

i. Proposal number.# 2001-K-220*

ii. Short proposal title.# Reintroduction of Native Salmonids into Central Valley Headwaters: Bioengineering and Social Acceptability*

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 proposal is to assess the feasibility of introducing spring-run chinook salmon and steelhead trout to stream reaches above major impoundments in the Central Valley. For both species, loss of access to historical headwater spawning and rearing areas is greatly implicated in the species' declines. Reestablishing access to these headwater areas may be a requirement to provide sustainable populations and to recovery the species. This is consistent with targets identified in the ERP regarding feasibility studies addressing the introduction of anadromous salmonids to the upper watershed areas of some Central Valley streams.*

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.*

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.# The subject of this proposal is not identified as an action in the PSP. It is most closely related to the PSP section on Fishery Monitoring Assessment, and Research, but it is not described as a solicited study in that section.*

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 not lined to proposed Stage 1 actions.*

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 requirements of spring-run chinook salmon and steelhead trout, both MSCS "recover" species. The proposal is generally consistent with MSCS conservation measures.*

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 would provide information to resolve recurrent issues regarding the quality of upstream habitat for spring-run chinook and steelhead and could such habitat contribute to their recovery. Three issues arise, is there suitable habitat, can we provide access to adults and ensure juveniles can successfully emigrate to the ocean, and what are the social and economic costs of such programs. This proposal will provide data to answer those types of questions. There are serious engineering questions regarding fish passage that need to be addressed and this study appears to be able to provide some of the necessary answers. Overall, this proposal is ambitious but if successful would provide a data necessary for informed decision-making. The conceptual models and hypotheses are well-constructed*

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.# From the physical habitat and biological requirements perspective, the proposal is good. If the political aspects of this proposal were to be evaluated, then an informed opinion is that this proposal could easily self-destruct. It should be funded in phases. Phase I would be to build local and broader support and to establish a totally open and credible process for identifying potential dams and streams to evaluate. Phase 2 funding would be totally contingent on the results of Phase 1.*

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 project has potential to significantly benefit natural production of all anadromous species through out the Central Valley which as its' ultimate intent is allow access to historic habitat above the Central Valley rim dams. Although, there is no direct increase in natural production as a result of this project: This is an evaluation project. There is no certainty that projects will come to fruition and if they do it will be long into the future.*

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.# All salmonids (spring-run, state and federal threatened, winter-run, state and federal endangered, steelhead, federal threatened, and fall- and late fall-run, federal candidate) in the Central Valley could benefit from this proposal. Benefits to other aquatic and terrestrial species would potentially benefit, although, to what extent would be extremely speculative at this time.*

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 would not restore natural channel and riparian habitat values.*

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).# If chinook salmon and steelhead trout could be reintroduced above the rim dams, this would likely lessen the need for CVP to provide water/flows to maintain those species below the major

rim dams. Also, it is likely that it would reduce and allow redirection of water/flows under Section 3406(b)(2) and (3) of the CVPIA.*

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 could ultimately lessen the need for water under the Water Acquisition Program (WAP) and directly contributing to the objectives of the Anadromous Fisheries Restoration 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.# There is no direct increase in natural production as a result of this project: This is an evaluation project. However the project could lead to significant benefits for all anadromous species as well as significant multi-species (aquatic and terrestrial) and natural production benefits. The project could ultimately modify CVP operations (lessen water demand) and contributes to the WAP and AFRP. However, most watersheds where rim dams are present, currently have stewardship groups which are very knowledgeable of the potentials, both biologically and politically, in the watershed and this proposal may confound local efforts in those watersheds. Also, the applicant may be overly optimistic as to the level of effort required for public outreach. It is unlikely that based on similar efforts elsewhere on single watersheds, that significant strides can be made towards stakeholder participation/buy-in based on the level of local involvement proposed, and without sufficient efforts to adequately involve stakeholders, this may generate significant opposition (personnel experience AFRP staff) and ultimately be counterproductive.*

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. Proposed project complements steelhead and spring-run salmon restoration and improvement projects by CALFED/CVPIA in the Delta and upper Sacramento River and will supplement CALFED fish passage improvement programs. 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.# There were no outstanding issues clearly designated in the proposal. However, based on personnel experience of AFRP staff, it is without doubt that the reintroduction of anadromous fish above major dams is extremely volatile throughout the state and unless major efforts are made to coordinate with stakeholders, this subject will not be well received. Additionally, because of volatility of this subject it is not believed that there is adequate public outreach.*

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

tasks 1 and 2 are inseparable and tasks 3 and 4 are inseparable and could be funded in a phased approach. Task 5, Project Management relates to both 1 & 2 and 3 & 4 and should be reallocated if the project is phased. Service contract costs are provided as lump-sum amounts with no further detail.*

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

they will pursue an undefined amount of cost share from 4-pumps and NFWF.*