

i. Proposal number:# 2001-E213*

ii. Short proposal title .# Little Mandeville Island Levee and Wetland Habitat 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# 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.# This proposal would develop tidal marsh habitat in the Central and West Delta Ecological Management Unit by reversing subsidence. It would also provide riparian and riverine aquatic habitat, and mid-channel islands. The proposal would incrementally contribute to the ERP habitat restoration goals and support the recovery of species in the Delta dependent on tidal marsh habitats.*

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 1, Objective 1. This proposal would acquire a 375 acre island to provide over 300 acres of shallow water tidal and seasonal wetlands.*

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.# Goal 4, Objective 1, Goal 1, Objective 1. This proposal would acquire a 375 acre island to provide over 300 acres of shallow water tidal and seasonal wetlands.*

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 a Stage

1 action to restore fresh emergent wetlands and mid-channel islands in the Delta.*

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 habitat is identified in the MSCS as the tidal freshwater emergent NCCP habitat. It would benefit delta smelt, splittail, all anadromous salmonids and other 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 proposal provides a narrative conceptual model and a list of hypotheses related to restoration of shallow water/tidal marsh habitat. The subject of subsidence reversal should be described in a separate conceptual model. The proposal would be improved if better identified how the data would be evaluated and used adaptively to refine management actions or operations*

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 consistent with Stage I actions but not directly located in the area described in the PSP. It addresses the issue of restoring deeply subsided lands in an integrated manner. It discusses the need and cost to upgrade the levee system but does not identify how that component links to the CALFED Levee System Integrity Program. The cost of the project is high with the vast majority of the funding for construction.*

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).#

This project could benefit juvenile chinook salmon as additional shallow water habitat may provide benefits to individuals rearing in the Delta. Expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production is unknown. The highest relative value would likely be for fall run, as more fry rear for longer periods in the Delta than other races which tend to enter the Delta at larger sizes. The magnitude of benefit would be small in the sense that the area to be restored (300 acres) is small relative to the overall area of the Delta. Also, the project site is located in an area where survival of juvenile salmon may be reduced by State Water Project and CVP pumping. Benefits are largely uncertain, although a monitoring plan is included which could be used to make a general assessment of the restored area. It is likely that there would not be immediate benefits. The restoration process will take several years to complete and it is unknown whether colonization will occur immediately after completion or increase over time.*

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.#

Juvenile winter run (endangered), spring run (threatened) and late-fall and fall run (both candidates) could potentially benefit. The greatest benefits (if they occur) would occur for fall run (see above). Potentially, listed Delta smelt or Sacramento splittail, might also benefit from shallow water habitat restoration. Other species could also benefit by some undetermined amount from increased tidal and seasonal wetland habitat values.*

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 attempts to restore wetland habitat for waterfowl and fisheries. Four key wetland habitats will be expanded: shallow tidal freshwater marsh, riparian forest and shaded riverine aquatic, seasonal wetland and mid-channel shoals. The restored wetlands are to provide rearing habitat for Delta smelt and chinook salmon. Where feasible, natural recolonization will be initially used to restore natural wetland vegetation. If performance standards are not attained, then a supplemental planting regime will be employed. The duration of benefits to the natural channel and riparian habitats is unknown but after establishment may last indefinitely.*

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 proposed project would 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 proposed 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.# The project proposed is a pilot/demonstration project on a subsided Delta island (Little Mandeville Island). The project would implement, test and monitor various techniques and incentives related to restoring the island to shallow water tidal and seasonal wetlands. The project would restore wetland habitat for waterfowl and fisheries. Four key wetland habitats would be expanded: shallow tidal freshwater marsh, riparian forest and shaded riverine aquatic, seasonal wetland and mid-channel shoals. This project could benefit juvenile chinook salmon as additional shallow water habitat may provide benefits to individuals rearing in the Delta. The highest relative value would likely be for fall run, as more fry rear for longer periods in the Delta than other races that enter the Delta at larger sizes. The magnitude of benefit to juvenile salmon is likely small, as the area restored (300 acres) is small relative to the overall area of the Delta and the project site is located in an area where survival of juvenile salmon may be reduced by State Water Project and CVP pumping. Potentially, listed Delta smelt or Sacramento splittail, may also benefit from shallow water habitat restoration. Migratory birds, water fowl and shorebirds would also benefit from the restoration. The project would qualify for funding consideration under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program or the 3406 b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program.*

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.#Habitat restoration projects on other islands within the Delta ecological zone (including this project) are consistent with CVPIA and or CALFED goals and objectives. The proximity of Little Mandeville to other restoration projects will ensure a mosaic of improved habitats near the Western edge of the Delta, a critical migrating corridor for anadromous fishes and other at risk species.
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.#

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):#DU has completed or is currently monitoring their restoration projects for CALFED and progress has been satisfactory. Project 97N19 has experienced problems due to an engineering mistake which resulted in excessive seepage to third parties, which has been partially corrected. The project benefits to species are being monitored. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

REQUESTS FOR NOXT-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 landowner has already spent more than \$100,000 of his own money repairing the levee beach and getting the site ready for the proposed restoration. These actions would indicate the landowner's support of the project. The project commits biologists involved in the project to attend professional meetings, to share the results of monitoring this restored wetland habitat. Ducks Unlimited also plans to initiate a public outreach effort that will invite local landowners, representatives from local government, public resource managers and other interested parties to participate in local workshops.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Everything is filled out correctly and the estimated completion date for public review of documents is estimated to be the end of the first quarter of year two.*

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:# 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***