i. Proposal number.# 2001-K207*

ii. Short proposal title.# Lower Yuba River Monitoring and Research 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*

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 proposal will provide assessments to resolve fish passage and predation issues on the Yuba River that affect fall-run chinook salmon, spring-run chinook salmon, and steelhead trout. This could be accomplished through recommendation to improve fish ladders or eliminate Daguerre Point Dam. The intent is to contribute to the recovery of at-risk species and to restore a more natural floodplain, channel meander, sediment transport dynamic and improve freshwater and essential fish habitats.*

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.# Goal 1, Objective 1;, Goal 2, Objective 7; Goal 3, Objective 1; Goal 4, Objective 3.*

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.# Yes. This proposal is linked to channel-floodplain reconstruction projects as it may lead to removal of Daguerre Dam, the reconstruction of the floodplain and reactivation of other floodplain processes such as coarse sediment transport. It also has an element that is linked to mercury in the sediments contained behind Daguerre Dam and whether or not this source of mercury is bioavailable. The proposal is also linked to the Fishery Monitoring Assessment, and Research PSP element which requests investigation regarding the nature and extent of adult and juvenile fish stranding in the Yuba

River.*

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.# This proposal is directly linked to the Stage 1 actions. The Strategic Plan Stage 1 actions specify the following" evaluate options to improve fish passage upstream and downstream of Daguerre Point Dam and conduct a feasibility study of removing or modifying Daguerre Point Dam.*

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 is designed to provide data that will assist in developing actions to recover spring-run chinook salmon, fall-run chinook salmon, and steelhead trout.*

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 is primarily a monitoring and research proposal. It has well-stated hypotheses and conceptual models. It will provide information to better understand stream channel dynamics, mercury contamination of alluvial deposits in the Yuba River, predation, and fish passage uncertainties.*

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 fits well with other ongoing activities in the Yuba watershed. It is exactly the type of investigation that is needed to resolve potential fish passage problems in the basin. It is compatible with the Upper Yuba River Studies Program feasibility studies and other ongoing efforts. *

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 evaluation project will not in itself lead to any increase in natural production of anadromous fish. However, information is essential in evaluating alternatives for improving adult and juvenile fish passage which will have long term and lasting benefits for anadromous fish. Currently adult salmonid passage is a problem at Daguerre Point Dam. Juvenile predation below the dam is considered significant since large number of predators, especially striped bass and American shad, concentrate below the dam during juvenile chinook smolt outmigration. Presently 2 alternatives exist for improving fish passage (improvements to the dam or dam removal) and without doubt passage improvements will be implemented, and information is essential in developing a prudent fish passage alternative. All salmonids in the Yuba River are from natural production. Fish passage improvement will allow adult spring-run salmon to pass the dam in good condition along with fall-run, late fall-run and steelhead. Juvenile survival of all salmonids will be improved by eliminating/reducing predation. Fish passage improvements will also reduce poaching at the dam. This project supports Yuba River Action 7 and 8 in the revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP*

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, state and federal threatened, steelhead trout, federal threatened, late fall- run, federal candidate, and fall-run, federal candidate, will benefit. There would be additional benefits to other non-listed species, but benefits are dependent on the alternative selected. At the minimum it is expected that additional salmonid production would occur which would have indirect benefits for other aquatic species as well as terrestrial 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.# This project could restore natural channel and riparian habitat values, depending on the fish

passage improvement alternative selected.*

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 would 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.# The project would improve access of spring-run, fall-, and late fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead trout to the best habitat, pass fish in better condition, and increase survival of natural produced fish, which directly supports the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, [(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.# Information is essential in evaluating alternatives for improving adult and juvenile fish passage and survival. All salmonids in the Yuba River are natural production and all would benefit. Fish passage improvement will allow adult spring-run salmon to pass the dam in good condition along with fall-run, late fall-run and steelhead. Juvenile survival of all salmonids will be improved. The project directly supports the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program and Yuba River Action 7 and 8 in the revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP. Recently, there was general agreement by the Yuba River Technical Working Group that fish passage improvements at Daguerre Dam are necessary, potentially eliminating the need to evaluate fish passage and predation. However, sediment constituency and contamination evaluation remains a need for any fish passage alternative selected. This project supports Yuba River Action 7 and 8 in the revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP This project is appropriate for funding under the AFRP.*

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. # Compliments CALFED action to study option of removing Daguerre Dam. Currently CALFED and other interagency efforts monitor adult populations, fish passage, downstream migration and juvenile salmon and steelhead distribution in the Yuba River, and are studying the lower Yuba River as part of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Comprehensive Study. 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.#none*

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.#

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.#

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#

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.# This has the support of the Yuba River Technical Working Group which is composed of
stakeholders (all interests) in the lower Yuba River. However, some principal investigators (Natural Resources Scientists Incorporated and Mr. Jeff Kozlowski) will not be accepted by some Working Group members and results will be questioned. Work Group members have requested replacement of those investigators and if that is corrected, continued support is expected.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# The project proponent will need to get a Scientific Collecting Permit through the Department of Fish and Game.*

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.# Applicant indicates all tasks are severable, however, the applicant relates project management (task 7) to tasks 1 thru 6. Applicant indicates that USGS will be performing task 6, but USGS cannot enter into a contract with the applicant and consequently the applicant is requesting CALFED fund USGS through a separate arrangement. It is unclear how the applicant's project management costs relate to task 6. Varying overhead rates of 18 - 54 %are computed for the tasks. SF424 and budget spreadsheet have calculation errors that may effect the total funding request made by the applicant.*

COST SHARING

6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.# no*

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:# $0*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# $0%*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# Applicant indicates
there will potentially be in-kind services contributed (no estimated amount provided) to the study by cooperating entities*