

**i. Proposal number:#** 2001-G201.\*

**ii. Short proposal title .#** Wildlife Friendly Farming Demonstration.\*

**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, C, 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.#** Approximately 25-50% of the Stage 1 target for enhanced wildlife friendly agriculture This proposal is to enhance 2,500 to 5,000 acres. How it will contribute to any of the three relevant goals will be determined after implementation of the project through monitoring and reporting of results.\*

**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.#** Objective 2 under Goal A would provide wintering roosting habitat for greater sandhill cranes. Amount of contribution is unknown at this time and should be determined through the monitoring of the effects of enhanced agricultural practices on sandhill crane use of the habitat.

Objective 3 under Goal C - would enhance seasonal wetlands for migratory waterfowl.

Objective 1 under Goal F - monitoring will determine the degree of change in water quality due to the discharge of irrigation waters to the Delta.\*

**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.#** Proposal addresses the Agricultural Conservation and Wildlife Friendly Farming Practices element of the Beyond the Riparian Corridor Restoration action.

**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.**#10 pts. This proposal is directly linked to ERP Stage 1 action # 4, which calls for restoration of seasonal wetlands and the establishment of wildlife friendly agriculture.\*

**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.**#7 pts The MSCS recognizes the need for preservation and enhancement of some agricultural practices for certain wildlife. One species of concern is the greater sandhill crane (a "r" species). This proposal should provide higher quality winter habitat for the crane and migratory waterfowl than currently exists. \*

**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 project should provide the Program with information on how to implement wildlife friendly agricultural practices in an economically feasible manner. \*

**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.**#

There is a need to provide incentives to the agricultural community to implement wildlife friendly agricultural practices, such as seasonal flooding, possible changes in cropping patterns and type, and lowered use of pesticides and herbicides. This proposal will develop economically viable means of doing that. The location has been involved in wildlife friendly agricultural practices for many years and therefore, provides some baseline information necessary to evaluate the level of success of enhancing and increasing those practices. The monitoring of all species involved, waterfowl and sandhill cranes, and adjusting the practices accordingly will be important to guiding how we promote and implement wildlife friendly ag practices elsewhere in the Delta. One weakness may be in the focus of monitoring only the waterfowl species and habitats after implementation. There is a potential for negative impacts on greater sandhill cranes from converting corn to rice that should be addressed.\*

## **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).# No anadromous fish are expected to benefit from the project; its main focus is on sandhill cranes.\***

**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.# No anadromous fish are expected to benefit, while the Greater Sandhill crane should benefit from the project. Upland wetland habitat and waterfowl, shorebirds, migratory birds are expected to benefit from the project.\***

**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 does not restore natural channel nor riparian habitat. In fact, it would create several artificial cross levees on Staten Island.\***

**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 could negatively affect CVP delta export water quality, but could improve understanding of how Delta island drainage affects dissolved organic carbon loading to the Delta.\***

**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.#** Potentially CVPIA measures (b)(22)-flooded fields and 3406(g)(3) surface wetlands interactions would benefit from the project.\*

**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.#** Proposal would qualify for funding consideration under the Habitat Restoration Program (b)(1) other and also the 3406(g)(3), and 3406(g)(2) efforts of the CVPIA. There would be no direct benefit to anadromous fish, but a potential benefit might result from improved understanding of

the DOC output from wetlands/delta island drainage and its effect on water quality. The proposed project would very likely benefit waterfowl, Greater sandhill cranes and shorebirds.\*

## **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.#**This project complements and is an addition

to the Cosumnes River Preserve's existing wildlife-friendly farming and wetland restoration effort. It is consistent with goals set by the CVHJV for the Delta. Proximity to other habitat restoration and preservation efforts(Woodbridge Ecological Reserve, Stone Lakes NWR, Cosumnes River Preserve)provides habitat link to effectively create an "East Delta Habitat Corridor". 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.#99B12 - Riparian Corridor Acquisition and Restoration Assessment\***

**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):#Project is under contract and are negotiating a conservation easement. Progress is satisfactory. Source: Contract files\***

#### **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.#** There is

considerable support from the landowners and a variety of government and environmental, educational partners. There may be opposition from adjacent farmers or from various farming groups.\*

#### **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.#** 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.# 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:#** n/a\*

**6c2. Matching funds:#** n/a\*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#** M and T Staten Ranch: 471,364 dollars; DWR: 67,550 dollars. Total: 538,914 dollars or 41% of total funding requested\*

**6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#** There was an error found on the PSP Cover Sheet under Cost Share partners. M and T Staten Ranch contributed a total of 471,364 dollars, not 417,364 dollars\*