

**i. Proposal number:#2001-I202\***

**ii. Short proposal title .# Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Project\***

**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 this proposal has some potential to further the goals of the ERP. \***

**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.# This proposal does not appear to have much near term potential to advance ERP strategic objectives. \***

**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.# The proposal does not appear to advance any stage 1 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.# . Stage 1 does not emphasize the big environments. Because this proposal targets elementary school children and focuses only on the most basic environments concerns, it is unlikely to generate benefits in Stage 1. \***

**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 does not address MSCS issues in any meaningful way. \***

**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.# Not applicable.\***

**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 has little potential to benefit the implementation of the ERP through outreach, education, or feedback to the program. \***

#### **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).# It is unclear whether there will be any benefits to the natural production of anadromous fish from this project. This project proposes continuing a CALFED funded program to provide environmental education to schools in the Bay-area. One component mentioned to be included in the program, is to clean up community creek and bay habitat, and to plant trees and wildflowers along urban creeks. These actions in conjunction with the environmental education proposed may allow the public to take greater ownership for urban creeks and the bay which may have some indirect benefit. The area of focus in this proposal is outside to the CVPIA focus area from the estuary upstream.\***

**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 or threatened species are expected to benefit directly 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 clean-up program described (although likely not extensive) may help restore habitat value in some of the urban creeks around the Bay area.\*

**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 does not contribute to efforts to modify 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 does not contribute to implementation of supporting measures in CVPIA as it is not a geographic area covered by the CVPIA.\*

**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 project proposes to work with teachers and students to explore, clean-up and restore creek and bay habitats, reduce urban runoff pollution and address issues of water quality and safe bay

food consumption. This project would not be eligible for funding through CVPIA since it is not within the geographic boundaries of CVPIA.\*

#### **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.**#Phase one and new work proposed here expands education programs in the Bay and they are utilizing films produced for CALFED by the Independent Documentary Group Films. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports\*

#### **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.#99B21 - Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Project\***

**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):**#Phase I project for October 1999 through September 2000 is meeting set goals and objectives, progressing on schedule and will be completed by September 2000. They have

exceeded goals for participation by teachers and students in the programs.  
Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract documents\*

### **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.#99B21\***

**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.** Definitely ready for next phase funding. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract documents\*

### **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.#** The project has partners (Sierra Club and Goldman Fund) and has previously been funded by CALFED. It appears it has local support for the program.\*

### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.#** They state they do not need to comply with CEQA. Even though the educational projects may be exempt, they still need to provide CEQA documents to the regulatory agency to determine if the project is a project or exempt. There may be access issues if the project is on private land and an encroachment permit may be needed if work will be on or around levees.\*

**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.#** Overhead quoted at 25%. Applicant provided narrative, page 8, for funding them at the only \$40,000.\*

## **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:#** \$9,000 proposed\*

**6c2. Matching funds:#** \$50,000 in-hand\*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.#** 118% or  $59,000/50,000=1.18$ \*

**6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.#** Other matching fund sources are pending for a total of \$65,000.\*

