

**i. Proposal number.**#2001-G202\*

**ii. Short proposal title.**# Staten Island Acquisition\*

**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, C, D, F \***

**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 continuation and increase over G 201 and will assist in

meeting the goals discussed in that proposal. This applies mainly to Goals A & C. With acquisition of the island restoration, enhancement and development of other significant habitats such as riparian, freshwater tidal emergent and shallow water in accordance with goal D is also attainable. The acquisition would also provide a contiguous habitat corridor reaching from Stone Lakes and the Valensin Ranch portion of the Cosumnes River Project to the north all the way to the Mokelumne Forks confluence; essentially the "East Delta Habitat Corridor" envisioned in the ERPP. \*

**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.**# Objective 1 of Goal A - achieving recovery and large self sustaining population of at risk species

such as delta smelt and the suite of anadromous fish. The protection and enhancement of shaded riverine and other aquatic habitats will assist in meeting this goal.

Objective 2 of Goal A - contributing to the recovery of an at risk species, greater sandhill crane which is an "r" species in the MSCS. Protection of important winter roosting habitat and enhancement of the value of agricultural practices in the area for the cranes will assist in meeting the goal.

Objective 3 of Goal A - protection, enhancement and development of significant habitats will assist in improvement in the conservation of native biotic communities.

Objective 3 Goal C - Would enhance seasonal wetlands for migratory water fowl.

Objective 1 of Goal D - Restore large expanses of all major habitat types and sufficient connectivity among habitats in the Delta... This project would provide a completed "East Delta Habitat Corridor".

Objective 1 of Goal F Monitoring will determine the degree of change in water quality due to the discharge of irrigation waters to the Delta.\*

**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.** # Beyond the Riparian Corridor. Proposal addresses the Agricultural Conservation and Wildlife Friendly Farming Practices element of the Beyond the Riparian Corridor Restoration action. This proposal would also provide for the enhancement and development of other significant habitats such as riparian, shallow water and tidal emergent wetlands, and would therefore address elements in both the Channel Dynamics, sediment Transport and Riparian Vegetation Action and the Shallow Water, Tidal and Freshwater Marsh Habitat Action.\*

**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.** # The proposal is directly linked to ERP Stage 1 actions 4, 8 and 15. It is indirectly linked with ERP Stage 1 action 1. \*

**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 is directly linked to achieving the conservation goals for several of the MSCS evaluated species and habitats. The enhancement of wildlife friendly agricultural practices leading to increased quantity and quality of seasonally flooded wetlands and forage crops will benefit the sandhill crane, an "r" species. The project has the potential to restore and enhance habitats for the giant garter snake ("r") and most of our focus fish species ("R") Should the acquisition provide the opportunity to restore significant acreage of riparian habitat as proposed, species such as yellow warbler ("r") May benefit as well as others.\*

**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.**

# See staff review form for G 201. This proposal would also offer the opportunity to create, monitor and experiment with other habitats such as riparian and shallow water habitat that could assist in providing information towards several of the other scientific uncertainties. \*

**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.** # Acquisition of Staten Island provides the opportunity to protect a large habitat area completing the East Delta Habitat Corridor as envisioned in the ERPP. In conjunction with proposal G 201, it allows for the development of economically feasible methods for managing agriculture in an environmentally friendly manner, could provide information on reversing subsidence on Delta islands, enhances the quantity and quality of seasonally flooded ag lands for migrating waterfowl and greater sandhill cranes and will restore and enhance several of the significant habitats discussed in the ERP and MSCS such as valley riparian, shaded riverine and tidal emergent wetlands. Acquisition will also provide protection from a change in agriculture to less environmentally friendly crops such as vineyards. \*

## **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 does not contribute to the natural production of anadromous fish because it is levee landside land acquisition and restoration.\***

**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.# Grater sand hill crane, state threatened, Swainson's hawk, state threatened, and giant garter snake, state and federal threatened, and all species (terrestrial and plant) associated with the interior of delta islands would benefit from this proposal.\***

**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 would not restore natural channel and riparian habitat values because it is associated with interior of Staten island.\***

**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 is not intended 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 does not contribute to 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 does not contribute to the natural production of anadromous fish nor does it support other measures in the CVPIA because it is for the acquisition and restoration of the interior of Staten island.\***

## **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 acquisition would expand Cosumnes River Preserve protected lands for the benefit of fish, wildlife, and habitat. Complements and expands on previous acquisitions in the watershed funded by CALFED in order to protect the lower floodplain and link Delta habitat to USFWS Stone Lakes NWR and North Delta NWR habitats. 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.#both\***

**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**

96M06 - Cosumnes River Preserve-Valensin Ranch

97N14A - Cosumnes River Floodplain Acquisition and Management

99F04 - McCormack-Williamson Acquisition, CALFED Directed Action

98B17 - Cosumnes River Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration

98F19 - Cosumnes River Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration

99F03 - McCormack-Williamson Wildlife-friendly Management Project

99C01 - Cosumnes River Feasibility Study

**CVPIA**

1448-11300-98-9 Howard Ranch Acquisition

00-FG-20-0026 Horizon Organic Dairy Conservation Easement

1448-0001-96648 Valensin Ranch\*

**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):#**Through CALFED and CVPIA funding, TNC and partners have acquired or will soon acquire properties totaling almost 4500 acres. Projects are completed in a timely manner.  
Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, project deliverables\*

#### **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.# No outstanding issues related to support or opposition are apparent at this time.\***

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# This proposal is for land acquisition only, therefore, nothing is needed in this phase.\***

**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.#** It is stated under "cost" that project management costs will be funded by income generated from the island\*

#### **COST SHARING**

**6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.# No\***

**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\***