

i. Proposal number:# 2001-H203.*

ii. Short proposal title .# Sonoma Creek watershed conservancy 2001-2003*

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,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.# Focus of the proposal is on stressors assumed to be limiting production of steelhead *

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.# Sonoma Creek falls into Central Coast ESU for Steelhead- the ERP addresses this species under Goal 1, 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.# This proposal falls within the "Other Topics" category of restoration actions, specifically the watershed stewardship category.*

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 proposal is consistent with Stage 1 action #15- pursue actions that are opportunity based- provide incremental improvement on private lands- develop partnerships with farmers on "environmentally friendly" agricultural activities.*

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.# Central coast ESU Steelhead are not a CALFED "Big R" species. This project contributes to the maintain objective the MSAC has established for this species.*

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.# The proposal does not contribute greatly toward resolving any of the twelve scientific uncertainties described in section 3.3 of the PSP.*

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 proposal continues efforts previously funded by CALFED and others. Early efforts have provided additional information regarding stressors and limiting factors to steelhead production in this system. Resource issues in this watershed are tied directly to milestones identified in the Biological opinion for the CALFED bay delta program.*

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).# Steelhead trout are expected to benefit from the project. A minor contribution is expected to natural production of steelhead trout. There is moderate certainty in the benefits as essential aspects of steelhead life-cycle needs in a portion of the creek are to be restored by the project. The project yields immediate and long term duration of benefits to natural production of steelhead.*

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.# Steelhead trout are threatened under the ESA. California freshwater

shrimp are also expected to benefit. The Sonoma Creek freshwater ecosystem, and its multiple species, are the expected benefits from the project.*

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 promote natural processes by the barriers to steelhead passage, restoration of an eroded road bed that is affecting a spawning area through elevated sedimentation, and improving pool habitat by installing large woody debris. The duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values is long term if maintained.*

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 will not contribute to modified 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.# Project will provide steelhead data for CAMP but the geographical area is outside the Central Valley and Delta.*

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.# The project is outside the effects of the Central Valley project and hence, doubtful to be funded by CVPIA. The project provides direct habitat improvement to a listed anadromous salmonid (steelhead), increases understanding of the benefits of salmonid habitat restoration and of the factors influencing their productivity, stream ecology, increases watershed coordination and educates public through a significant outreach and educational program. However, it is outside the scope of the CVPIA and its focus on Central Valley anadromous fish stocks since relates to a stream that is a tributary to San Pablo Bay.*

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 previous efforts for the Sonoma Creek Watershed, including SWRCB 205(j) Sonoma Creek Watershed Enhancement Plan, funding to reduce sedimentation and non-point source pollutants, a DFG grant for workshops to develop Best Management Practices for fishery and riparian improvement, and two years of CALFED funding for studies on limiting factors for anadromous fish, restoration projects and community outreach (see section three for details). The proponents and Sonoma Ecology Center will begin partnerships with USCOE and RWQCB on a San Pablo Bay Study and TMDL development for the North Bay for further studies and prioritizing restoration actions. 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.#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.#98E02 - Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy-Watershed Restoration
00E04 - Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy*

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):#Project 98E02 Tasks are underway for initial restoration and enhancement projects (50-85% complete) with project deadline of April 2001. Project 00E04 recently awarded for additional projects on habitat restoration, watershed stewardship, education and project management. Will be under contract in August 2000. Source: Proposal summary, quarterly progress reports, monitoring plan data, update from contract agency*

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.#98E02, 00E04*

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):#Tasks in this proposal are year two and year three of tasks proposed and funded for first year in 2000. Some tasks are expansions of tasks proposed in 2000 and some are new or revised from the earlier work, based on new information and needs in the watershed. Information on status of earlier projects listed in 3c2. 00E04 was not yet underway at the time of this proposal, but work was scheduled for completion in 2000-2001 time frame. Much of the proposed work deals

with monitoring after construction of the projects, which is vital in verifying success/failure of those projects and should be funded. Some of the additional elements proposed are consistent with the conceptual model developed and all of the elements really represent next phase funding from the original 2000 proposal, which was a three year proposal that got funded for first year only. Project update:Project will be implemented August 2000- 2001, so are ready for next phase funding for summer of FY2001. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, project update from contracting agency*

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.# Diverse

partnerships with local and regional agencies, educational institutes, general public, landowners all support the project.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# The project proponent anticipates getting a Streambed Alteration Agreement and will be required to comply with CEQA and CESA as part of that process. The project will also need to comply with federal ESA and NEPA since steelhead are present in the system. The US Army Corps of Engineers will need to be consulted under Section 10. The proponent will also need to get an Encroachment Permit from the Reclamation Board.*

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.# RWQCB: 75,000 dollars; CALFED: 438,000 dollars; CALFED: 68,000 dollars; CA Dept. of Fish and Game: 9,000 dollars; Sonoma County Water Agency: 57,000 dollars; Sonoma County Water Agency: 60,000 dollars; Sonoma Valley Harvest Wine Auction: 18,000 dollars; Sonoma County Water Agency: 83,000 dollars; Volunteers: 40,000 dollars; Interns: 15,000 dollars; Professional: 34,000 dollars. Total: 164.5% 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*