

i. Proposal number.# 2001-L203*

ii. Short proposal title.# White Mallard Dam and associated 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# 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.#

The project objectives are consistent with fish passage objectives in the ERPP for Butte Creek and Goal A to recover at-risk species, specifically spring-run chinook. This project is one small piece of the suite of activities taking place on Butte Creek.*

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.#

For Goal 1 the proposal would address Objective 1 - recover the Big R species and Objective 3 - enhancing and or conserving other species such as waterfowl*

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.#

Though not specifically identified in Section 3.5, this is part of a number of ongoing activities consistent with restoration goals identified for Butte Creek.*

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.# The project address the Stage 1 action to improve fish passage at diversion dams either by providing alternative diversion structures that will allow removal of existing dams or by upgrading fish ladders and diversion screens .*

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.# Improved fish passage would benefit at-risk species. Monitoring plan is described which may be able to quantify improvements on Butte Creek.*

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.# The hypothesis is that improvements in fish passage should result in greater survival of adult and juvenile fish. Baseline monitoring has occurred and results of surveys will be published. Surveys have shown the population has increased since 1995. A number of monitoring activities are outlined.*

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 is requesting for final design and permitting to prepare for the next phase which is construction. It is continuation of important work on Butte Creek which is consistent with the ERP actions for this area.*

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 proposal is for final design and environmental documentation of fish screening facilities, consolidation of diversion facilities and removal of migration barriers. While this proposal does not directly influence natural production of anadromous fish, should this project be constructed, benefits to natural production would be realized. This benefit would be realized in the form of

increased access to rearing habitats along with reduced mortality because of consolidated diversions and improved diversion facilities. This proposal would have a direct affect on natural production by reducing mortality experienced by down stream migrating anadromous fish. All races of Central Valley chinook salmon (winter, spring, fall and late fall-run chinook) and Central Valley Steelhead pass this diversion as they migrate down the Sacramento River to the Delta. Other anadromous fish species benefiting from this effort would include sturgeon, green and white, Striped bass and American shad. The magnitude of the contribution to any of these species would be difficult to quantify specifically, but you could extrapolate from the reduction in take of these species at the new facility and generally determine the decrease in mortality. The benefits would be certain, and realized immediately after construction and would last the life of the project. *

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 expected to benefit are winter-run chinook salmon, federally listed as

endangered; spring-run chinook salmon, federally and state listed as threatened; Central Valley steelhead, federally listed as threatened, fall-run federal candidate species, spring-run state and federal listing of threatened and winter-run listed federally as endangered. Reduction of entrainment would also benefit Delta smelt, federally listed as threatened and Sacramento splittail and green sturgeon, both species of special concern. All anadromous species and those species that inhabit the Sacramento River in general (i.e., native minnows, and exotics like sunfish, and delta fishes) benefit from the consolidation of multiple diversions and improved diversion facilities that meet state and federal screen criteria. The new facility will reduce mortality because the reduced screen openings minimize the opportunity of being entrained (sucked through the screen) and the reduced "through screen" velocities allow small fish the ability to avoid being impinged (stuck) on the screen. The removal of migration and access barriers will provide increased habitat for rearing also. The Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP lists fish screen projects on the mainstem of the Sacramento River as high and medium priority Actions (Action 6 and 9, respectively). *

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 does benefit natural channel and riparian habitat values by removing barriers that affected the habitat values of the small stream that they were located on. Opening up access to this habitat will likely restore some function to the stream. *

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 does not 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 contributes to the implementation of the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, b (21), by being a fish screen modification/construction. The removal of access and migration barriers supports Central Valley-Wide Evaluation 11, a high priority evaluation, which promotes making small stream and tributaries more fish friendly. *

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 fish screen project will benefit all anadromous and local fish species by reducing the mortality/loss of these fishes into the diversion by consolidation of diversion points and improved facilities. By replacing and upgrading these fish screen facilities to meet state and federal criteria, impacts to fish populations are greatly reduced. This action is appropriate for the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to fund, and also supports AFRP Sacramento River Action 6, Evaluation 9 and Central Valley-Wide Evaluation 11 from the Revised Draft Restoration Plan. The restoration component (barrier removal) may be appropriate for 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.#Project directly relates to CALFED/CVPIA ecosystem restoration projects in the Butte Creek Watershed and furthers improved fish passage in the lower reaches, including this project. 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.# AFRP Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase 1 (b) #113328J024.*

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):#Previous project has been completed and final report received. They completed project objectives and a final draft alternatives analysis. Source: Proposal.*

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.#113328J024.*

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. Proponents successfully completed Phase I and are ready for Phase II.

Source: Proposal.*

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.# One outstanding issue is the complexity of water issues in the Sacramento area. The applicant has been coordinating with other entities for over 5 years and over that time various opportunities, proposals and changes in water management have changed such that it affected this proposal. This will continue to happen as this is a very complex water use area. The applicant will continue to communicate and coordinate with other entities on this project, but intends to move forward with final design of facilities to meet their present needs. Aside from that caveat, the applicant lists evidence of strong support for this action.*

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 quoting an overhead of 9.1% on project management. Funding will be used against subtasks 1d through 1h and project management. \$84,938 is a 11% increase in White Mallard project costs due to change in original scope. Service contracts are described as lump-sum amounts.*

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 proposed*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$750,000*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# \$11% or $84,938/750,000=.113250666$ *

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

6a - 6c3.# Cost share provided in the amount of \$750,000 is from an existing CALFED Grant 1999-B02 to Ducks Unlimited under which the applicant is a subcontractor. Applicant also cites cost share received from other sources (AFRP, Tracy Mitigation, Sacto NWR) in the total amount of \$3,427,400 for prior phases of work. Total of all phases is 3,512,338 which equals 3,427,400 plus current request.*