

i. Proposal number:# 2001-H205*

ii. Short proposal title .# Battle Creek Watershed Stewardship, Phase II*

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# See 1g.*

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.# See 1g*

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.# See 1g*

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.# See 1g*

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.# See 1g*

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.# See 1g*

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.# See 1g*

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 is not eligible for CALFED funding.*

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).# All five Central Valley salmonid populations (winter, spring, fall and late-fall chinook, and steelhead) are expected to benefit from this project. This second phase of Battle Creek Watershed Stewardship links to the AFRP plan because it is proposed by the local watershed group that is working in the Battle Creek watershed. These three additional tasks would continue implementation of the work that has already occurred toward restoring natural production of anadromous fish in the Battle Creek watershed. These tasks have a moderate certainty of expected benefits for population increases with near-term benefits to improve people's understanding of the watershed.*

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.# Sacramento River Winter-run ESU - Federal and State listed Endangered; Central Valley Spring-run ESU - Federal Threatened, State Candidate; Central Valley Steelhead ESU - Federal Threatened; fall and late-fall run chinook salmon - ESA candidate status. Various multiple species benefits could also occur.*

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.# A key component of the existing program and this Phase II proposal is direct local involvement

in understanding watershed function, and participation in watershed assessment efforts that benefit natural process. This educational/outreach process is longterm and when continuously applied to many landowners should result, directly and indirectly, in immediate and continuous projects to benefit and improve natural channel and riparian 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).# While this proposal has three main components (e.g., watershed assessment, watershed information system and implementation of the Strategy) it does not directly focus 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.# This proposal, with its three inter-related tasks, is primarily education/outreach/working with the local watershed group, it also provides both direct and indirect benefit to the implementation and long-term success of all CVPIA measures (e.g. the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program and (b)(1)other.*

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 proposal is appropriate for consideration for funding by the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program; the strength of this proposal lies in it being proposed by the local watershed working group. The tasks identified in the proposal will more fully enable the watershed group to continue its efforts to involve the local people in restoration of their watershed and will provide added certainty of restoration benefits that are accruing. Task One: Complete a watershed assessment and treatment plan by identifying upper watershed sites (i.e., timber harvest areas)

with a risk of soil erosion. Task Two: Implement a Battle Creek Watershed Information System will build on the 1999 version of "KRIS (Klamath Resource Information System)/Battle Creek" the electronic information tool developed for the Klamath River Watershed now in a version containing information on Battle Creek. Since the completion of KRIS/Battle Creek in January 1999, the data has continued to accrue. It could be extremely beneficial for the locals and agencies involved in restoring Battle Creek if this information could be made electronically available. The benefits of this effort could be far-reaching, including providing a hands-on tool to strengthen watershed interest and education in the area's schools. Task Three: Sustain implementation of the Battle Creek Watershed Strategy would continue the three years of effort that went in to producing the draft strategy. Aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process include noting that the recently completed Battle Creek Watershed Strategy (WSRCD 2000) shows that Task 1 is supported by Strategy I.E. "seek funding for watershed-wide assessment of existing conditions to identify impacts on anadromous fish restoration efforts" Task Two is not specifically supported by the Strategy, but indirectly ties in with Strategy XIII for outreach and education, and Task Three is self-explanatory.*

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 all of the ongoing projects in the Battle Creek Watershed, and continues project 98E06, the first phase of the Watershed Stewardship Program. Source: CALFED Tracking Table, 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.#98E06 - Battle Creek Watershed Stewardship*

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):#Proponents have developed a Battle Creek Watershed constituency, with public meetings and workshops, and is developing a list of stakeholder concerns, including fire defense improvements and conservation easement opportunities. Have completed a Battle Creek Watershed Strategy Plan.
Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

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.#98E06*

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):#See information under 3c2. First phase scheduled for completion in September 2001, but the new tasks for Phase II could begin in Spring 2001. Source: Proposal, quarterly report*

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.# [See also the response to

question 3.e.3.] This proposal is primarily aimed at involving the local people in the restoration of the watershed. Outstanding issues related to support or opposition for the project include: this is the watershed that a large proportion of CALFED and CVPIA funding and effort has been, and continues to be, invested in to restore salmonids, prior years funding and effort have been fairly successful, and continued efforts are still needed. On the other hand, full support from all Board members for the overall restoration of the watershed is lacking and full representation by a broad range of interest groups needs to be improved. Nonetheless, the effort to restore the watershed with the involvement of local people, the Conservancy Board, and stakeholders needs to continue. The potential for third party impacts has not been thoroughly resolved. Some concerns exist, which may be alleviated by actions such as are identified in this proposal (i.e., comments expressed at Battle Creek Work Group and Public Meetings include "not enough effort/funds are being directed at non-fisheries issues in the watershed (e.g., fuels mgt and its impact on landowners)").*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Nothing is needed for this phase of the project.*

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, it's at 20%*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# No

mention of project management costs*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.# Need to clearly identify project management costs in budget table*

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.# Sierra Pacific Industries: 75,000 dollars or 28% 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*