

**i. Proposal number.#** 2001-K202\*

**ii. Short proposal title.#** Use of the Delta for Rearing by Chinook Salmon\*

**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\***

**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.#** This is a research proposal which is not described by any ERP targets. It is described in the Strategic Plan and one of the 12 ecological uncertainties.\*

**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.#** Indirectly, Goal 1, Objective 1 applies to this research project: achieve, first recovery, and then large self-sustaining populations of chinook salmon.\*

**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 responds directly to the PSP section on Fishery Monitoring Assessment and Research. Specifically, research regarding the importance of the Delta for juvenile salmonids.\*

**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.#** Yes. It is described as

follows: complete targeted research and scientific evaluations needed to resolve the high priority issues and the twelve uncertainties identified in the ERP Strategic Plan.\*

**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.#** This proposal addresses the role of Delta habitats in the survival of juvenile chinook salmon. Chinook salmon are designated for "recovery" in the MSCS.\*

**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.#** This proposal is designed to begin resolution of the ecological uncertainty related to the importance of the Delta for salmon. It provide a scientifically based approach to answer questions related to chinook salmon life history and the influence of the Delta. The proposal poses the appropriate questions, states a hypothesis, provides a conceptual model.\*

**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 provides an approach to answer questions related to the role of the Delta in the survival of juvenile chinook salmon. The use of otolith structure is a competent approach. Before funding this proposal, a peer review should be solicited to confirm the approach will provide the anticipated data.\*

#### **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).**# Anadromous fish species potentially benefiting from this project include: fall, late-fall, spring and winter run chinook salmon and perhaps steelhead trout. The magnitude of the project's contribution to natural production of these species is potentially high because it would address the relative importance of the Delta as chinook salmon rearing habitat under existing conditions. Results of this study would be useful in developing, evaluating, prioritizing or coordinating a number of water supply, flood control, ecosystem restoration initiatives under consideration in the Delta. Given the lack of consensus on this issue, the certainty of the project's benefits is also high. The expected benefits to production would depend in part on the findings of the study and the degree to which its recommendations are incorporated into field-scale adaptive management experiments, but could be immediate and of long term duration for chinook salmon.\*

**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 anadromous species potentially benefiting from the project would include: winter run chinook salmon (endangered) and spring run chinook salmon (threatened) and Central Valley steelhead trout (threatened). Central Valley fall- and late fall run chinook salmon, which are candidates for federal listing, would also benefit. The project would provide information that would facilitate restoration of chinook salmon. Any restoration actions for these species are likely to result in general improvement of the ecosystem and thus benefit other native species.\*

**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 study would improve understanding of the relationship between when, where and how juvenile salmonids emigrate from Central Valley streams and their subsequent survival to adulthood (recruitment). This understanding is crucial to effectively restoring natural channel habitat values and promoting processes that benefit natural production of chinook salmon.\*

**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).**# Results of this study could lead to changes in b(2) releases\*

**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.# Results of this study would support the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program.\***

**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 would improve understanding of the role of the Delta as rearing habitat for chinook salmon and of environmental and life history factors affecting chinook salmon recruitment. Results of this study would be useful in developing, evaluating, prioritizing or coordinating a number of water supply, flood control and ecosystem restoration initiatives under consideration in the Delta. This study would contribute substantially to fulfillment of a high priority evaluation need (Evaluation 6) identified in the 1997 Revised Draft Restoration Plan of the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. The project would benefit CAMP and would be appropriate for funding consideration under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program.\***

## **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.#Proponents stated all restoration actions require an improved understanding of how targeted action is integrated with salmon response. 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.#CVPIA\***

**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.#Cooperative Agreement 11332-9-J102, Continue to conduct a pilot study of the use of otoliths to evaluate the role of Delta rearing in the life history of Central Valley chinook salmon and steelhead. Project 11420-5-0351, Continue to conduct instream flow studies on the Sacramento, American and Merced Rivers.\***

**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):#Instream flow-related studies have been summarized in annual data 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.# No apparent opposition or third party impacts.\***

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# .# He does not address juvenile salmon take in the environmental compliance checklist. He will be taking tissue samples from alive juvenile salmon. This is not considered exempt and needs ESA consultation and Incidental Take Statement\***

**4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# .# Project proponent will need to consult with the Federal Agencies before beginning project.\***

#### **COST**

**5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.#**

**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 project could be funded annually for three years in the amount of \$164,126 with the fourth year costs totaling \$26,398. Overhead quoted at 20%. Project management costs total \$134,000.\*

#### **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:#** \$134,000 proposed\*

**6c2. Matching funds:#** \$16,000 proposed\*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#** 29% or  $150,000/518,777=.289141577$ \*

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