

i. Proposal number:#2001-H206*

ii. Short proposal title .# Management Plan Implementation for Ecological Preserves of Butte County*

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,C,D and E.***

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.# Proposal will contribute to these goals in a minor or insignificant way.*

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.# Goal 4 Habitats - Objective 3 - Proposal may help in some small way to protect an existing tract of high quality habitat.*

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.# Project does not directly relate to one of the restoration actions described in Section 3.5 of the PSP. *

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.# Proposal is not directly (or indirectly) linked to Stage 1 ERP actions.*

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. # Spring run chinook are steelhead described as "R" species, currently occupy habitat within these two parcels subject of this program.*

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, if any, information to resolve one or more of the 12 scientific uncertainties will be generated by this proposal.*

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. # Little additional benefits to listed species, their habitats, or to stressors will likely occur if this proposal is funded. The Big Chico Creek parcel is an acquisition of land currently in a natural state with most of the value for species their habitats extant. The Butte Creek parcel is an isolated tract of disturbed land with little value in either its natural or restored state. It would appear that the applicant is requesting funds to carry out their "management" responsibilities for two parcels of land that they actively sought to manage, primarily for educational purposes. It seems inappropriate to fund an organization that is actively pursuing management responsibilities for land yet either does not have or is unwilling to commit the needed financial resources to properly conduct their management responsibilities.*

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). # Project develops and implements management plan(s) for recent land acquisitions along Big Chico and Butte creeks that directly benefit spring run salmon and steelhead. Benefits are long-term and provide protection for holding, spawning, and rearing. Both areas included in this proposal include key reaches with potential for intensive development that would have been detrimental to spring run salmon and steelhead. Within the Big Chico Creek watershed this project addresses AFRP action item 6 ("Protect spring-run chinook salmon summer holding pools on

lands adjacent to the pools") and 7 (Cooperate with local landowners to encourage revegetation of denuded stream reaches; and establish, restore and maintain riparian habitat .."). Within the Butte Creek watershed this project addresses AFRP action item 19 ("Develop land use plans that create buffer zones between the creek and agricultural, urban, and industrial developments; and restore, maintain, and protect riparian and spring-run chinook salmon summer holding habitat ...")*

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.# Lands acquired as proposed for management under this proposal have multi-species benefits.

Special status species which will benefit include the state and/or federally listed spring run chinook salmon (threatened) and steelhead (threatened), and federal candidate species fall and late fall run salmon.. In addition both areas support or potentially support Foothill Yellow-legged frog, Western pond turtle, Yellow warbler, and Yellow breasted chat.*

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.# Each of the lands included in this project is being managed in conjunction with previous acquisitions that encompass several miles of lands along the stream channels and riparian zone. The intent is to manage both properties to benefit the species listed under section 1h, and to promote natural process where possible, which includes allowing limited meander and natural regeneration of riparian areas as well as active vegetation restoration to help stabilize this section of Butte Creek that has been destabilized through past gold and gravel mining.*

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 original acquisition of these lands, and the management as provided within this project will serve to protect and enhance instream flows with particular benefit to the listed anadromous fish. Base instream flows have been provided in both Big Chico and Butte Creeks through an innovative water exchange program with the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation. That project

exchanged water (40 cfs) normally taken from Butte Creek for the right to take the same volume from the Sacramento River, allowing the Butte Creek water to remain for instream use to the eventual confluence with the river. Additionally, the project relocated pumps from Big Chico Creek to the Sacramento River, restoring the full natural flow to Big Chico Creek.*

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 provides a management plan and initial management for lands acquired within the Big Chico and Butte creek watersheds that implement CVPIA AFRP (3406 (b)(1) other) actions directed at riparian and stream channel protections. *

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.# Proposal is to provide funding to develop or complete management plans and provide for the two years of management for lands recently acquired along Big Chico and Butte creeks. Project implements CVPIA AFRP 3406(b)(1) actions to restore/protect stream channel and riparian lands key to anadromous fish in Big Chico and Butte creeks. Within the Big Chico Creek watershed this project addresses AFRP action item 6 and 7 and within the Butte Creek watershed addresses AFRP action item 19. Each will also contribute to the maintenance of natural processes in close coordination with local input and need. Each of the land acquisitions (McAmis on Butte Creek, and Simmons on Big Chico Creek) received previous AFRP co-funding. AFRP funds are thus appropriate for further development of a management plan and initial implementation of the plan for the first two years. Project initiates management planning and management of properties acquired along Big Chico and Butte creeks specifically to address CVPIA and CALFED objectives. Project will therefore contribute to long-term watershed function and benefit key anadromous species (spring run salmon and steelhead).*

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.

#Proposed work complements several Butte Creek projects, including Sacramento River NWR acquisitions, Keeney Ranch Preserve, Butte Creek Ecological Preserve, Chico Parks and Recreation District programs, watershed education programs, restoration projects on the Sacramento River, and SB1086 interagency restoration and conservation program. Source: Proposal, quarterly 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.#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 projects:

98B35 - Butte Creek Watershed Education
98F01 - Butte Creek Watershed
98F02 - Butte Creek Watershed Coordinator Assistant
98F03 - Butte Creek Acquisition and Riparian Restoration
98F24 - Butte Creek Riparian Restoration Demonstration
96M24 - Butte Creek Watershed Management Strategy Plan
97N06 - Butte Creek Acquisition and Riparian Restoration*

CVPIA

1448-11332-98-G - Butte Creek Watershed Road Survey
1448-11332-98-G - Butte Creek Watershed Administration
1448-11332-98-G - Butte Creek Watershed Education Project
113328G022 - Butte Creek Riparian Protection and Restoration Project*

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): #All projects to date have either been completed or are scheduled for completion in year 2000, except for continued monitoring and management, which is ongoing. Source: Proposal, quarterly progress reports*

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.# While the proposal does include, as a major component of the project, outreach and public education, a key concern expressed by local entities including watershed groups is the need for coordination and local input prior to initiating the grant application process. Applicant did however supply copies of the proposal to each of the affected parties including the Butte Creek Watershed Conservancy, and the Big Chico Creek Alliance.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# This project under Task 2 may need to acquire County permits to construct and operate an outhouse. The project proponent will also need to obtain a Categorical Exemption for the replacement of the culvert, if it is replaced with the same size culvert. Repair and replacement of the perimeter fence may impact the environment if an established trail does not exist. CEQA consideration may be required. Creating a nature trail in the Simmons unit will require that the project proponent comply with CEQA and potentially CESA.*

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, the budget table does not specify for which years the are costs shown.

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.# Budget table needs to be broken down by year*

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.# CSU: 3,500 dollars per year for 2 years or 7,000 dollars total (3.2%)*

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*