

**i. Proposal number:# 2001-I212\***

**ii. Short proposal title .# Next phase funding for expanding salmon habitat through non regulatory mechanisms to alter dams and diversions\***

**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 Item G\***

**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 Item G\***

**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 Item G\***

**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 Item G\***

**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 Item G\***

**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 Item G\***

**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 Item G\***

**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 requests ERP funds to advocate policy which CALFED could not control and which may not be compatible with CALFED program objectives. It is not the sort of proposal requested in the PSP and should not be approved\***

#### **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).#** Sustenance of natural production of spring-, fall- and late-fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead associated with Cow, Battle and Butte creeks, Central Valley tributaries that PG&E hydroelectric projects have direct effects on with salmon and steelhead populations (a small portion of the total PG&E hydro assets directly affecting anadromous fish), should be supported by this proposal. Elimination of diversion dams associated with Kilarc and Cow creek powerhouses would directly benefit passage of spring- and fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead. Proposed changes in the Battle Creek hydroelectric system are already agreed to by the agencies and PG&E and are underway. Any slight changes in amounts of water or temperatures of water discharged through the DeSabra-Centerville Powerhouse complex on Butte Creek could impact spring- and fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead populations. This project is expected to have a low contribution to production of anadromous fish since, realistically, they only apply to the Kilarc-Cow Creek Hydroelectric Project. The immediacy and certainty of these benefits are low, but if successful, the duration of benefits to anadromous fish associated with Cow-Creek would be long-term.\*

**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-, (threatened) fall- and late-fall-run (candidate) chinook salmon and steelhead (proposed threatened). Since the operation of the new Livingston-Stone winter-run hatchery located on the mainstem Sacramento River at the base of Shasta Dam, winter-run, possibly with the

exception of a few strays, are no longer immigrating into Battle Creek. No other streams and associated anadromous fish populations are expected to be directly benefited since the majority of PG&E hydroelectric facilities are located upstream of major impoundments. However, this project would support preservation and restoration of Cow, Battle and Butte creek watershed corridors (a small portion of the total PG&E hydro assets directly affecting anadromous fish), resulting in multiple-species benefits.\*

**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.**

# If the "Consumers Authority" becomes reality through AB 1956, it could bring about the most desirable environmental outcome from the divestiture of PG&E's hydroelectric facilities on three tributaries to the mainstem Sacramento River that directly support anadromous salmonid populations (Cow, Battle and Butte creeks)(a small portion of the total PG&E hydro assets directly affecting anadromous fish). This outcome would also have positive and beneficial effects on watersheds upstream of major impoundments where the vast majority of PG&E's hydroelectric assets exist. The concept proposed is designed to protect and restore natural channel and riparian habitat values and, hence, natural processes. These benefits would accrue initially through preservation of the existing habitats and later through direct habitat restoration supported by revenues generated by the sale of electricity by the "Consumers Authority" for a transitional period of six years before complete divestiture of the PG&E hydroelectric generation facilities to private owners takes place.\*

**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).**

# Project does not 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.**

# This project contributes to the implementation of CVPIA, 3406 (b)(3)- water acquisition, and 3406 (b)(10)- minimize fish passage by establishing a transitional public trust through AB 1956, "Consumers Authority", to purchase PG&E's hydro assets; the "Consumers Authority" would collect approximately \$500 million over a six year period and invest those dollars in water quality, fish and wildlife and ecosystem restoration objectives consistent with CALFED objectives and long term requirements of the State. This project also contributes to the implementation 3406(b)(1) other. If an interim state ownership type of approach fails, this project also

supports the education of decision makers, stakeholders and the general public about the possible adverse consequences to the CALFED program and helps to ensure that the new owners incorporate the necessary environmental safeguards after any private takeover.\*

**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.#**

Only a small part of this proposal is applicable to CVPIA, since the majority of the watersheds affected are located above major impoundments and can have no direct effects on anadromous fish populations. The most appropriate sources of CVPIA funding for this project would be the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program for the general process or the Anadromous Fish Screen Program for passage improvements on both Cow and Butte creeks, within both of the hydro facility's instream boundaries. Battle Creek restoration has already been settled through CALFED funding commitments.\*

#### **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.#**

PG & E hydro assets are located in light of the fourteen CALFED ecological zones and affect twelve making CALFED and CVPIA investments vulnerable to future operations so this work will support future restoration and acquisition projects by developing habitat friendly operations in the future. 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.#**

98N02 - Expanding California Salmon Habitat through non-government and nonregulatory mechanisms to alter dams and diversions.\*

**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 proponent has completed earlier work and project scheduled to be completed September 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.#98N02.\***

**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. Project 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.#** Based on consultation with CALFED staff, a letter in Appendix D explains that the requirement to formally notify local governments affected by this project does not apply in this case. Also, key educational objectives are targeted towards decision makers, stakeholders and the general public to understand relationship between the proposed hydro divestiture and the CALFED program and objectives, to understand potential adverse consequences to fishery restoration programs associated with this divestiture,

to recognize opportunities to use the CALFED program and its adaptive management approach during the divestiture process and assist these groups to reach decisions that have positive environmental benefits.\*

#### **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.#** Applicant indicates that funding request would drop to 33,570 if tasks 4 and 5 were postponed. Service contracts are expressed as pump-sum amounts with no further detail. Overhead is quoted at 30%.\*

#### **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:# \$0\***

**6c2. Matching funds:# \$5,000 in-hand and 35,000 proposed\***

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 102% or  $40,000/39,000=1.0245641025$ \***

**6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# n/a\***