

**i. Proposal number.**# 2001-E208\*

**ii. Short proposal title.**# Benecia Waterfront Marsh Restoration, Phase II\*

**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, B\*

**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 is a small project that will make a contribution to the saline emergent vegetation habitat goal for the Suisun Bay and Marsh Ecological Management Unit. Restoration will result in the reactivation of natural marsh creation/maintenance process.\*

**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 2, Objective 3. The ERP goal for saline emergent wetlands is 5,000-7,000 acres in the Suisun Bay and Marsh EMU. The restoration of 6.8 acres of tidal marsh will make a small contribution to the overall acreage targets and the restoration of natural processes.\*

**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.**# The proposal is most closely aligned with the acquisition and restoration of tidal marsh in the Suisun Marsh as described in the PSP. The proposal is consistent with the PSP.\*

**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.**# The proposal would directly

qualify as a Stage 1 action to restore 1,200 to 2,300 acres of saline emergent wetlands in the Suisun Bay and Marsh EMU.\*

**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 does not list species to benefit from the project other than a contribution to foodweb organisms. Given the location of the site, it appears that longfin smelt, delta smelt, all races and species of juvenile anadromous salmonids would benefit from increased tidal marsh habitat along the Benicia waterfront. These species are all "recover" 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.#** The information component of the proposal is adequate and the hypotheses that are offered are very relevant to the restoration of small tidal marshes. A larger question, which was not asked, is the relative value of a series of small tidal marsh restorations versus larger scale marsh restoration project. The project is weak in identifying linkages between restoration and the potential benefits for aquatic and terrestrial species. The proposal is short on the adaptive management value of the project, and it could be improved. The information gained from restoration of this small parcel can be transferred to many similar projects. The issues of invasion by non-native plant species is discussed but may be a significant issue for 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 is a Phase II proposal. It will provide a small amount of restored tidal marsh habitat but will also provide a significant opportunity for public outreach and education.\*

**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 potential of minor benefits

to all species of anadromous fish to benefit from the project.

However, since the project area is very small the benefits would expect to be very small. The certainty of an benefit to natural production of anadromous fish difficult to ascertain as are the immediacy and duration of any anadromous fish benefits.\*

**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 are expected to benefit from the project. The tidal

wetland shallow water habitat community with a variety of plant and animal species is expected to benefit. Chinook salmon and steelhead as listed and candidate species and could benefit in a minor way from the project.\*

**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 promotes and restores

natural channel and

riparian habitat values by the removal of fill of past landfill modifications and creation of pilot channels. This promotes natural processes by increasing the tidal prism to achieve a natural evolution of low order tidal channels and the increase of freshwater to upper marsh with more heterogeneous mix of species. Any benefits that do accrue 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).# The project will not contribute to modified 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 help implement the (b)(1) other, Habitat Restoration Program.\***

**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 Habitat Restoration Program 3406(b)(1) other has potential to fund the project as a pilot effort to restoration of tidal marsh with potential benefit to CVPIA habitat restoration goals in lower estuary and inherent biotic communities. The project is at the extreme western edge of the CVPIA geographical scope and hence is a low priority region for restoration. A very minor or no benefit to anadromous fishes is possible with a minor direct benefit to delta smelt production.\***

## **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.**#Phase I Planning funded by CALFED in 1998. No direct connection to the restoration project, but, complements other restoration projects in Suisun Marsh/NB Ecosystem Management Zone. 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.**#98F17 - Benicia Waterfront Marsh Restoration, Phase I.\*

**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):**#Work on Phase I is progressing well and have developed Negative Declaration and draft Monitoring Plan. Project is on schedule. Source: Proposal, quarterly 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.**#98F17.\*

**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):#See 3C2. Project should have all permits in near future and is ready for next phase funding.\***

#### **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.# There is widespread public support including local school community group volunteers for the project.\***

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Everything looks good except ESA consultation would apply here.\***

**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:#** \$67,920.00\*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#** 14%. \$67,920 divided by \$502,255.\*

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