

i. Proposal number.# 2001-F-205

ii. Short proposal title.# Brake Pad Partnership*

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# F***

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.# ERP Goal F. The degree to which the proposal contributes to this goal moderate.

ERP Target #11 (Reducing loadings on contaminants in Sacto-SJR Delta). Proposal provides an indirect contribution to this target. The degree to which the proposal contributes to the target is somewhat significant. The contribution is indirectly related to this target.*

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.# ERP Goal 6, Objective #1 (Reduce loadings and concentrations of contaminants)*

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.# Restoration Action #6 is linked. Studies needed to remove trace metals from the source. Proposal will assist in defining source of trace metals, particularly and non-point source runoff.*

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.# Environmental Water Quality

Stage 1 Action #6 - Proposal is directly linked to State 1 Actions listed under #6. The process described in this proposal will work towards the assessment of copper contamination and ecological significance. CALFED participation in the Brake Pad Partnership is specifically listed here. The degree to which the proposal is linked to Stage 1 Action #6 is very significant.*

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.# Not directly linked. All threatened or endangered species could benefit if the project leads to a reduction in copper loading in the Delta.*

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.# Scientific Uncertainty #11 (Contaminants in the Central Valley)*

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.# Strengths

CALFED Environmental Water Quality (EWQ) staff supports the past and future efforts of the Brake Pad Partnership. Despite inconclusive data to support aquatic toxicity from copper in the South Bay, CALFED EWQ staff believes it is important to continue to assess the potential source and load of copper and other trace metals.

Weaknesses

This proposal was hard to evaluate since it is not a traditional research and monitoring project and does not fall easily into one of the scientific uncertainties. This project is more closely aligned with the types of proposals discussed under "Local Watershed Stewardship" (engaging stakeholders in collaborative effort to solve problems) or those groups funded under the Sacramento River Watershed Program. The proposal could have been strengthened if this issue was clarified.*

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 project will not directly increase the natural production of anadromous fish. All species of anadromous fish could potentially benefit indirectly by some unknown amount if project resulted in reduction of copper inputs into the Delta. Copper has been identified as a potential concern for juvenile salmon in the Delta. Effects and magnitude of problems for juvenile salmon or other anadromous fish are unknown. *

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.# Potentially all threatened or endangered aquatic species in the Delta could benefit indirectly from the project if it leads to a reduction of copper loading to the Delta.*

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 project is an attempt to reduce copper in the Delta by conducting a study on copper residue in surface run-off from automobile brake pads. Improving water quality by reducing a non-point source of contaminants would protect and 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).# The project would not contribute to efforts to 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 would contribute to implementing the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program by helping to reduce toxicant exposure in the Delta.*

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 conducts a study and attempts to limit copper inputs into the Delta from automobile brake pads. It is not clear whether copper is limiting to the production of anadromous or other fish in the Delta, thus the benefits of the project are unknown and uncertain. Potentially, CVPIA b1-other habitat restoration funds or the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program could be used to fund the 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.#Compatible with CALFED goals and objectives for source reduction of pollutants (including copper) and work with the Brake Pad Consortium to study the source. If test results indicate brake pad copper is having an environmental effect, get manufacturers to commit to reducing copper and monitor to see if improves water quality for Bay-Delta. Potential to use tests on other constituents and use of project as a model for collaborative pollution prevention projects in the future. Information 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.# No*

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.# Brake-pad manufacturers involved in process.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# None required because this is not a project under CEQA.*

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.# All information requested has been provided by project proponent in a clear, concise, and understandable format.*

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.#federal*

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

6c1. In-kind:# n/a*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$60,000.00*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 25%. \$60,000 divided by \$242,122.*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# n/a*

