i. Proposal number.# 2001-L208*
ii. Short proposal title.# Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program - Phase II*

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.# Project addresses needs of at-risk ("R") native species (Goal A) to maintain and enhance fish populations in the Mokelumne River, by screening and improving fish passage at Woodbridge Dam on the Mokelumne River. Contributes to the ERP target of screening flows along the Mokelumne River, Programmatic Action 1B to improve fish screens and fish bypass system at Woodbridge Dam, and Action 1C to evaluate feasibility of screening small pump diversions.*

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.# This proposal addresses objective 1 - recovery of "R" at-risk species in the Mokelumne River. No quantification provided.*

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.# Fish screens are identified in Section 3.5, however, screening along the Mokelumne River is not called out specifically.*

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.# Screening all large diversions is discussed in the ERP and Implementation Plan (Page 2-9, #12-continue high priority actions to reduce direct mortality to fishes, including screening diversions on the San Joaquin River and its tributaries). This project is linked to action 5a, the Agricultural Diversion Screening Program, but is not specifically called out as a stage 1 action.*

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.# The ERP and MSCS have identified fish screens and improved fish passage as contributing to Goal 1, to assist in recovery of at-risk species ("R"). This project targets chinook salmon and steelhead.*

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.# Unscreened diversions are not covered in the twelve 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 project is the next phase in activities designed to improve fish screens and fish passage in the lower Mokelumne River as part of the Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Plan and addresses specific goals and actions identified by CALFED.*

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 proposed project would help implement a medium priority action (Mokelumne River Action 5) in the 1997 Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP)The project would primarily benefit fall run chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead trout of the Mokelumne River. Benefits would

be moderate and fairly certain because existing screen system does not meet current CDFG or NMFS criteria. The uncertainty stems from lack of quantitative data on the relative importance of screen-related mortality compared to other loss processes such as predation downstream of the diversion dam or direct and indirect mortality induced by the CVP/SWP pumping facilities in the southern Delta. Benefits would be
essentially immediate after screen placement and would increase as restoration efforts boost natural production of salmonids over the long term.*

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.# Central Valley steelhead trout (threatened); fall run chinook salmon (candidate).*

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 phase of the project focuses on structural solutions to the problem of minimizing mortality
or impediments to downstream movement of outmigrating juvenile salmonids. It does not contribute to the protection or restoration of natural channel or 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).# Project would not affect CVP operations because there are no CVP facilities in the Mokelumne River watershed.*

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 lead toward improved fish screening at the Woodbridge Irrigation District diversion dam and would start the process of screening numerous small unscreened or inadequately screened riparian diversions elsewhere along the migration corridor of the Lower Mokelumne River. The project would therefore qualify for consideration under the Anadromous Fish Screen 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.# The project proposes to prepare a complete design for state-of-the-art screening facilities that will be integrated with CALFED-funded fish ladder design work already underway for the

Woodbridge Irrigation District diversion dam. The project would also initiate the process of screening unscreened riparian diversions along the Lower Mokelumne River migration corridor. This action is called for in the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program 1997 Revised Draft Restoration Plan (Mokelumne River Action 5) and would contribute substantially toward the goal of doubling natural production of fall run chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead trout in the Mokelumne River. The project therefore qualifies for consideration under Section 3406 b(21) of the CVPIA, the Anadromous Fish Screen 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.#Fish screening at Woodbridge Diversion Canal and other riparian diversions are part of the Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program developed by WID, City of Lodi and local stakeholders to improve fish and wildlife conditions in the watershed. They participate in the Mokelumne-Cosumnes Watershed Alliance (CALFED co-sponsored)and project complements other CALFED projects in the watershed. 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.#CALFED*

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.#98B11 - Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program-Woodbridge Fish Screen and Passage*

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):#First phase is for design of fish passage facilities and environmental compliance for fish passage and screen. Preliminary alternatives assessment report completed January 1999, Draft EIR/EIS circulate fall/winter 1999, Final EIR/EIS is due September 2000. Fish passage engineering work ongoing, with final approval expect October 2001. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract documents*

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.#98B11*

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. Next Phase could be concurrent with fish passage design work, since it is for design of the fish screen element and a prioritization study for need for additional screens. Source: Proposal, contract documents*

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.# The proposed project stems from a consensus achieved among technical representatives from CDFG, NMFS, USFWS, the Bureau and Reclamation and the project proponents. It enjoys widespread local support and no opposition has been expressed to date from any environmental or other non-governmental organizations or groups. No third party impacts are immediately apparent.*

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.# no*

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.# no*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.#yes*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# no*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.# Cost proposal
is not further defined than the lump-sum consulting service contract amounts by tasks. Overhead and project management costs are included in applicant in-kind services; and the consultants' overhead is included in the service contract lump-sum amount.*

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.# n/a*

6c. List cost share given in proposal and note whether listed cost share is identified (in hand) or proposed.

6c1. In-kind:# $20,000*

6c2. Matching funds:# $0*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 2.9% or 20,000/680,000=.029411764*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# Applicant providing
other in-kind services which were not valued in the proposal.*