

i. Proposal number:#2001-I203*

ii. Short proposal title .# Partnerships for Environmental Education*

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 ongoing education proposal this has some potential to advance ERP goals.*

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.# Some potential to benefit strategic objectives is apparent but the focus appears to be on seasonal wetlands and existing ERP projects.*

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 could educate students on existing CALFED ERP projects.*

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 will be working through the San Joaquin initiative in the area of this proposal.*

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.# There is no apparent link between this proposal and the MSCS.*

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 some limited potential to build a foundation of understanding of the ERP and to expose students to ERP projects.*

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 project is an educational program with a broad implementation within the San Joaquin River Basin. The contribution to natural production of anadromous fish is in the form that an informed public will understand the value of all anadromous fish species, make sound choices and support responsible resource management. This proposal does support a low priority action in a high priority watershed identified in the AFRP draft Restoration Plan (1997). Elements of the proposal support and expand the existing Salmonids in the Classroom program and educational opportunities on the Tuolumne River. These elements can have benefits for anadromous fishes. Other elements of the program may incorporate watershed concepts in a broader environmental education format. These would have less value for anadromous fishes.*

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 has targeted educational programs in three key areas of the San

Joaquin River Basin: west -side wetlands, uplands and agriculture, the mainstem river and the east-side tributaries. Thus, thematic, locally-focused environmental curriculum could increase awareness of over 100 sensitive species that occur in the basin, including fish species: steelhead (Federally threatened), SJRB fall-run Chinook salmon (Candidate), Delta smelt and splittail (Candidate). Depending on the curriculum, the majority of species affected would likely be plants and higher aquatic and terrestrial animals.*

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.# Curriculum could promote awareness of natural channel and riparian habitat values. However such detail was not included in the proposal.*

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).# Proposed project will not directly contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations, although an informed citizenry is more likely to participate in public input opportunities regarding 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.# Indirect and depends on content of curriculum. Because of the broad base of operations this program might likely provide the greatest support for Section

3406 (b) (1) other. The Salmonids in the Classroom and watershed curriculum development would be the elements of this proposal most likely to benefit the Anadromous Fish 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.

This proposal supports a low priority action in a high priority watershed identified in the AFRP Revised Draft Restoration Plan (1997). This project is an educational program with a broad implementation within the San Joaquin River Basin. Educational programs are beneficial from the premise that an informed public will understand the value of natural resources and will make sound choices and support responsible resource management. The project targets key geographic areas with focal issues within the San Joaquin River Basin. It also builds on existing successful programs which do not have capacity to meet demands. The curriculum will only partially address or emphasize features that support natural channel and riparian habitat values in support of sustained production of salmonids.*

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.#Current Phase I work contains lessons on the importance of water quality, water supply and ecosystem quality for salmonids, and proposed work is consistent with other educational programs, providing a curriculum for other programs statewide. 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.#00E05 - Merced River Corridor Restoration, Phase III
98F11 - Merced River Habitat Enhancement, Phase III
98B30 - San Joaquin Valley Salmonids in the Classroom Program Enhancement
97C09 - Developing a Genetic Baseline for San Joaquin Salmon
97C11 - Gravel at Basso Bridge*

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):#After initial contracting delays, the DFG projects have progressed well. 00E05 and 97C11 are constructed and monitoring is ongoing, 98B30 is completed, 97C09 is in the second of its three year study, and 98F11 is in Final Design Phase. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract documents*

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.## 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 essence of this proposal is an outreach plan. Owing to the successful history of the existing programs, local opposition would be unexpected. The local involvement section indicates a broad range of constituents have and will support such a project.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# They state actions are categorically exempt. The lead agency needs to make that determination.*

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.# Actual funding request is \$299,998. Overhead quoted at 20% (1999/2000 rate). CDFG providing project management costs as in-kind services. Subtasks 2a and b are not described in the narrative. Incremental funding or task severability is not addressed by applicant.*

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:# \$45,000 proposed*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$135,000 proposed*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 60% or $180,000/299,998=.600004$ *

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# 2001-1206?*