

i. Proposal number.# 2001-I200 *

ii. Short proposal title.# Working at a Watershed Level *

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#See 1a2***

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.# . As an education proposal at the professional level the proposal has potential to advance each of the ERP goals. Because it targets practitioners it could have more immediate benefits than many of the other education proposals. *

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.# There are no strategic objectives relative to education. However this proposal could help build working relationships.*

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 does not address any specific actions.*

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.# . A linkage can be drawn between this proposal and the San Joaquin initiative, a Stage 1 effort. *

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 could educate professionals and the active public on MSCS objectives and obligations. *

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.# Some feedback to program management could be obtained. This is not an adaptive management proposal. *

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 could advance ERP goals through education of professionals and the involved public. *

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).# This educational effort indirectly affects natural production of all chinook races and steelhead

by influencing landowners, farmers, agency personnel and concerned local citizens through the teaching of foundational watershed physical and biological principals. This training could produce benefits like: impacts to local advocacy groups, land use practices, county permitting, mining activities and a host of other activities that impact fish populations such that indirect benefits could be realized. These benefits would be hard to quantify, but would be long term in duration. Benefits could be realized immediately after training as increased education changes people's decisions and behavior. This project supports Central Valley-wide Actions 1 and 2 by educating the public on watershed and salmonid restoration. *

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.# This proposal could indirectly affect Central Valley steelhead, federally listed as threatened, by increasing public awareness in watershed principles and activities and how they impact the steelhead populations. This education focuses on watershed health and includes improved water quality, restored or improved geomorphic processes, and how to work together with all interested entities to reach the long term goal of restored, healthy watersheds that maintain themselves. That type of stewardship education will influence all aquatic organism through out the watershed, including riparian flora and fauna. *

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.# This project teaches lay people and people involved in watershed work (i.e., city and county employees, resource staff, environmentalists...) about natural channel and riparian habitat values and increases the overall acceptance of these processes and values in the general public. That increased understanding and acceptance of these necessary riverine functions will increase the likelihood and acceptance of restoration of the watershed that includes these processes. These benefits could range from immediate to 5-10 years and would be long term in nature. *

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).# This project could indirectly affect CVP operations by the increased understanding of the need for flows in shaping and maintaining channel and riparian habitat values necessary for self sustaining watersheds. That understanding could eventually influence decisions made concerning flows released, or water allocated to fish and wildlife as directed by b (2) or (3). *

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.# This project supports Central Valley-wide Actions 1 and 2 of the Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP by educating the public on watershed and salmonid restoration. This effort also supports the restoration aspects of the b (1) other programs and the 3406 c programs. *

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.# This program indirectly affects salmonid populations and in general all aquatic and riparian species, and the riverine processes essential to a self sustaining watershed. The effort has succeeded in other geographic regions in raising the level of awareness in watershed issues such that it is indirectly influencing salmonid populations and the certainty of that happening in the San Joaquin Basin is high. The AFRP has supported this educational effort in the past and is an appropriate source of funding again. This effort supports Revised Draft Restoration Plan Central Valley-wide Actions 1 and 2 for the AFRP. It may also be appropriate for consideration under the b (1) programs. *

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 watershed education course will provide guidance for the public in watershed restoration methods in the San Joaquin River and increase support and awareness for ongoing CALFED restoration projects in the San Joaquin River Watershed. 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.# The proposal doesn't mention any third party impacts or outstanding issues. While there is no specific plan for outreach in this proposal, the project is itself an outreach effort. *

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.# This is an educational proposal for training. *

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.# n/a*

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:# \$35,000 in-hand and 12,000 proposed*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 235% or $47,000/20,000=2.35$ *

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