

**i. Proposal number.**#2001-G203\*

**ii. Short proposal title.**# Battle Creek Riparian Protection\*

**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#**

**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 will significantly advance goal relative to at-risk species, will support continuation of natural processes and will protect important habitat.\*

**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.**# This proposal will accomplish a significant portion of the strategic objectives relative to Battle Creek.\*

**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 proposal addresses beyond the riparian habitat issues. This proposal is unique in this regard because of it's potential to protect spring sources which support riparian habitat and stream flow in Battle Creek.\*

**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.**# Battle Creek is a very high priority in Stage 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.#** The protection of Spring's Run and the potential re-establishment of winter run make this proposal very highly linked to the MSCS.\*

**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.#** An important adaptive management element of this proposal surrounds the linkage beyond the riparian concept to the ecological health of the riparian and stream zones. The temperature maintenance aspect of Battle Creek is especially important.\*

**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 an excellent proposal. It matches several goals with strategic objectives and relies on easements rather than fee table. The adaptive management learning opportunities are very important.\*

#### **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).#** All five Central Valley salmonid populations (winter, spring, fall and late-fall chinook, and steelhead) are expected to benefit from this project. In particular, winter-run chinook are expected to benefit due to the high quality habitat that will soon be accessible as a result of the passage improvement projects underway in Battle Creek (MOU, 1999). The certainty of the expected benefits is high, because it is the best tributary habitat that remains for winter-run chinook salmon. The immediacy of benefits is also high because the project will provide for continued maintenance of high quality water in Battle Creek (or, otherwise stated, the avoidance of the threats of urban development and the ensuing increased water usage/potentially decreased water quality). The benefits will be long-term duration because in case of change-of-ownership,

the conservation easements will be linked to, and transfer with, the title for the property. The "Approach and Focus for Implementing the CVPIA 1999-2004 refers to focusing on species and habitats determined to have the highest biological priority at this time and believed to contribute most to achieving fish and wildlife restoration goals. \*

**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.** # Sacramento River Winter-run ESU - Endangered; Central Valley Spring-run ESU - Threatened; Calif Central Valley ESU Steelhead - Threatened; fall and late-fall run chinook salmon - ESA candidate status.

In addition, multi-species benefits could occur. The species present that would benefit include: Native non-anadromous fish species green sunfish (*Lepomis cyanellus*), speckled dace (*Rhinichthys osculus*), tule perch (*Hysterocarpus traski* ssp.), Sacramento sucker (*Catostomus occidentalis*), rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdnerii*), prickly sculpin (*Cottus asper*), Sacramento squawfish (*Ptychocheilus grandis*), and hardhead (*Mylopharodon conocephalus*), and the non-native fish species small mouth black bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*).

Mammal species black bear (*Ursus americanus*), mountain lion (*Felis concolor*), deer (*Cervidae*, spp.), coyote (*Canis latrans*), racoon (*Procyon lotor*), bobcat (*Felis rufus*), squirrels (*Sciuridae*, spp.) and a number of smaller mammals (CDF&G 1997). Specifically, the riparian area may provide habitat for the long-tailed weasel (*Mustela freneta*), river otter (*Lutra canadensis*), and muskrat (*Ondatra zibethicus*).

Avian species -- bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), a Federally-threatened species, California Valley quail (*Callipepla californica*), wild turkey (*Meeagris gallopavo*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), scrub jay (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*), canyon wren (*Catherpes mexicanus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), northern harriers (*Circus cyaneus*), turkey vultures (*Cathartes aura*), and acorn woodpeckers (*Melanerpes formicivorus*). In addition, migratory waterfowl utilize the area. Amphibians and reptiles -- gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), western rattlesnake (*Crotalus* varieties), western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), a variety of garter snakes, bullfrog, western pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata*) and Pacific tree frog (*Hyla regilla*). In addition, the foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*) and the red-legged frog (*Rana aurora*), a Federally-threatened species are amphibian species which have the potential to occur within the watershed. Insects -- The Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*) is a Federally-threatened insect and a State species of concern that requires elderberry bushes for larval and adult life cycles. Elderberry bushes are present in the riparian area within the watershed.\*

