

Geographic Review Panel 2 - Sacramento River/Butte Basin

Proposal number: 2001-C201 **Short Proposal Title:** Clear Ck. Floodway Restoration

- 1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** Consistent with CALFED ERP goals 1 and 4, supported by Staff review. Goals for channel restoration for CVPIA (production doubling) appear achievable without further channel work. Consistent with CALFED and CVPIA goals and objectives as well as SB2261.
- 2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** Elements of CVPIA on Clear Creek that permanently establish improved flow regimes and removal of Seltzer Dam need to be coordinated with the design. Control of discharge of mercury to the creek and river from the old mine tailings is an issue that needs to be coordinated.
- 3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** The projects' ability to move forward in a timely fashion may be affected by the presence of mercury in the mine tailing that are proposed for placement in the floodplain. Achieving the floodplain processes that are the objective of the design depends on permanent availability of flows to maintain those processes; however at this time there are not commitments to provide those flows and they have not been identified.
- 4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Western Shasta RCD is qualified based upon completion of past projects in the basin.
- 5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** Very good. Project has community acceptance; however uncertain of the community acceptance if the high cost (8 million dollars per mile) were widely known.
- 6. Cost.** Very high cost with potential to increase dramatically due to presence of mercury in the fill and smaller increases are possible for the wetland mitigation requirements for filling in the wetland. Costs will be approximately 8 million dollars per mile and that may exceed the level of benefit given the attainment of the CVPIA doubling objective in this reach under the existing conditions.
- 7. Cost sharing.** Identified but amount may not be significant given the overall cost.
- 8. Additional comments.** Panel agrees with TARP and recommends a reduction in scope, phasing in smaller components, and improved monitoring.

Recommend applicant investigate alternate methods to resolve restoring the natural channel bottom.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Medium

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking: Panel was concerned about potential feasibility problems due to the scale and nature of the project. Panel recommends a reduction in scope, phasing in smaller components, and improved monitoring. Funding for future phases should depend on demonstration of benefits.