

**i. Proposal number:**# 2001-G207\*

**ii. Short proposal title** .# Sustaining Agriculture and Wildlife Beyond Riparian Corridor.\*

**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., D., E., 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.**# Potential benefit to at risk species based on success of establishing riparian and hedgerow vegetation. Width of hedgerows and linear riparian strips along irrigation canals not mentioned. Farm use of pesticides not obviously mentioned. Potential slight benefit to harvested species depending on type of cover crops planted. Slight contribution to restoring functional habitats. Stronger contribution to reducing impacts of NIS; strong contribution to maintaining water quality. \*

**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.**# Possibly objective 2 of Goal 1 - slight contribution

Objective 3 of Goal C - slight to medium contribution

Objective 4 of Goal D - good contribution

Objective 7 of Goal E - good contribution

Objectives 1&3 of Goal F - strong contribution if results from demonstration projects prove out.\*

**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.**# Control and eradication of NIS; contaminants in the Central Valley - pesticides and agricultural sediments; agricultural conservation and wildlife friendly farming practices; local watershed stewardship and outreach. \*

**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.**# Directly linked to action # 1 with strong outreach and landowner education and continued participation through web-based product.

Directly linked to action # 4 though not as strongly through the establishment of some riparian, seasonal wetland and wildlife friendly ag.

Directly linked to action # 14 some eradication of existing NIS plant species and a monitoring program to determine benefit to reestablished native species.

Directly linked to action # 15 with benefits to native species through the establishment of habitat corridors through ag lands. \*

**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.**# Several R and r species are mentioned as benefiting in the proposal, however the premise is weak. There is a potential for species to benefit somewhat through the establishment of habitat corridors if enough contiguous landowners participate. Contributing to the recovery of species such as the Valley elderberry long-horned beetle and the Swainson's hawk will be very dependent on size and species of riparian strips and hedgerows, cropping patterns and types, and the continued use of pesticides.\*

**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.**#

Strongest contribution to resolving one of the scientific uncertainties is the work that will go into resolving non-point source pollution to surface water from agricultural erosion. \*

**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.**#

Strength of proposal is the testing of various methods to reduce on farm erosion and its contribution to pollution of surface waters. Methods indicated will be monitored for effectiveness. Secondary benefits for many native species from the various practices should occur, such as winter forage for waterfowl, hedgerow and riparian corridors and seasonal wetlands provided by tailwater ponds. \*

**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 directly benefit from the project because its focus is on terrestrial habitat.\***

**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. Swainsons hawk, tiger salamander, West spadefoot toad, and West pond turtle, are expected to benefit. Terrestrial wildlife, migrating waterfowl and birds, shorebirds, and the upland ecosystem are expected to benefit.\***

**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.# There is potential to improve water quality in delta tributaries by improved land management practices in the Willow Slough watershed of the Yolo Basin by protecting soil through increases in stream bank vegetation.\***

**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 has potential to improve CVP export water quality to a very limited degree as the run-off from the slough is very small relative to other delta inflow.\***

**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 the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration 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.# Elements 3406(g)(2) and 3406(g)(3) could fund the proposal. The project has potential to improve understanding of watershed function and benefits to conservation activities with primary focus on water quality and wildlife benefits.\***

#### **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 will help develop conservation techniques on use of native vegetation, water quality improvement, and habitat restoration in the watershed. This work directly relates to CALFED and other Agency goals and funding for watershed management programs, bank stabilization, native plant projects, "farming for wildlife" workshops, and rangeland management research. Next phase of CALFED project--Union School Slough Watershed Improvement Program. 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.#yes\***

**3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4#.98E13-Union School Slough Watershed Improvement Program\***

**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):#**

This next phase is for a project where the first phase was completed by the National Audubon Society. The first year of work on the three year project is complete and year two underway. Have assisted individual landowners in implementing conservation activities provided outreach and training, and are monitoring there ongoing efforts. Next phase partners Yolo RCD with Audubon to provide a holistic approach to the watershed, builds on lessons learned in Phase I, and has shown a lot of public interest in the project with significant cost share for the additional work. Next phase also greatly expands on the monitoring and assessment program, which only received limited funds in Phase I.  
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.#** Local landowners and broad range of cost-share partners support the project.\*

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.#** Need to comply with CEQA so lead agency can make its determination. They will need a collecting permit and possibly a 1600 agreement from CDFG. They need to consult with ESA for monitoring/collection of wildlife.\*

**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.#** Under "Cost," it is mentioned that there is a table containing a detailed budget for each year of requested support and for each task but it was not located\*

**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:#** Farmers/Ranchers: services, consulting, equipment; USDA-ARS\*

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

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#** Farmers and Ranchers: 60,000 dollars; CALFED-Bay Delta Grant: 164,480 dollars; USDA-ARS: 549,000 dollars; Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation district: 35,000 dollars; UCD Info Center for the Environment: 4,800 dollars; UCD Center for Integrated Watershed Science and Management: 1,000 dollars; USDA Natural Resources Conservation Services: 418,000 dollars; RCD Board: 198,000 dollars; UCCE: 11,000 dollars; USF and WS: 30,000 dollars; Idaho One Plan: 850,000 dollars; Previous and present related supportive projects: 2,050,000 dollars. Total: 298.32% of total funding requested\*

**6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#** All information requested has been provided by project proponent in a clear, concise, and understandable format\*