

i. Proposal number:# 2001-H207*

ii. Short proposal title .# Sacramento River Conservation Area Program*

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# 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 .# Proposal is focused on establishing capacity on a non-profit entity to provide service in carrying out a developed plan to restore riparian habitat and function along the Sacramento River.*

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 .# Proposal supports Goal #4 - Objective 2 . . . restore large expanses of . . . habitat. . in the Central Valley. This proposal would help create the capacity of the program to better pursue this objective.*

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.* Proposal would carry out planning, coordination and information development which would lead to the development of more and better projects to meet objectives of the overall Sacramento River Program.*

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 action 10 - This proposal will help to achieve this Stage 1 action - complete remaining easements and acquisition for the Sacramento River meander corridor.*

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.# Proposal suggests that it will benefit a full range of "R", "r" and "m" species found in or associate with habitats included within the boundaries of the Sacramento River 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.# Proposed project as designed would provide little information to resolve uncertainties related to channel form and dynamics, sediment transport and riparian vegetation, and areas of uncertainty. Proposal if focused on furthering implementation of a plan to create an expanded corridor of habitats along the portion of the Sacramento River. Nothing in this proposal suggests investigation or experimentation to better understand relationships between the proposed activity and the larger question of channel dynamics.*

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.# Proposal is consistent with goals and objectives, MSCS, and Stage 1 actions of the ERP. CALFED has previously committed substantial dollars to implement aspects of this program. This proposal will enhance the capacity of the established non-profit to continue and complete implementation of the 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).# This proposal will contribute indirectly but immediately to production of anadromous fish species in the Upper mainstem Sacramento River on a long-term basis. These species include spring-run, fall-run and late-fall-run and winter-run chinook salmon, steelhead, white

sturgeon, and green sturgeon. It proposes funding the second phase of the formation of a non profit organization (NPO) to facilitate, coordinate and implement a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among conflicting factions and activities involving agriculture, flood control, habitat restoration, urban development. First year funding has been provided by the AFRP. This NPO proposes to assist in the development and implementation of restoration plans within the Sacramento River Conservation Area with the goal of creating a continuous riparian ecosystem between Keswick Dam and Colusa and a continuous corridor of vegetation along the levied portions of the river below Colusa. Given the incredible mixture of self-interest generated conflicts involved in restoring the Inner River Zone, a NPO as proposed, would significantly contribute to the production of anadromous fish by managing these negative activities and facilitating and speeding-up the process for implementing proposed restoration projects. As the situation is today, most proposed restoration projects are opposed or supported by a large diverse group of stakeholders. The sooner the proposed restoration projects are in place, the faster the environment will respond to restore ecosystem functions that in turn will support anadromous fish production in the upper mainstem Sacramento River..*

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 chinook salmon (threatened), fall-run and late-fall-run chinook salmon (candidate) and winter-run chinook salmon juveniles (endangered), steelhead (threatened), white sturgeon, and green sturgeon (California Species of Concern) and a non anadromous species, splittail(threatened). Restoration of the natural meander and ecosystem functions to the upper mainstem Sacramento River will also benefit other fish and wildlife species. By supporting approval, and rapidly moving projects to implementation phases, this proposal offers benefit to anadromous fish including federal/state listed species represented by 1 amphibian, 1 reptile and 7 species of birds. Additionally benefitted are multiple federal and state species of concern, composed of 3 species of bats, 1 rodent, 4 amphibians, 2 reptiles, 28 birds, and also including 5 plant species identified by the California Native Plant Society. Also of major overall benefit is the restoration and protection of key Central Valley habitats that include Valley riverine aquatic, Montane riverine aquatic, and Lacustrin.*

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 would implement the consensus derived MOA, by coordinating implementation of natural process and meander zone restoration projects which are key SB1086 objectives. These projects are designed to protect and restore 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).# 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.# Implementation of the goal of creating a continuous riparian ecosystem between Keswick Dam and Colusa and a continuous corridor of vegetation along the levied portions of the river below Colusa supports measures of the CVPIA, 3406(b)(13) and 3406(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 project supports the AFRP approach to making all reasonable efforts to at least double natural production of anadromous fish through partnerships, local involvement, public support, adaptive management and flexibility. It has been previously funded under the AFRP and supports the AFRP's Upper mainstem Sacramento River Action 9, thus qualifies for consideration of further funding under the AFRP. The major strength of this proposal is that it represents the implementation phase of the SB1086 process. It builds on all the consensus planning and meeting of stakeholders from state and federal agencies, county supervisors, landowners, water contractors, commercial and sport fisheries and general wildlife and conservation interests that has occurred since the inception of SB1086. The Upper Sacramento River Fisheries and Riparian Habitat Management Plan Conservation Area Handbook, which was also developed through consensus, will be used by the proposed NPO for riparian habitat management and project implementation; it addresses both the dynamics of riparian ecosystems as well as the realities of the local agricultural and landowner issues. There is a long history of consensus building leading to restoration of the Sacramento River meander zone preceding this proposal which, if funded, would facilitate the implementation of these efforts, a major contribution towards restoring ecosystem functions to the 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.#Proposed restoration activities within the Sacramento River Conservation Area (SRCA) will be consistent with SB 1086 principles and objectives. Program will act as a clearinghouse and will monitor recommended restoration. 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 and CVPIA project. 97C03 - Watershed Management Planning for the Sacramento River Riparian Program, AFRP-FY 2000 - Sacramento Conservation Area Program*

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):#The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the non-profit organization to coordinate management activities has been completed. Coordination of site specific

plans and public outreach program is ongoing. Organization fully established in July 2000. 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.#97C03*

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):#Summary and MOA provided in the proposal and have outlined next steps. Organization has been established and is ready for next phase. Source: Proposal, quarterly 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 potential for issues to surface is always present. That is the reason for the MOA and the NPO, to address issues as they arise from the myriad of stakeholders.*

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.#no*

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.# The overhead is not identified on the budget table, it is simply stated that costs are subject to overhead*

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.# Dept. of Water Resources: 150,000 dollars or 46% 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*