i. Proposal number.# 2001-E209*
ii. Short proposal title.# Suisun Marsh Land Acquisition and Tidal Marsh Conversion*

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.# This proposal can make a substantial contribution to the recovery of listed species which depend on the Suisun Marsh and a sizeable contribution to the restoration of saline emergent vegetation and the species dependent on that habitat.*

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 objectives for species goals address species listed for "Recovery" and "Contribute to Recovery", and the objective for habitats includes the restoration of tidal marsh habitats (fresh, brackish, and saline).*

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.# Yes. The PSP clearly requests proposals to acquire and restore large tracts in Suisun Marsh to tidal marsh and the proposals should focus on western and northern portions of the Marsh. This proposal responds to the PSP but specifies that the acquisitions will occur in the northeastern portion of Suisun Bay not the north and western portion.*

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 addresses a
Stage 1 Action: restore 1,200 to 2,300 acres of saline emergent vegetation. It would provide 22 to 42 percent of the Stage 1 target.*

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.# Tidal marsh restoration in Suisun Bay and Marsh Ecological Management Unit can benefit an extensive list of covered species that include delta smelt, longfin smelt, splittail, all salmonids, Suisun thistle, Suisun Marsh aster, Suisun song sparrow, Suisun ornate shrew, salt marsh harvest mouse, and other species. The actual benefit to the covered species will depend on the location and size of the tract of land to be restored. The MSCS recommends that the creation of tidal marshes should be large enough to include fourth order tidal channels and should be at least 1,000 acres in size.*

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 conceptual model of the restoration component of the proposal is weak and there is only one overarching hypothesis presented. If properly structured, the proposal could directly resolve some of the critical uncertainties related to the restoration of tidal marsh habitats. Specifically, the proposal should suggest benefits of tidal marsh restoration to the covered aquatic and terrestrial species. The ecological monitoring and assessment plans would be developed in a subsequent phase. The proposal, however, does describe (Page 9) how it would be compatible with similar proposals and lists some of the types of data and evaluations that will be collected and made.*

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 hit the target but missed the bulls eye. The proposal fails to mention the role of tidal slough and upland transitional habitats

as part of tidal marsh restoration. The location of the parcel is critical in determining whether or not there is the potential for linking to transitional habitat. The suggestion to seek parcels in the Denverton Slough/Potrero Hills areas suggests that someone may have been considering upland/transitional habitats but it was unclear from reviewing the proposal. The other critical omission for tidal marsh restoration in the Suisun Marsh is identifying the linkage with a levee program. Virtually all restoration efforts in the Marsh which breach existing levees, must describe the extent to which any existing interior levees will be upgraded to protect adjacent lands and habitats. Subsequent phases of this proposal would have to clearly develop the sections on a conceptual model for restoration of tidal marsh habitats, hypotheses to be tested during the implementation and monitoring period, and how the information can be used in an adaptive manner to improve the existing project but contribute to related future projects as well.*

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).# All anadromous salmonids are expected to benefit after other phases of the project are complete. This project is for land acquisition only (as Phase I). As this is the land acquisition phase, no direct benefits will result. In the restoration phase some small benefit could result for all anadromous salmonids. Benefits are expected to be small as relatively few salmonids rear in Suisun Marsh. The benefits are of medium certainty as there are uncertainties as to the success of restoration of tidal wetlands. The contribution to benefits for anadromous fish is in the next 10-25 years, again not in this project but in later phases of the restoration.*

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.# Fall and late Fall Chinook salmon are candidate species, winter run Chinook salmon are endangered, and spring run and steelhead are threatened. A total 45 other at-risk species are expected to

benefit in the later restoration phase. These include delta smelt, longfin smelt and splittail plus saltwater harvest mouse, soft birds beak and Suisun thistle. The Suisun Marsh tidal wetlands community is expected to benefit from later phases of this multiphase project. Again this project is only for land acquisition with inherent indirect benefits that are proposed to be seen later.*

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.# Later phases of this project will restore natural

channel values through restoration of tidal exchange, improved water filtering, sediment settling, downstream flooding and improved water quality. This will result in a tidal marsh habitat characterized by natural processes being restored in a shallow water tidal habitat environment with its marsh vegetation. The habitat values should be sustained over the 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 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 would contribute

to 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.# There is some small potential for the Habitat Restoration Program, (b)(1) other, to fund the proposal as it may benefit a variety of at risk species when combined with other phases of the program. It has the potential to help a variety of at risk, and listed species, but of only minor benefit to anadromous salmonids species in the Suisun Marsh. Benefits that do accrue should be long-term*

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.#Land protection and restoration in northeast Suisun Marsh complements and enhances region wide efforts to preserve and restore this ecosystem including 2300 acres at Montezuma Slough and 131 acres along the Baypoint Shoreline. Complements studies of sedimentation rates and marsh plan development conducted by DWR, DFG, SRCD, and USBR. Implementation of projects simultaneously will facilitate coordination on hypothesis testing and investigation of CALFED uncertainties. This will facilitate planning and timing of future restoration 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.#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 NOXT-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.# There are considerable government and environmental agencies that support this project. Concerns will likely be voiced in the planning phases (phase II) of the project by local landowners and reclamation districts.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# All compliance and access issues are addressed for future phases of this project.*

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.# no*

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.# n/a*