

i. Proposal number.# 2001-E214*

ii. Short proposal title.# Frank's Tract/Decker Island, 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,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 is to restore 45 acres of tidal wetlands in Frank's Tract and 20 acres on Decker Island. These habitat will be used by listed species such as delta smelt, splittail, and all anadromous salmonids.*

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 proposal is consistent with the ERP strategic objectives.*

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 PSP requests proposals to restore shallow water, tidal marsh habitats. The PSP requests proposals for the lower San Joaquin and southern Delta region and the Sacramento River, northern Delta slough, and the northern portion of the Yolo Bypass. This proposal is not within those described areas but lies within the Central Delta area.*

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 hypotheses to be tested are important to the long term ERP implementation program including the use of clean dredged materials, restoration of shallow water habitats in open water areas, and recolonization of restored habitats by native species.*

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 project is expensive. It is an innovative program to provide a mixture of habitats within an existing open water habitat to benefit a variety of aquatic and terrestrial species.*

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 natural production of all races of chinook salmon from the Sacramento River watershed, fall-run chinook salmon from the San Joaquin and East-side Delta tributaries, green sturgeon, white sturgeon, and steelhead should benefit from the actions in this proposal. The project is designed to develop new shallow water and riparian habitat that is expected to provide self-sustaining habitat for fish and enhance biological productivity. The new habitat consists of 45 acres of islands constructed to form a combination of shallow tidal perennial and intertidal habitat, fresh emergent tidal wetlands habitat and mid-channel islands and shoal habitat in Franks Tract, and 20 acres of tidal wetlands, riparian and upland habitats on Decker Island. The expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production of these fish is not presented and cannot be conveniently ascertained pending post-project monitoring. There is no certainty of the expected benefits. Hypotheses will be tested including whether stable island features can be constructed which will support colonization by native fish species and whether the techniques tested will favor desired native species over invasive species. Each of the four islands on Franks Tract will be developed and constructed as a standalone feature. The construction of islands 1 and 2 will begin and be completed in (state) FY 2002, island 3 in FY 2003, and island 4 in 2004; post-construction water quality and fishery monitoring will occur for 3 years following island construction. The immediacy of the expected contribution will be realized at the completion of the habitat construction which is scheduled for state FY 2002. The duration of the expected contribution is expected to be long term.*

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.# Listed species, anadromous species and special status species

expected to benefit from the implementation of the project include delta smelt, winter-run chinook salmon, spring-run chinook salmon, late-fall-run chinook salmon, Sacramento splittail, longfin smelt, and steelhead. The program is anticipated to result in multiple-species benefits from the replacement of open water flooded habitat with 45 acres of habitat islands constructed to form a combination of shallow tidal perennial and intertidal habitat, fresh emergent tidal wetlands habitat and mid-channel islands and shoal habitat in Franks Tract, and from the restoration of 20 acres of tidal wetlands, riparian and upland habitats on Decker Island.*

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 protects and restores

natural channel and riparian habitat values, and promotes natural processes. The project is designed to convert up to 45 acres of existing open water flooded habitat at Franks Tract to a combination of shallow tidal perennial and intertidal habitat, fresh emergent tidal wetlands habitat and midchannel islands and shoal habitat, and to convert 20 acres of existing weedy non-native vegetation on Decker Island to aquatic, tidal wetlands, riparian, and upland habitat. The work proposed in this proposal would all phases of the project. The immediacy of the benefits to the natural channel and riparian habitat values will not be realized until state FY 2002 when all project work is scheduled to be completed, although post-project water quality and fishery monitoring will begin as each construction element is completed. It is anticipated that the construction will result in self-sustaining habitats that, once established, will require little human intervention to maintain. Therefore, the duration of the benefits to natural channel and habitat values 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).# No evidence is presented to indicate whether/how the project would contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations. No such relationship is apparent.*

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 does not contribute to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA..*

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.# This project is appropriate for funding support from the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. The project could contribute to meeting the goal of the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program to increase the natural production of anadromous fish by creating 45 acres of islands that will restore shallow water habitat features of the ancestral Delta at Franks Tract and to restore the 20-acre borrow-site at Decker Island to wetland habitat. A basic premise of this project is that the existing open water flooded habitat at Franks Tract can be converted to a combination of shallow tidal perennial and intertidal habitat, fresh emergent tidal wetlands habitat and midchannel islands and shoal habitat, and that the existing weedy non-native vegetation on Decker Island can be converted to aquatic, tidal wetlands, riparian, and upland habitat, all of which will be capable of supporting a greater number and variety of desirable species. This project is consistent with Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Evaluation No.4 (Evaluate potential benefits of and opportunities for increasing salmonid and other anadromous fish production through improved riparian habitats in the Delta.) and No. 6 (Evaluate benefits of and opportunities for additional tidal shallow-water habitat as rearing habitat for anadromous fish in the Delta) in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, May 30, 1997;

they are both identified as a high priority in the draft plan. The strength of the proposal is that the entire process from evaluation of the problem to the development of potential solutions will be done in one contiguous effort and under the singular control of one program manager. No apparent weakness in the proposal is identified.*

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.#Project has similar goals and objectives as other in - Delta projects on Prospect, Sherman, and Tyler Islands, and the in-channel islands project. Meets habitat goals and objectives through restoration of tidal and intertidal marsh habitats and functions. 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.#
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:#Did not identify other projects, except first phase for this proposal; continuation of work completed by Moffat and Nichols (proponent for first phase). Source: Proposal*

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 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 NOXT-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.#
97N12 - Frank's Tract Restoration.*

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):#Maybe - Based on completion of first phase of this project, it is ready for the next phase, with environmental documentation and final engineering report due by the end of year 2000. However, if funded it should be conditioned so that CALFED must first review final design to determine if cost is worth the expected benefit. When Phase I initially funded many questioned the cost/benefit for this work on a pilot demonstration project. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports and project reports *

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.# No third-party impacts are identified in connection with the restoration of Decker Island. The following discussion of third-party impacts is associated solely with the creation of habitat islands in Franks Tract:

Support: - local reclamation districts - due to wave sheltering that will reduce levee vulnerability and maintenance.
- boaters, hunters, and fishers - due to ecosystem restoration.
- water surveyors - due to reduced risk of levee failure in neighboring islands.
Opposition: - bass fishers - due to the loss of deeply flooded habitat which support the exotic bass species.

No quantification of any third-party impacts is presented.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Checklist is filled out correctly and the estimated completion date for public review of documents is estimated to September 2000.*

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:# \$4,000,000.00*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 24%. \$4,000,000 divided by \$16,651,604.*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

6a - 6c3.# n/a*