

i. Proposal number.#2001-G204*

ii. Short proposal title.# Conservation Easements for agricultural lands/CEAL Project*

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,B, and 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.# Project addresses needs of at-risk ("R") native species (Goal A) to maintain and enhance fish and wildlife populations on the easements, Goal B, rehabilitate natural ecological processes by creating seasonal flooded wetlands to provide habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and other terrestrial species, and D, Habitats, restoring functional habitats by improving habitat on and adjacent to agricultural lands in the Sutter Basin. Contributes to the ERP targets for habitat restoration to enhance fish and wildlife populations, including at risk species. Initial agricultural land easement purchases of 2,700 acres, with eventual goal of adaptive management plans for 6000 acres of farmlands in the Sutter Basin. Management will target "wildlife friendly" agriculture and some restored to a variety of wetland and riparian 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.# Contribution to ERP goals is as described in 1a2. Objectives addressed include:

Goal A, objective 1 - recovery of "R" at-risk species through habitat preservation and restoration through conservation easements,

Goal B, objective 1 - Establish and maintain hydrologic and hydrodynamic regimes by creating seasonal wetlands on agricultural lands, and

Goal D, objectives 2 and 3 - restoration and protection of large expanses of habitat and provide sufficient connectivity among habitats by development of conservation easements with adaptive management plans designed to promote wildlife use.*

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 project addresses the action for Bypass/Floodplain Acquisition or Easements (P.43 of PSP) by acquiring conservation easements for land

within the Sutter Bypass. It also addresses Agricultural Conservation and Wildlife Friendly Farming Practices (P. 46 of PSP), since all easements will be managed for agricultural conservation and wildlife friendly farming.*

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.# This project is linked directly to early implementation actions 6f - Alternatives analysis and implementation for Yolo Bypass Habitat, and 6g - Conduct a needs and opportunities analysis for achieving ecosystem restoration in flood bypasses. Both actions include Sutter Bypass and Butte Basin as part of the effort and this project addresses conservation easements to preserve and improve habitat for fish and wildlife within that region.*

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 ERP and MSCS have identified habitat restoration as contributing to Goal 1, to assist in recovery of at-risk species ("R" and "r"). This project targets chinook salmon, splittail, steelhead, green and white sturgeon, waterfowl, shorebirds and migratory birds.*

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 addresses the scientific uncertainties of use of the Sutter Bypass as habitat (P. 34 of PSP), ability to recover at-risk species through restoration of seasonal wetland habitats (P. 35 of PSP), and benefits and impacts of wildlife friendly farming practices and how they influence ecological health (P. 38 of PSP). Ducks Unlimited will develop Adaptive Management Plans with each land owner as part of the conservation easement to establish baseline criteria and monitor annually to assess results of their efforts.*

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 fits in well with the ERP Goals and Objectives and directly addresses two of the early implementation actions. The project is for acquisition of conservation easements in the Sutter Bypass for habitat preservation and restoration purposes. This is located in the Sutter and Butte Basin and the acquisition would help promote habitat connectivity and use in that corridor.*

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 Sutter Bypass provides passage to adult and juvenile spring-

run, fall-run and late-fall-run

and winter-run chinook salmon juveniles and steelhead in the east and west bypass channels.

Although the easement properties targeted for acquisition are located on the outside of the Sutter Bypass levees. These acquisitions will provide a buffer zone against industrial development (urban, power etc) and indirectly protect existing channel conditions. Easement acquisitions outside and adjacent to the Sutter Bypass will not have an immediate measurable contribution to natural production of these species. Easement acquisitions may require additional water supplies during the fall, winter and early spring. Project should insure development of water supplies to meet these needs, and that do not impact flows within the Sutter Bypass that are beneficial to fish and wildlife.*

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.# Project does not directly benefit any fish species, but may benefit

species dependent upon

seasonal wetlands.*

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.# Project does not directly protect or

restore natural channel and riparian values, although may

provide some benefit by reducing development of lands adjacent to lands that have natural channel

and habitat values.*

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).# Project may need to develop additional water sources necessary to flood easement properties at non-traditional times of the year and should insure that CVP flows are not impacted.*

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 the Habitat Restoration program (3406(b)(1) other) by insuring that lands farmed for rice and that currently provide for seasonal wetlands, are not converted to uses that would not continue the seasonal wetland benefit.*

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.# Project will develop agricultural easements on properties that are now planted in rice, that will provide potential seasonal wetland habitat through flooding for rice straw decomposition and is intended to inhibit future commercial/residential development. Target properties are on the outside of the east and west levees of the Sutter Bypass and thus do not directly affect or benefit any fish species. Flooding of easement properties during the fall, winter and early spring may require new and additional sources of water. Project proponent should insure that any new sources of water do not impact flows within the two channels of the Sutter Bypass that are beneficial to fish and wildlife. This project should be evaluated under either the Habitat Restoration Program 3406(b)(1) other, or the Waterfowl Incentives Program 3406(b)(22) for potential 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 complements and expands on previous work in the Sutter Bypass and Sutter Basin, particularly previous work on Butte Creek. Project lies within CALFED Feather River/Sutter Basin Ecological Management Zone, an important component of the overall CALFED restoration plan. CEAL program partners include CVHJV partners, Northern CA Water Assoc., CA Rice Commission, Wildlife Conservation Board, Pelgar Mutual Water District, CA Waterfowl Assoc., and TNC. CEAL supports DFG, CVPIA, and DWR restoration plans. 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

99B02 - Lower Butte Creek Project:Phase II-Preliminary Design/Environmental Analysis for Butte Sink Structural Modifications

96M22 - Gorrill Dam Fish Screen

95M05 - M&T/Parrott, Pumping Station and Fish Screen

96M21 - Rancho Esquon/Adams Dam Fish Screen

CVPIA

1448-11332-9J006 - Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase III-Butte Creek, Drumheller exclusion Barrier engineering, permitting and construction

113329-9J135 - Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II, Butte Creek, Butte Sink/Sutter Bypass Stakeholder Coordination/Facilitation

113329-9-J135 - Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II,Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass East-West Diversion Dam Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review

11332 - J122 - Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II, Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #5 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review

113329-9-J136 - Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #3 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review*

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):#Nine major technical and environmental evaluations completed and three in progress in the Watershed. Ultimate success and effectiveness is dependent on completion of projects in the lower watershed. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, documents.*

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.# Local landowners appear to be in total support of this activity as evidenced by the landowner

letters and the six pledged landowners involved in the CEAL Program easement negotiations. There may be some level of third-party impacts via initiating water usage at new times of the year potentially affecting fish and CVP USBR flows within the channels of the Sutter Bypass, and may

therefore require NEPA/CEQA and filing for new water rights under the State Board Division of Water Rights process.*

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.# 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.# David and Lucille Packard Foundation: 200,000 dollars or 2% of total funding requested.*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# Funds are dedicated to fish screen development and implementation*