

**i. Proposal number.#** 2001-G205\*

**ii. Short proposal title.#** Rice in the Delta.\*

**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\***

**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 project addresses Goal D, Habitats, restoring functional habitats by converting a large expanse of Delta habitat to rice production, which more closely resembles seasonal flooded wetlands. Project will increase habitat and food for waterbirds and will help maintain physical characteristics by reducing subsidence. This pilot demonstration project will first work with a farmer who has converted to rice production (1000-1500 acres) to assess the effects of conversion and will develop an incentive program to enlist more farmers with the goal of converting 10,000 acres of furrow/sub-irrigated crops to flooded rice production.\*

**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 goal D, as described in 1a2. Objectives addressed include: Goal D, objectives 1 and 4, by restoring a large expanse of perennial aquatic habitat in the Delta and minimizing conversion of agricultural land to urban and suburban uses. Initial target for studying conversion is 1000-1500 acres; eventual goal is conversion of 10,000 acres.\*

**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 will test the hypothesis that conversion from corn to rice will appreciably decrease soil subsidence, assess the impacts on water quality, determine if rice production is an economically sound alternative to corn production, and assess the relative benefits of rice vs. corn production for waterfowl and shorebirds. This addresses actions under wetland restoration in the delta (p. 44) and agricultural conversion and "wildlife friendly" farming practices" (p.46).\*

**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 indirectly linked to early implementation actions 17e and 17f - to improve habitat conditions and ecosystem health in the Cosumnes-Mokelumne rivers watersheds, through research on habitat conversion initially on Brack Tract, with eventual expansion throughout 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.#** The ERP and MSCS have identified habitat restoration as contributing to Goal 1, to assist in enhancing and/or conserving native biotic communities in the Bay-Delta estuary, including neotropical migratory birds, wading birds, shorebirds, and waterfowl.\*

**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 will assess the value of converting corn to rice production for reducing subsidence, maintaining water quality, increasing wildlife habitat use, and determining economic viability if want to expand acreage. This addresses uncertainties described under freshwater marsh habitat restoration (p. 35), contaminants in the Central Valley (p. 35), and understanding the benefits and impacts of this crop conversion in the Delta under "beyond the riparian corridor" (p. 38).\*

**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 indirectly addresses two of the early implementation actions. The project is a pilot demonstration project to study the effects of conversion from corn to rice production in the Delta, and addresses uncertainties identified in the PSP. This is an important study, but they should concentrate efforts on studying Brack Tract for at least a few years before considering expanding conversion to 10,000 acres in light of those scientific uncertainties.\*

## **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).# There is no benefit to anadromous fish from the project because it is focused on terrestrial crop production (conversion from corn to rice) and subsidence.\***

**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.# There are no direct benefits to listed anadromous fish. Some potentially unknown benefits to some wildlife species. The upland, beyond riparian, rice land habitat community and its associated shorebirds and waterfowl species may 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.# The project does not relate to natural channel and riparian habitats value.\***

**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).# The project has potential to affect water quality of CVP water supplies.\***

**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 may have some contribution to the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program through knowledge gained about the wildlife benefits delta rice (vs. corn) production.\*

**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.#** There is potential for CVPIA elements, 3406(b)(22), 3406(g)(2), 3406(g)(3) and 3406(b)(1)-other to fund the proposal. The project focuses on migratory waterfowl and shorebird habitat with potential to decrease island subsidence, maintain levee integrity and improve quality of habitat that could have some benefit to CVPIA goals.\*

## **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.#**Using rice production in the Delta will help reduce island subsidence and support levee integrity, which will protect existing habitat and future restored habitat for Delta fisheries. Flood protection benefits include protection of plant communities, waterbird habitat, and water quality for Delta fishes. 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**

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):#DU projects are either completed or in progress and on schedule. Project list updates information on projects. 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.# Local landowners support the project.\***

**ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# This is an agricultural project which doesn't need compliance but if there will be a change in diversion type or location then permits such as 1600 agreements will be needed. Also, Delta Protection Commission needs to be notified. That is not stated on the checklist but is included in the proposal.\***

**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.# No\***

**6b. Are applicants specifically requesting either state or federal cost share dollars? Type state, federal, or doesn't matter.#Doesn't matter\***

**c. 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.# The Cortopassi Family has completed an initial study of economic costs and has planted and maintained the pilot project for 2 years\***