

**i. Proposal number:#** 2001-H210\*

**ii. Short proposal title .#** Science Based Adaptive Management of the Lower American River \*

**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,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 requesting funding to test the hypotheses of their Plan which are that improved temperature, flow and physical habitat conditions will result in increased populations of target species. The desired outcomes described will contribute to Goal A - recover fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead; Goal B - rehabilitate natural ecosystem processes and biotic communities; Goal D - rehabilitate habitat for at risk species; Goal E - reduce impacts of non-native invasive species and Goal F - improve and maintain sediment and water quality.\*

**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.#** The proposal would contribute to numerous strategic objectives related to the goals listed above.  
\*

**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 action is not specifically identified in Section 3.5, though the proposal describes connection to natural flow regimes, channel dynamics, sediment transport and riparian vegetation and flood management as an ecosystem tool.\*

**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.#** Developing a corridor management plan for the LAR was a high priority in previous proposal solicitations and an initial phase of this effort has been funded by CALFED, and a plan is being developed. This ongoing work meets the specific Stage 1 action (Appendix D) of controlling or eradicating non-native riparian plants to the extent that work gets implemented under the plan. This proposal meets Stage 1 actions in general by proposing a suite of monitoring and modeling activities that will support and inform implementation of the plan in the most appropriate manner. \*

**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 work in this proposal should provide valuable information for several at risk species including fall-run chinook, steelhead and splittail. The proposal describes several projects aimed at increasing understanding about stressors affecting 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.#** Numerous conceptual models are included in the proposal. The purpose of the proposal is conduct a fish population monitoring project to gather information on the uncertainties described above (see 1c) to benefit the target at risk species.\*

**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.#** CALFED previously funded the high priority action of development of a corridor management plan for LAR and a technical advisory team is in place. This proposal is requesting funds for monitoring and modeling to support implementation of the plan and to address numerous scientific uncertainties. The applicant did a good job in describing the current work and status of understanding for issues in this watershed. The proposal has the potential to contribute valuable information and could act as a test case for adaptive management implementation for the CALFED 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).#**

Central Valley steelhead and fall-run chinook salmon are expected to benefit from the actions in this proposal. The contribution to natural production for these species via improved management of temperature, flow and physical habitat could be significant, but would be difficult to quantify. The certainty of the benefits to natural production is high in that the effort is based on scientific based evaluations carried out under the direction of a broad based stakeholder group with the ability to influence operations and management actions necessary to implement changes identified as beneficial to increasing salmonid populations. The benefits could be realized in the 5 to 10 year time frame, perhaps longer, and should be long term in duration. This proposal addresses AFRP American River Actions 2, 3, 5 and 8 and Evaluations 1 and 2 of the Revised Draft Restoration Plan.\*

**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.#**

The Central Valley steelhead, listed as threatened by the federal ESA and fall-run chinook salmon, a candidate species, are expected to benefit from this project. Also, expected to benefit is the Sacramento Splittail, a species of concern in the Delta region. In general, the proposal looks to fund efforts study, understand and improve water temperatures, flows and physical habitat. The information gained from these actions will benefit the salmonids, macro-invertebrates, native and non-native fishes using the river. Increasing habitat complexity through the creation of floodplains, appropriate temperatures, in channel cover and increased riparian and shaded riverine aquatic habitat will benefit all organisms in the American River Watershed Community. \*

**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 proposal seeks to restore to whatever degree possible natural channel and riparian habitat values. The proposal explains the applicants understanding of the importance of geomorphic processes in maintaining the overall health of a watershed by maintaining and creating riparian and instream habitats. The components of the project that will address the habitat values are 1) improved temperature control at Folsom, 2) updated LAR flow standard, 3) improved floodplain habitat, and 4) improved shaded riverine aquatic habitat. The benefits should be realized in the 5-10 year time period and should be long term in nature. \*

**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 will contribute to modification to the CVP Operations. The proposal seeks to understand flow fluctuation impacts and fishery flow needs directly related to American River salmonid populations and then change CVP operations to benefit fish populations. It could affect b (2) or (3). \*

**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 contributes to implementation of many supporting measures. Much of the data collected through this effort is strongly related to the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program. 3406 b 2,3,8,9, and 13 all could be contributed to through this project. \*

**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.#** Because this effort addresses AFRP American River Actions 2, 3, 5 and 8 and Evaluations 1 and 2 (all high priority Actions and Evaluations) of the Revised Draft Restoration Plan it is appropriate to consider for AFRP funding. The species benefitting the most from this proposal would be the fall-run chinook salmon, the Central Valley steelhead, and the Sacramento splittail, but because of the ecological value of the pursuits of this proposal (improve temperatures, flows and restoration of complex habitat values) it is likely to improve the entire aquatic community and the riparian corridor. The benefits of the tasks in this proposal would be long term and self sustaining if channel dynamics were restored. \*

## **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 RCMP project is the next phase in developing a plan to provide overall adaptive management of the Lower American River (CALFED Ecozone 9.2), which was funded for first year activities under 99N21. 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.**#99N21 - Development of a River Corridor Management Plan (RCMP) for the Lower American River\*

**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 planning has progressed, with the development of a Fisheries and Instream Habitat Group to develop the aquatic habitat element of the RCMP, developed a workplan with guidelines, goals, and desired outcomes. They are developing and prioritizing restoration projects and research recommendations. Year one activities will be completed in early 2001. 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.#99N21\***

**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 comments under 3c2.**  
The group is ready for the next phase in 2001, for project implementation, intensive monitoring, rigorous hypothesis testing and adaptive management.  
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.#** There is concern about outreach because this is such a densely populated area with many entities having great interest in the watershed. There is a plan to be as comprehensive as possible. There is no discussed opposition to the proposal. Third party benefits will occur in the future as watershed groups can use this model. \*

#### **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, for three years\***

**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 varies from task to task. See Table 1\***

**5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# Yes, it will be funded by management and administrative staff at the water forum\***

**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.# Water Forum: 1 million dollars; SAFCA: 5.6 million dollars. Total: 6.6 million dollars or 415% 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\*