6 years *

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.# No
mention of project management costs*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

5a - 5d.# Detailed budget tables but project management costs need to be included. Budget is for 6 years rather than the maximum of 3 years. First year includes request for \$15,000 endowment seed money.*

*

COST SHARING

6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.# No-technically, but possibly yes through proposed mitigation bank. See 6d.*

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.# Cost sharing will be accomplished through the proposed mitigation bank. Once approved, the bank will provide 342,000 dollars in reimbursement funds to CALFED*