**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.**# Land acquisition under this proposal will focus on three key properties, one on the mainstem, one on the North Fork and one on the South Fork of Battle Creek, in order to provide conservation protection of natural processes while maintaining land in private agricultural use and ownership. It is intended that the terms of the easements will help ensure protection of the riparian habitat, will help prevent excessive water extraction and use, and will help ensure connectivity of the stream to the surrounding land, but may vary slightly to fit a particular property.\*

**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 does 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 implementation of the (b)(1) "Other" Program (Habitat Restoration Program) of the CVPIA due to the benefits of protecting riparian and upland habitats that may support species of concern for the (b)(1) "Other" 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.**# This proposal is appropriate for AFRP funding. The two goals of this project are to: 1) limit future impacts of landscape fragmentation, instream physical disturbance, and the addition of new wells and septic systems that would degrade water quality; and 2) preserve streamside vegetation adjacent to wildlife compatible agriculture. Although land along most of Battle Creek remains relatively undeveloped, development trends in the area point to increased loss of

agricultural lands as residential demands from Redding expand. Already there have been purchases of land along the Creek for speculative purposes, and subdivisions have occurred. Substantial groundwater extraction, well development, and septic tank use are increasing in this region and could eventually have devastating effects on instream flows. The strength of this proposal lies in the collaborative approach demonstrated by TNC working cooperatively with willing landowners and the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy to acquire conservation easements on key properties along Battle Creek. The protection of these properties would complement acquisitions being made by BLM in the lower reaches of the Creek. The work proposed in this proposal includes acquisition, stewardship and monitoring of up to three critical riparian properties. This project will also benefit other riparian-dependent species that have been impacted by the development and operation of the Central Valley Project. \*

## **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 meets CALFED and CVPIA objectives for protection of riparian and freshwater fish habitat.

Complements and builds on current Battle Creek Restoration Projects designed to increase instream flows on 42 miles of Battle Creek for salmonids, including dam removal, fish ladder construction, and fish screens. Part of Lassen Foothills Project for restoration and protection of continuous habitat corridor along the Sacramento River, including Deer, Mill, and Battle Creeks. Source: Proposal, quarterly progress 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.#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

97N08 - Lower Mill Creek Riparian Restoration

98F20 - Deer and Mill Creeks Acquisition and Enhancement

CVPIA

14481133297G030 - L&L/Hamilton  
113328G124 - Birkes  
113328G048 - Dana  
14481133298J - Latimer  
114209J113 - Mill and Deer Creek Acquisition  
Pending - Deer Creek Fencing and Pelton 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): #** Listed projects have completed protection (through acquisition/easements) for 450 acres on Deer Creek and 1650 acres on Mill Creek, with additional Deer Creek acquisition contracts in process. Have also completed some restoration on Mill Creek and are currently monitoring. All projects going well. 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.**# Community support of, and coordination with, the local watershed strategy (WSRCD 2000) and

the overall fishery/watershed restoration program is a key aspect of the proposed project. TNC is, and has been, working closely with the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy on a conservation easement strategy for the watershed. Both the BCWC Board and individual landowners have met with TNC to discuss conservation easements on several occasions.\*

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.**# Although this proposal is for land acquisition, it states that riparian areas will be fenced. This will need to comply with CEQA if vegetation is removed or cut, and terrestrial habitat altered. The Nature Conservancy needs to work with the lead agency and/or a third party contracted to complete CEQA documents.\*

**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:**# If CALFED or CVPIA award TNC 1,000,000 dollars, TNC will raise additional funds to complete the project.\*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.**# CVPIA is contributing 200,000 dollars for one property, or 20% of the total amount of funding requested.\*

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

**6a - 6c3.**# All information requested has been provided by project proponent in a clear, concise, and understandable format\*