

i. Proposal number:#2001-H208*

ii. Short proposal title .# Kirker Creek Watershed CRMP 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# A, B, C, D, E, F*

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.#

The proposal is to develop a Coordinated Resources Management Plan (CRMP) for Kirker Creek, which, if successfully implemented, could contribute to all the above ERP goals. They propose to develop a plan to address watershed-wide issues including restoration of wetland and riparian communities, prevention of soil erosion, reduction of non-point source pollution, reduction of flooding and non-native invasive species issues. *

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.#

Again, if CRMP is successfully developed and implemented, it will address numerous goals and strategic objectives. The project also lists a number of stressors that would be addressed. *

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 closely follows the type of watershed proposal described in Section 3.5. The proposal clearly identifies the steps necessary to develop the plan as well as a long list of potential local participants. There are a few letters of support but the commitment of the other local participants is unclear at this time.*

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.# The project is not specifically identified as a Stage 1 action in Appendix D though it may contribute to the action of implementing control strategies for nuisance marsh and upland plants in the Suisun Marsh.*

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.# The watershed supports numerous at risk species including California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, San Joaquin kit fox, San Joaquin pocket mouse and several at risk plant species. Thus, if a plan is successfully implemented, those actions would benefit these 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 CRMP could provide information to answer several uncertainties depending on how the plan is implemented. The applicants do commit to using an adaptive management approach. They also state that NRCS has committed to conducting an initial assessment which will provide a basis of information for analyzing future monitoring results.*

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 describes a clear process for developing a CRMP to address the natural resource issues in the watershed, and commits to using an adaptive management approach. The proposal describes the stressors which may be addressed in detail, as well as the key players in the watershed. To the extent they will be able to gain the appropriate local support and implement the plan, there is the potential for addressing numerous ERP goals and objectives for this watershed.*

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).#

The expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish is unknown. Kirker Creek is not known to be inhabited by anadromous fish. The Kirker Creek watershed covers approximately 8,000 acres in northeastern Contra Costa County and enters the San Joaquin River near Brown's Island. The report suggests that benefits in the creek can be applied to all aquatic life, including fish, in the Suisun Marsh and Bay as well as further downstream. This is a mighty claim and is not substantiated in the text. Since the proposal is based on the development of the Kirker Creek Watershed Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) report which will be prepared in its entirety over the 2-year period January 2001 - November 2002, neither the expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production, the certainty of the expected benefits, the immediacy of the expected contribution, nor the duration of the expected contribution can be identified.*

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.#

Listed species, anadromous species and special status species expected to benefit from the implementation of the project include California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, San Joaquin kit fox, San Joaquin pocket mouse, large-flowered fiddleneck, Delta tule pea, Mason's lileaeopsis, burrowing owl, and Alameda whipsnake. It is expected that the Kirker Creek Watershed CRMP report will address each of these species, but that cannot be determined since the report preparation, including scoping, will not begin until 2001.*

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 extent to which the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values and promotes natural processes, and the duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values cannot be determined pending completion of the Kirker Creek Watershed CRMP. The Kirker Creek Watershed CRMP Program is designed to address watershed-wide natural resource problems including restoration of wetland and riparian communities, prevention of soil erosion, reduction of non-point source pollution, and reduction of flooding. The immediacy of the benefits to the natural channel and riparian habitat values, if they occur at all, will not be realized for at least two years at which time the Kirker Creek Watershed CRMP will be completed. Following completion of the CRMP, the recommendations therein would have to be implemented under separate proposal(s).*

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).# No evidence is presented to indicate whether/how the project would contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations. No such relationship is apparent.*

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 does not contribute to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA.*

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 is not appropriate for funding support from the Anadromous Fish Restoration Project. There is no evidence that anadromous fish will benefit from this project. Kirker Creek is not known to be inhabited by anadromous fish, and the product of the project is the Kirker Creek Watershed CRMP, a report which will not be prepared for two years and whose scope will not be addressed until well into the first year of the project. The strength of the proposal is that there is expected to be strong public participation in the development of the restoration goals, objectives, etc. The weakness of the proposal is that the lack of specificity prevents wholesale endorsement of the product. The project could very well end up contributing the goals of the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, but that cannot be determined until the CRMP is completed.*

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. #Contra Costa RCD has developed local support and the project complements ongoing restoration efforts by DOW Wetlands and Environmental Team at the mouth of Kieker Creek with more potential restoration in the planning stages. Also complements water quality improvement efforts by East Bay Regional Parks District. Builds on lessons learned from previous CALFED project (98E17) on Alhambra Creek. 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. #98E17 - Alhambra Creek watershed CRMP 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): #98E17 is in the second year of implementation and is on time and budget. Have hired coordinator, leveraged additional support for early implementation efforts, conducted workshops, a stream inventory, and developed GIS database. Expect watershed plan by Fall 2000. Source: Proposal, quarterly 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.# The Contra Costa Resource Conservation District (RCD) has garnered the support of landowners, residents, civic groups, industry, and local municipalities for the development of the CRMP. The RCD expects to involve a wide level of involvement from the volunteers who will participate in the development of the CRMP, which should ensure that many interests will be represented in the watershed plan. Since the plan has not been developed yet, the potential third party impacts cannot be identified. Possible positive impacts include improved property values due to improved natural habitats, reduction of flooding damages, reduced risk of catastrophic wildfires within the watershed, improved financial opportunities for landowners to implement conservation plans associated with the watershed **plan**, and improved educational curriculum through local school involvement.*

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.# 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:# Total: 241,895 dollars*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# Contra costa RCD: 66,195 dollars; NRCS: 66,650 dollars; Watershed Planning: 109,050 dollars. Total: 241,895 dollars or 122% 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*