

i. Proposal number:# 2001-H211*

ii. Short proposal title .# Willow Slough Watershed Rangeland Stewardship Program.*

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.# The proposal is requesting funding to develop an expanded watershed stewardship program to enhance and restore riparian and grassland habitat, improve forage quality, improve water quality and reduce erosion. The desired outcomes described will contribute to Goal A - recover at risk species including Swainson's hawk, California tiger salamander, western spadefoot toad and others; Goal C - maintain and enhance commercial and recreation harvest by improving habitat for upland game species and waterfowl; Goal D - restore functional habitat types; Goal E - reduce impacts of non-native invasive species on riparian and grassland habitats; and Goal F - improve and maintain sediment and water quality by reducing erosion on rangeland.*

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.# The proposal would contribute to numerous strategic objectives related to the goals listed above.
*

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.# This proposal relates to the watershed stewardship section, beyond the riparian corridor section, and environmental education discussion of Section 3.5. The tenets of the project are to use a community-based watershed stewardship approach and implement actions on individual farms and ranches to meet goals outlined above while sustaining the economic conditions for agriculture.*

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.# This proposal is not a Stage 1 action in Appendix D, but this type of action is discussed in the ERPP under the habitat vision for agricultural practices and vision for the Yolo Basin Ecological Management zone. *

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.# This proposal would contribute to recovery of several at-risk terrestrial species as identified in 1a. *

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 applicant identifies over 36 hypotheses to be tested and numerous studies to be conducted on the conservation and restoration activities proposed. Very detailed tables and graphics are included describing the adaptive management process to be undertaken. The applicant also describes how this information will be used to address the beyond the riparian corridor uncertainty.*

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 proposal represents next-phase funding for a CALFED project underway. It addresses numerous CALFED ERP goals and will provide important and valuable information relating to the beyond the riparian corridor uncertainty. The proposal provided detailed information on questions to be answered and how the project will be implemented within an adaptive management context. *

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).# Anadromous fish are not expected to benefit from the project.*

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 listed anadromous fish are expected to benefit. The VELB, Swainsons

hawk, California tiger salamander, and west spadefoot toad are expected to benefit from the project. The project has potential to improve the upland grassland ecosystem and Willow Slough riparian ecosystems with their variety of species.*

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 has potential to improve water quality of

a delta tributary and increase riparian habitat values. The project promotes natural processes indirectly through research activities that result in ways to improve watershed management through conservation and restoration activities, burning, modified grazing, restore native grasslands, fencing and erosion control. The duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values is potentially long term if the resulting project data can be put to use in a long term restoration action.*

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 will not contribute to modified 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 could contribute to the implementation of 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.# The Habitat Restoration Program 3406(b)(1) other may be an appropriate element to fund the proposal as the effort could enhance watershed management to benefit several endangered and special status species. This is a well supported proposal that could provide data to improve agricultural management practices to improve wildlife habitats and reduce non-native invasive species.*

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 is the next phase of 98E13, Union Slough Watershed Improvement Program, building on lessons learned in Phase I. Will begin systematic assessment and monitoring efforts to evaluate its potential to achieve ERPP goals within the Willow Slough Watershed Ecological Management Unit. 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.#98E13 - Union School Slough Watershed Improvement Program*

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):#Excellent update provided. Work on Phase I is ongoing, with several (9) improvement projects completed and several more in the late planning stages after one and a half years, including upper and lower watershed riparian and rangeland restoration, construction of tailwater ponds, and outreach. Progressing very well. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

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*

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. Proponents are progressing well with current phase and are ready to expand this program, including more projects, hypothesis testing, research and monitoring. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

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.# There is broad local support (Yolo County Farm Bureau, NRCS, farmers, Audubon Society) for the project.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# The activities described in Task 2 would trigger CEQA compliance. Permits will also be needed from the Regional Air Quality Control Board during burning activities.*

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.# Applicant indicates

each subtask of Tasks 1 and 2 can be separately funded. Elements of Task 4 are dependent upon completion of Task 2 projects. Subtasks under Tasks 1-3 are listed in order of applicant priority request for funding. Overhead quoted at 10%.*

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:# \$0*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$1,217,000 combination of in-hand and proposed*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 68% or $1,217,000/1,800,668=.675860291$ *

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

6a - 6c3.# Details of cost share

contributions are contained on Table 7. of the applicant's proposal. Percentage given in 6c3. may overstate that portion of funding being leveraged against the proposal under consideration.*