i. Proposal number.# 2001-K208*
ii. Short proposal title.# Central Valley Floodplain Fish Rearing and Stranding*

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*

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 will assist in developing implementation measures to resolve stranding issues on the Yuba and Feather rivers. This will benefit all anadromous salmonids, sturgeon, and splittail. The proposal may also identify means to reconnect stranding ponds or lowlands with the main river channels. The ERP target is to reduce or eliminate the stranding of juvenile chinook salmon on floodplains, shallow ponds and levee borrow areas.*

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 6. Reduction of fish losses resulting from stranding could be significant in some water year types or flow events. This will contribute to the recovery of at-risk species. The identification of locales where stranding is a problems will lead to efforts to reconnect these areas with the main river channels.*

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 exactly responds to the request in the PSP addressing Fishery Monitoring Assessment, and Research. Specifically it addresses the request for investigations regarding the nature and extent of adult and juvenile fish stranding in the Yuba and Feather 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 monitoring and research
proposal is indirectly linked to the following Stage 1 action: Provide incremental improvements in ecosystem values throughout the Bay-Delta system.*

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 directly linked to MSCS "recover" species: all chinook salmon, steelhead, green sturgeon, and splittail.*

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 directly linked to MSCS "recover" species: all chinook salmon, steelhead, green sturgeon, and splittail.*

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 is a good proposal. It addresses a potentially serious problem that can occur on a relatively frequent basis. The number of young fish lost annually could be enormous. We just don't have enough information at this time to make an informed recommendation regarding opportunities to resolve the potential stranding problem.*

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 proposed project would benefit all four races of chinook salmon and possibly steelhead trout and splittail. The magnitude of the increase in juvenile salmonid survival is not known at this time but would be evaluated as part of this study. While it is indicated that corrective actions will be proposed, the durability of those actions is uncertain. Based on the floodplain characteristics in the project area, it is likely that floodplain modifications will not be durable without some maintenance.*

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 known to be in the general area include winter-run chinook salmon, state and federally listed endangered, spring-run chinook salmon, state and federally listed threatened, steelhead trout, federally listed threatened, fall- and late fall-run chinook salmon, federal candidate, and splittail, federally listed threatened. However these species would not benefit as a result of this study, rather only if measures are implemented as a result of this study.*

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 is a study and will not directly result in restoration of natural channel values and processes. However, the project could lead to specific recommendations that would restore natural channel processes to river or bypass reaches that at present become permanent stranding areas for juvenile salmonids.*

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 study would probably not modify CVP operations. Flow augmentation under Section 3406(b)(2) and water acquired pursuant to Section 3406(b)(3) would not be available in the amount needed to provide for floodplain inundation.*

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.# Does not contribute to implementation of 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.# The proposed study could benefit all four races of chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead by evaluating losses of juvenile fish to stranding and providing recommendations for reducing this loss process. This study qualifies 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.#Compliments CALFED, CVPIA and other interagency studies on the Lower Feather and Yuba Rivers, including stranding studies, monitoring and research, and as part of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin 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.# No apparent opposition or third party impacts.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Applicant will need to get a Scientific Collecting Permit issued by the Department of Fish and Game. Applicant will also need to apply for an incidental take statement/permit to conduct the sampling associated with sampling of the stranding ponds.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# CESA compliance will need to occur. In addition, consultation with the national Marine fisheries Service will also need to occur, since activities will involve sampling for steelhead.*

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 5) to tasks 1 thru 4. Overhead is listed as a range of 25 to 56%, however, calculations do not support the rates identified. SF 424 and Task D cost calculations are off by $210 which reduces the overall cost of the project to $132,913.*

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 such as DFG, DWR and Audubon Society.*