

i. Proposal number.# 2001-E215*

ii. Short proposal title.#

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 is a Phase II request. It is less a habitat restoration proposal and more a monitoring/adaptive management proposal for the Contra Costa shoreline and a portion of San Pablo Bay. The proposal is not to create more habitat but to better manage existing marshes to improve their ecological and biological functioning.*

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.*

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.# This Phase II request is not well linked to the PSP. It is, however, linked to shallow water, tidal and freshwater marsh habitat. In particular, this proposal will assist in identifying limiting factors which determine the distribution and abundance of selected wetland species for various inundation-salinity regimes.*

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 addresses the quality of tidal marsh habitat and is consistent with the Stage 1 action to complete scientific evaluations needed to resolve the high priority issues and uncertainties identified in the ERP.*

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 provide a basis to improve the quality of tidal marsh habitats and the species that depend on that habitat.*

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 is heavily weighted toward information richness. It provides conceptual models, hypotheses, and monitoring programs. It specifically is targeting the resolution of uncertainties, limiting factors, and bottlenecks in restored marshes. The data collection and analytic procedures appear to be well constructed. *

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 proposal was difficult to read. Regardless, it seems to be well directed at resolving some of the uncertainties related to restoration of tidal marsh habitats. It looks at muted and full tidal marshes, had established reference marshes, uses replicate sampling, and has statistical and quality control procedures in place.*

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 is the second phase which is adapting results/information gained in the initial phase.

The project will increase tidal action in marshes, provide connectivity to channels, and identify limiting factors in order to enhance tidal marsh productivity, will provide information on measure to improve restoration and maintenance of marsh habitat to increase invertebrate and native fish population, create nurseries for native migratory fishes and through adaptive management, detect and correct ecological limiting factors. The project will be completed within 3 years, providing information to guide future tidal marsh restoration. The initial amount of tidal marsh restored by this project is small. The efficacy/durability of restored/constructed tidal marsh is not known and long term monitoring/evaluation is necessary: This project does not provide for the long term monitoring and evaluation of restored tidal marsh habitat. This project may contribute to anadromous fish production by providing tidal marsh habitat for juveniles, although the project does not monitor species other than Delta smelt and splittail (primary target species). This project supports Delta evaluation 6, listed as high priority evaluation in the highest priority watershed in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan.*

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.

Splittail, federal threatened, Delta smelt, state and federal threatened will benefit. There may be

benefits to spring-run, state and federal threatened, winter-run, state and federal endangered, steelhead, federal threatened, and late fall- and fall-run chinook salmon, federal candidate, Resident aquatic, terrestrial (resident and migratory) and plant species dependent on tidal marsh habitat would benefit.*

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.

This project in Phase 2 would specifically construct and improve tidal marsh function. The monitoring data is being used in an adaptive process to improve restoration and maintenance/management of marshes to increase invertebrate and native fish populations by detecting and correcting ecological limiting factors and bottlenecks both in marshes being restored and reference sites.*

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 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.# This project may contribute to implementing the Habitat Restoration Program 3406(b)(1) other.*

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 would specifically construct and improve tidal action in marshes, provide connectivity to channels, and identify and ameliorate limiting factors that enhance productivity, and improve understanding of restoration and maintenance of marsh habitat. The monitoring data would be used in an adaptive process to improve restoration and maintenance/management of marshes. This project would not contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations, but may contribute to implementing the Habitat Restoration Program 3406(b)(1) other. This project may contribute to the AFRP by providing tidal marsh habitat for juveniles, although the project does not monitor species other than Delta smelt and splittail (primary target species). Resident aquatic, terrestrial (resident and migratory) and plant species dependent on tidal marsh habitat would benefit. Implementation/restoration benefits would occur over an extended time period. This project supports Delta evaluation 6, listed as high priority evaluation in the highest priority watershed in the Revised Draft Restoration Plan and is appropriate for AFRP funding.*

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 seeks to identify factors and conditions to increase populations of native threatened fish species and test conditions to improve habitat in Suisun Marsh (CALFED Ecological Zone 2), and use results to aid CALFED and other restoration efforts with their tested methods to sample species non-destructively. Later could implement methods in other ecological zones in the North Bay and East Bay. 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.#
98F22 - Biological Restoration and Monitoring in Suisun Marsh and North SFB Ecological zone.*

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):#Monitoring and analysis are ongoing and work products are on schedule. Project to continue through September 2001. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

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.#

99F22.*

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.#no.*

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#Phase I began in January 1999 and is to be completed September 2001. They are basing their hypothesis for Phase II on data from 1 1/4 years of monitoring and want to add elements based on the preliminary data. They should complete analyses on Phase I before starting Phase II, unless the technical review indicates preliminary results are compelling enough to approve Phase II before final Phase I results are done. Project proponents have progressed well on Phase I, just not quite ready for Phase II. Source: Proposal, quarterly 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 outstanding issues. Limited public outreach to non-affiliated stakeholders.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Cannot be provided-Information provided by applicant is incomplete.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline. # Cannot be provided-Information provided by applicant is incomplete.*

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: # \$471,232*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding

requested along with calculation.# 32%. \$471,232 divided by \$1,491,835*

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