

i. Proposal number:#2001-I201*

ii. Short proposal title .# Watershed Education, Headwaters to the ocean.*

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 thru 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 .#

This education project can potentially advance each of the RP goals through education projects by studying birds and their habitats in the Sacramento River watershed, including ecosystem processes, harvestable species, native and exotic plant species, and potential erosion sites and revegetating them with native species.*

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 work helps build working relationships and promotes revegetation, eradication of non-native species, and promotes better understanding of ecosystem processes.*

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, but indirectly addresses an action under non-native species, specifically Arundo Donax, since students map the species on the Sacramento River stretch that are project sites.*

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 contributes to early implementation Action 14, Environmental Programs to develop a broader understanding of natural conservation issues. This program concentrates on the Sacramento River watershed.*

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 educates students, professionals, and the active public on MSC's 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.# Education projects are not generally designed to address scientific uncertainties, but the project will inform the public about the scientific uncertainties CALFED faces.*

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 project is a continuation expansion of a hands-on educational program informing the public about CALFED goals and objectives through bird monitoring, native grass restoration and, mapping and eradication plan for non-natives. This is a very good project that both educates and completes habitat restoration along the Sacramento River.*

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).# All Sacramento River/Central Valley anadromous salmonids will indirectly benefit from this proposal to build an educational model that helps to develop citizens who better understand, appreciate, and manage natural systems. This replicable model has been developing for five years and includes five specific projects: birds as connectors in the watershed, native grass restoration, native/drought tolerant gardens, mapping and eradication of non-native riparian

species, and a short video on biodiversity. The magnitude of the contribution to natural production of anadromous fish is difficult to measure -- but we do know that this project will directly reach a minimum of 10,000 students per year through teacher training, high school/college natural resource academy, and student visitors to the Sacramento River Discovery Center. An additional 4,000 general public visitors per year are indirectly touched by the projects. The certainty of these benefits is high, based on the positive results of a more educated public. The benefits will occur immediately upon people learning more about their watershed and will have a high duration. *

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.# Sacramento River Winter-run ESU - Endangered; Central Valley Spring-run ESU - Threatened; Calif Central Valley ESU Steelhead - Threatened; fall and late-fall run - candidates.*

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 has no direct actions to protect or restore natural channels, yet it includes four tasks that will indirectly benefit riparian habitat values. Specifically, this project would provide five educational opportunities: to study the thirty-two riparian obligate bird species, restore 9 acres of native grass, provide native plant education in the garden surrounding the Discovery Center, and eradicate 15 river miles of non-native plant species. These benefits would occur over the next three years.*

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).# While this is an education project and is not directly focused on CVP operations affecting flows, it does effectively address physical process and habitat requirements, a key component of which are flow related. *

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. # Project is education and provides both direct and indirect benefit to the implementation and long-term success of all CVPIA measures. These measures will provide benefits to not only fish, but also bird and other riparian dependent species. These additional benefits will assist with implementation of (b)(1) other 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 project is appropriate for AFRP funding. It is supportive of AFRP Central Valley-wide Action 1 to provide educational outreach in restoration. The strengths of the work are best identified in the following text from the proposal: No matter how much land is acquired, how much work is completed, or how many specialists and scientists monitor and provide data, if the general public is not part of the process, they will not value the results. One day, the tough water choices for people living a water thirsty lifestyle and/or water for healthy systems will face towns, cities, countries, and the voting populace. These choices will involve money and lifestyle and difficult decisions. A citizenry who doesn't understand, and therefore appreciate, water systems will not choose to pay the price to maintain their diverse structure and complex health. Education alone will bring the people to this kind of understanding and appreciation. Students must be engaged in activities throughout the watershed. This proposal is a step in that direction.*

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 expands on earlier CALFED funded work (99B20) and provides a critical link for connecting people to the process and work in the Sacramento River Watershed. Project will establish a successful intern project as a model for replication at other sites. 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. #both*

**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.# CALFED 99B20 - Sacramento River Discovery Center(SRDC)--Adopt-a-Watershed Program
CVPIA - In 1994-95 CVPIA funded planning phase for the SRDC***

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):#Proponent has been conducting some of the work through their other funding sources while their contract with CALFED is being completed. Next phase would expand the ongoing bird monitoring, native grass restoration, and educational programs, and begin additional work on eradicating non-native invasive plant species and developing materials on biodiversity. Work has progressed well and are ready for next phase funding. Source: Proposal*

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.#99B20*

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.

This project is ready for the next phase. Source: Proposal, contract update*

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.# This proposal has outstanding support from all involved (e.g., counties of Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Siskiyou, and Trinity). It provides a critical link for connecting people to the processes of and work in the Sacramento River watershed. It builds a foundation for implementation of educational programs that develop a populace with systems understanding. The magnitude of third party impacts is expected to be low. *

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.#The project proponent did not fill out the second page of the environmental checklist. If working on levees, they need to notify Reclamation Board for an Encroachment permit. May need to comply with NEPA for federal agencies involved in revegetation project.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.#They state in the proposal that there will be controlled burns to eradicate invasive species. This is not mentioned in the environmental checklist and will need permits.*

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.# no*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

5a - 5d.# Applicant indicates tasks are severable.*

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:# \$457,500 proposed*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$0*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 121% or $457,500/378,264=1.209472749$ *

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

6a - 6c3.# Applicant has also calculated in-kind serves per task and per year.*