

i. Proposal number.# 2001-E212*

ii. Short proposal title .# Tolay Creek and Cullinan Ranch Tidal Wetland Monitoring*

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.# The proposal is to fund monitoring at two tidal marsh restoration sites in San Pablo Bay, the Tolay Creek restoration project (435 acres) and the Cullinan Ranch restoration project (1497 acres). The monitoring and evaluations will determine the quality of the habitat created.*

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, Objectives 1 and 2.*

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.# Tidal marsh restoration is identified in the PSP. This includes the longer-term monitoring programs to collect data to evaluate the benefits of the project.*

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. This proposal is directly linked to restoration of tidal perennial aquatic and saline emergent vegetation. The restoration actions have already been completed. This is for the monitoring component.*

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 will conduct evaluation of vegetation, wildlife and fish. MSCS covered species that may use the habitat created in these two previous restoration projects include: California clapper rail, California black rail, Suisun song sparrow, salt marsh harvest mouse, Suisun ornate shrew, delta smelt, splittail, chinook salmon, steelhead, soft bird's-beak, Delta tule pea, and Mason's lilaeopsis.*

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 provide information regarding shallow water, tidal and freshwater marsh habitats as identified in the PSP. The proposal has provided conceptual models and hypotheses to be examined during the post project monitoring phase. The data collected during the monitoring program will feed back into the operations and management of the restored tidal marshes.*

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 request to conduct post-project monitoring at the Tolay Creek and Cullinan Ranch restorations sites. The post-project monitoring is important and needs to be conducted.*

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).# Chinook salmon (SR,WR,LF,F) and steelhead trout are expected

to benefit. The project has very minor and indirect contribution to chinook salmon and steelhead production through use of monitoring data to evaluate the benefits of restored tidal wetlands to anadromous fish. The certainty of expected benefits is low due to the indirect nature of the benefit and likely limited relative use by anadromous salmonid populations. The contribution is long term in the future and would be continuous if habitat is maintained.*

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.# Chinook (SR) are threatened; chinook (F,LF) are candidates; and

chinook (W) are endangered. Other special-status species expected to benefit are: California clapper rail, salt marsh harvest mouse, Delta smelt, Sacramento splittail, longfin smelt, and green sturgeon plus other birds and plant species. The salt marsh tidal wetlands ecosystems with their multiple plant and animal species are expected to benefit by new data about tidal wetlands that are restored.*

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 would monitor and

evaluate the conversion of diked wetlands to

tidal wetlands with potential to restore natural channel and riparian habitat values. Project monitoring data would assess how physical changes of restoring tidal wetlands may restore tidal flow, increased sedimentation, increased salinity and enhanced water quality and be reflected in the response of biological features (primarily vegetation) of tidal ecosystem. The duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values would be long term if the restored habitat is maintained.*

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 proposed project is outside the boundaries of the Central Valley and would 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 would contribute to the goals of the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program, but is focused on a site that is outside CVPIA program boundaries.*

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 b(1) other element of the CVPIA could potentially fund the proposal however the project is outside the geographic scope of the CVPIA as it is land adjacent to San Pablo Bay. The proposal has minor potential benefit to anadromous fishes, yet somewhat greater benefit for resident fish, shorebirds and waterfowl.*

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.#This project is directly linked to previous CALFED funding for Tolay Creek and Cullinan Ranch restoration projects completed by DU. Pre project monitoring has been completed for both projects. Tolay Creek has been constructed and post project monitoring is ongoing. Cullinan Ranch scheduled for construction in 2000. Project is adjacent to an additional CALFED restoration project. Monitoring will provide valuable information for future projects in the region. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports.*

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.#
97N18 - Cullinan Ranch Restoration.
97N19 - Tolay Creek Restoration*

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):#Yes, but not completely. Due to an engineering error the channel deepened at Tolay Creek was lower in elevation than expected causing excess seepage and flow constriction. This caused 3rd party impacts which are being addressed by the proponents. They need the next phase to enable them to continue monitoring on the project sites. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, interagency/interested party meetings on seepage issues.*

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.#97N18, 87N19*

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 comments under 3c2.*

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.*

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.# No information was provided as to how local entities support or oppose project and degree of their importance to project implementation.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# They state they don't need to comply with CEQA because it is a research project. This project includes a fisheries monitoring subtask which needs to be addressed for CESA. Will need CEQA documents for the permitting process to take threatened and endangered species. Since farmland is going to be taken out of production, the Williamson Act may apply. We did not have the time to check all lands that are under the Williamson Act. They may need to consult with BCDC also.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# If they complete the documents stated above than this project can be completed.*

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:# \$54,000.00*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 9%. \$54,000 divided by \$593,931*

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