

i. Proposal number:# 2001-H201*

ii. Short proposal title .# Upper Trinity River Watershed Stewardship 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# Does not explicitly tie proposed activities to ERPP strategic goals- implies potential water quality benefits (maintaining coldwater storage, decreasing turbidity from Lewiston to Whiskeytown), and maintaining harvestable species (increase production of Trinity stocks would decrease harvest pressure on Central valley stocks.)*

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 would could result in reduction of episodic sediment deposition (ave 200 ac ft of storage displacement annually) to trinity lake- corresponding reduction in sediment and turbidity in Whiskeytown Lake.*

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.# No strategic objectives are pursued through this proposal*

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.# The only restoration action related to this proposal falls under the "Other Topic" category- Local watershed stewardship. This project does demonstrate the capacity of local effort, engagement of local landowners and stakeholders, agencies and others. Proposal suggests an orderly process of assessment, planning and treatment.*

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 could have an effect on restoration actions planned for Clear Creek. Effects are likely to be indirect- could be tied to hydro generation needs vs. flow enhancement on lower Clear Creek.*

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.# No direct linkage to MSCS or species, Proposal implies a relationship between to Central valley fisheries i.e. chinook and steelhead in Sacramento River, and Clear Creek.*

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.# Little contribution to resolving any of the twelve 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 fall outside of the solution area defined by the ERP. The project is not an action described for Stage 1 of the ERP.*

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 is a community based watershed stewardship project with active leadership located in the upper Trinity River Watershed above Trinity Dam (total drainage area 692 sq mi). This project would enable the local people to work with local agencies to resolve the fine sediment input problem into Trinity Lake. Indirectly, all anadromous fish species in the Sacramento River could benefit -- if sedimentation from the Upper Trinity Watershed is found to be troublesome to fish as it is transported into the Sacramento River. The magnitude of the benefit appears to be low, the immediacy of the benefit is unclear, yet the duration of the benefit could be long-term.*

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.# Potentially, this project could benefit all upper Sacramento River listed salmonids and their habitats, to include fall and late-fall-run (candidate), spring-run (threatened) and winter-run (endangered) chinook salmon, and steelhead (threatened). There could also be multi-species benefits.*

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 may help to protect and restore natural channel and habitat values in the Upper Trinity River Watershed (approximately 70% public (USFS) and 30% private (Sierra Pacific Industries) ownership).*

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 may not contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations. While it is an outreach project and is not directly focused on CVP operations affecting flows, it does effectively address physical process and habitat requirements, a key component of which is flow related. *

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 is education/outreach oriented and may provide both direct and indirect benefits to the implementation and long-term success of all CVPIA measures.*

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.# Applicant proposes to work with the local interests to identify and rectify fine sediment sources in the Upper Trinity River Watershed. This project would help to enable a local watershed group to form and eventually work with the public and private entities on whose land the excessive fine sediment is originating from. One concern with this proposal/method is that it may be difficult to work with the public and private timber industries if they did not fully express support for the proposal. It also appears that the federal government, USDA Forest Service, would be the most appropriate entity to perform a Watershed Assessment on public land. No local involvement by Sierra Pacific Industries is shown under "G" Local Involvement. There is a lack of certainty of benefits due to the obscurity of fine sediment from the Trinity River causing problems in the Upper Sacramento River.*

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 is consistent with CALFED goals for improving water quality and storage capacity, by improving storage capacity of Trinity and Whiskeytown Lakes by reducing sedimentation, also improving water quality and fishery habitat for this system and the Bay-Delta. Project will coordinate with other Trinity River programs, earlier Proposition 204 projects (noncalfed)in the Trinity River Watershed, and complements key actions in the Clean Water Action Plan by EPA and the Dept. of Agriculture. 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.#none*

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

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.#

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:##

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):##

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.# As noted earlier in this review, the support of many private landowners is significant, but the support of the major private landowner (Sierra Pacific Industries) is lacking. Since this work will depend so intricately on the involvement of this one private landowner, the efforts to complete this work may be futile. Also, Forest Service involvement is minimal*

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.# No, there is no breakdown in the budget tables by year.*

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.# Need to include a breakdown of the budget by year*

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. # Several funding commitments could be counted toward cost sharing including prop. 204 funds, CA Department of Forestry and Fire Protections Forest Stewardship funds, and funds obtained by the TCRCD*