i. Proposal number.# 2001-E211*

ii. Short proposal title .# Frank's Tract, Big Break, and Lower Sherman Restoration Feasibility*

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 would primarily provide improvement in Delta habitats with subsequent benefits to species which depend on those habitats. Habitats could include tidal perennial aquatic, fresh emergent vegetation, and Delta slough (tidal). The proposal is comprised of three feasibility studies directed at restoring tidal marshes and levees in the Delta. Potentially, any of the three restoration sites could contribute to the habitat goals established for the Delta which in turn could contribute to restoration of species that utilize tidal marsh 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 4, Objective 1 and Goal 1, Objective 1. The ERP goal for fresh emergent wetlands in the Delta ranges from 30,000 to 45,000 acres. The proposed feasibility studies could develop projects that would contribute to the ERP goal.*

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 proposal will examine the feasibility of restoring tidal marsh habitat in the geographic areas identified in 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.# Yes. The proposal addresses
Stage 1 action directed and habitat restoration for tidal perennial aquatic, fresh emergent vegetation, and other shallow water habitats.*

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 is linked to the MSCS. Potential habitat restoration will benefit several aquatic species including delta smelt, splittail, and all anadromous salmonids. These 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.# This proposal would provide the type of information necessary for the long-term implementation program. It provides conceptual models, hypotheses, and identifies operational models to evaluate salinity and other factors related to converting flooded island to more complex tidal marshes. It erroneously states that adaptive management is not applicable to this early research stage. Adaptive management must be integrated into every step and phase of the program.*

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 is expensive and well constructed. An alternative would be to fund feasibility studies at only two of the three sites which should reduce the total cost proportionally. Regardless, this type of project is important for its information content and ability to help design future projects. It also has a link to improved Delta water quality which is an attribute that is very attractive.*

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 project would not directly increase the production of anadromous fish. This project is a feasibility study to restore three flooded islands in the Delta that could contribute to the natural production of anadromous fish, especially fall run chinook salmon. Habitat benefits may also occur for other chinook salmon runs, steelhead, and green and white sturgeon. Benefits from the restored habitat are uncertain but previous research (Grimaldo et al, in prep.) has indicated that native migratory fish inhabit areas without submerged aquatic vegetation, but along the intertidal edge. Therefore, restoring open water to intertidal habitat should change fish species composition and the hypothesis is that the change may favor native migratory fish. Non-native species can dominate the simplified, warmer, open water biotic communities supported by these three flooded islands. This project will examine approaches for rehabilitating these open water areas to increase the amount of intertidal area with its natural tidal fluctuations, cycling of nutrients and community complexities.*

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.# The restoration of complex tidal wetlands at Lower Sherman Lake, Big Break and Franks Tract would most likely benefit Sacramento splittail (threatened) and Delta smelt (endangered). Increasing complexity and other habitat improvements potentially stemming from this study would probably benefit other native species, such as tule perch.*

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 feasibility study would include wetland restoration concepts which would re-establish natural channels and in turn may reduce the spread of non-native aquatic plants.*

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 has the potential to improve the flexibility in operating the CVP, concurrently with native habitat restoration, by significantly improving Delta water quality (decreasing salinity at Clifton Court Forebay and Rock Slough by 10 to 20 %).*

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 feasibility study proposed would contribute to implementation of the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program. If a reduction in salinity in the Delta were achieved by the ultimate restoration of these islands, less water might need to be acquired to meet the goals of the various CVPIA programs (movement of X2) and may benefit the Water Acquisition 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 feasibility study to restore tidal mixing and wetland habitat on three flooded islands in the Delta (Franks tract, Big Break, and Sherman Lake) may provide habitat benefits to anadromous fish and other fisheries species of special concern if it leads to restoration of habitats that support these species. Reduction of the spread of invasive aquatic plants would also have overall ecosystem benefits. If the project facilitated reducing salinity in the Delta it would also provide benefits and additional flexibility to operation of the CVP

The program most applicable to fund this project would be the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program or Habitat Restoration Program. The strength of this proposal is that it is evaluating flooded islands owned by the public and are large expanses of area in the Delta. If they were successful at restoration, benefits may be greater than for areas of lesser size.*

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.#Additional restoration planning efforts at two of the sites (Frank's Tract, Big Break) complement this study of the project benefits. Nearby work at Lower Sherman Lake is identifying nutrient cycling, and food web characteristics, and this restoration may benefit from ongoing analysis and beneficial reuse of dredged material in the Delta. 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.#
CALFED 96M09 - Sherman Island Levee Habitat Demonstration Project
98C01 - Twitchell Island Subsidence Study*

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.#no.*

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#Proponent didn't list other Department of Water Resources information. Status developed using progress reports.*

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):#Most Department of Water Resources projects are underway and progressing. Many were initially delayed due to budget negotiations and contracting issues. Projects 96M09 and 98C01, have been delayed due to contracting problems (98C01) and budget constraints (96M09). 98C01 is progressing well now. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

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.# 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 Natural Heritage Institute and EDAW will coordinate the public involvement program. The feasibility study is intended to facilitate an interdisciplinary investigation that provides technical information to the decision-makers for the study, with input from the public outreach program.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# This is not a project under CEQA.*

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:# 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*