

i. Proposal number:# 2001-H200

ii. Short proposal title .# Lassen National Forest Watershed Stewardship Within the Anadromous Watersheds of Butte, Deer, and Mill Creeks.*

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,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 contributes to the protection of existing high value habitat (for spring run chinook & steelhead) in Mill and Deer Creeks. Lessor benefits to these species in Butte Creek portion of project, since project falls well above anadromous reaches of Butte creek.*

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.# Actions proposed relate to Strategic goal 1- Objective 1- Recovery of at risk species related to project operations. Also Goal 2- Objective 1, and Goal 4- Objective 4*

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.# Restoration action addressed in this proposal falls into the "Other topic category"- Local Watershed Stewardship and environmental education topics.*

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.# Stage 1 actions 53 Butte creek restoration

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.# Actions proposed will help achieve recovery, of primary species (Big R) addressed in 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.# Project focuses on implementation of management and restoration practices identified through previous assessments. Project is not designed to resolve or provide significant information which may help resolve one of the 12 ERP 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.# Project occurs in two areas important to recovery of spring run chinook salmon. Work proposed was identified through an established assessment process. Previous work of this type has been completed and is currently being monitored for affect. Costs and scope of proposal seem reasonable given qualifications and capability of applicants. Acceptable level of public involvement in overall efforts within the watershed (of which this project is a part).*

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 supports AFRP Revised Draft Restoration Plan action items; Deer Creek item 2 (high priority) and Mill Creek item 2 (high priority). It is impossible to estimate the contribution to natural production of anadromous species in these drainages, but the project should benefit spring-run, fall-run and late fall-run chinook salmon and

steelhead through improved water quality, public awareness and public stewardship. If sediment is a detrimental factor in egg and larval survival in salmon and steelhead redds, then this project in the long-term would reduce erosion and sediments and contribute to enhancing production by lowering sediments in redds and improving redd survival rates. A direct benefit is expected for over-summering spring-run chinook salmon adults in Deer Creek as a result of an added campground host to patrol the creek.*

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.# Spring-run (threatened), fall and late fall-run (candidate) chinook salmon, and steelhead (threatened) would likely benefit through improved water quality in holding, spawning and rearing habitat. Mill and Deer creek spring-run chinook salmon are the two recognized remaining genetically distinct wild runs in tributaries of the Sacramento River. Butte Creek spring-run can be genetically differentiated from Deer and Mill creeks spring-run strains. Benefits will also accrue to the general aquatic and riparian communities, particularly benthic macroinvertebrates.*

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 will improve water quality and substantially reduce sediment input to the upper reaches of Deer and Mill creeks. The project will also provide demonstration projects for erosion and sediment control in upper Butte Creek. Reductions in sediment loads will reduce the potential for loss of pool habitat important for over-summering spring-run chinook salmon adults.*

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 directly 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 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 supports the CVPIA and AFRP objectives to: 1) Improve habitat for all life stages of anadromous fish through provision of flows of suitable quality, quantity and timing; 2) improved physical habitat; and 3) Involve partners in the implementation and evaluation of restoration actions. Specifically, the benefits include, improved water quality, reduced sediment input, and increased public stewardship for spring-run, fall-run and late fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead. The project qualifies for funding under AFRP.*

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 proposal is phase II of a previously funded CALFED project designed to define the problem and plan for areas to concentrate on, and it complements numerous concurrent restoration efforts in the CALFED target watersheds that provide system wide benefits. Several other projects targeting Deer, Mill and Antelope creeks are underway, including projects to help increase migration of anadromous fish species, study the lower watershed, and study changes to flood regimes. Other efforts to treat high sediment production areas in the watershed have been completed by the Forest Service, Collins Pine, and some have been funded

through grants from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and Vina Resource Conservation District. Source: Proposal, 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 #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.#97B01 - Watershed Improvement: Stabilization of potential sediment sources within the Deer, Mill, and Antelope Creek watersheds on LNF lands.*

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):#See comments under 3e3*

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.#97-B01*

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.#yes*

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#The extensive sediment reduction/stabilization activities proposed represent Phase II of a previously funded project (97B01) which identified the problems, developed and tested hypotheses, and developed some demonstration projects. Planning and consultation for over 200 identified sites is near completion and Phase

I will be complete by December 2000. Phase II would initiate larger scale implementation actions in meadows throughout the forest. Source: Proposal, quarterly progress 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.# The project was developed with input from the Mill, Deer and Butte creek conservancies and agency input. A major issue addressed in the proposal is the need to coordinate with the public regarding lost access due to road closures and decommissioning on the Lassen National Forest.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# None*

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:#n/a*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# Chiefs National Stewardship Award: 25,000 dollars; Fisheries Budget: 150,000 dollars; Hydrology Budget: 150,000 dollars; Recreation Budget: 12,000 dollars; Engineering Budget: 30,000 dollars; General Budget: 12,000 dollars; Supplemental Watershed Improvement Funds: 125,000 dollars. Total: 59.3% of total 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.*