

i. Proposal number:#2001-I204*

ii. Short proposal title .# Watershed 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#**

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 proposal has the potential to generate outreach benefits relative to at-risk species, functional habitats and natural processes.*

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 has potential to generate useful data from student fieldwork and could advance some regional 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 has potential to advance local partnerships, some habitat restoration and some protection for at-risk species.*

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.# The proposal is linked to many Stage 1 and early implementation actions in the Butte Basin.*

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.# As it relates to the reduction of at risk species, this proposal relates to 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 except through the potential generation of data.*

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.# Because this is a hands on type educational proposal it does have some potential to generate ERP benefits.*

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 proposal expands an existing educational program that directly addresses watershed restoration efforts that benefit all Sacramento River anadromous fish species. While direct project benefits to these species are not quantifiable, local education and communication is essential to the implementation and long-term effectiveness of CVPIA and restoration efforts. *

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.# Project as proposed would expand educational program that would cover all upper Sacramento River listed salmonids and their habitats, to include spring run salmon (federal/state threatened), winter run salmon (federal/state endangered), and steelhead (federal threatened). Additionally, the federally listed splittail (threatened) would also benefit as well as CVPIA target species such as green and white sturgeon, striped bass and shad.*

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.# A key component of the existing program and this expanded proposal is direct student involvement in understanding watershed function, and participation in watershed restoration efforts that benefit natural process.*

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 is flow related and therefore encompasses flow management activities as related to 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.# Project provides both direct and indirect benefit to the implementation and long-term success of all CVPIA measures through education and local participation.*

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.# Applicant proposes to expand upon an existing watershed education program implemented

through the Chico Unified School District. The expanded program would provide continued funding for an education coordinator, establish and fund new coordinator positions in other local districts, provide Adopt-A-Watershed and Project Wet instructional materials, provide expanded opportunities for student participation in field studies and restoration projects, provide coordination with other locally based watershed education programs, and provide support to an Americorp education and restoration team. Previous components of this project, administered by the applicant have been funded by the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. Additionally, this effort has in the past proven to be a valuable tool in developing local participation and acceptance of restoration efforts implemented under CVPIA and CALFED that have specifically benefitted spring run salmon and steelhead. The Watershed Education Project recently completed a hands-on guide, "A Seed Is Planted", for implementing watershed education in k-6 grades. It's an excellent tool for teachers to use in the classroom. With the development of locally based watershed restoration groups, it is becoming increasingly imperative that effective lines of communication be established and maintained with them. In that regard, the applicant is proposing to develop and expand an education program, a major component of which effects the Butte Creek watershed, without effectively including the Butte Creek Watershed Conservancy or entities associated with the Lower Butte Creek restoration efforts. Prior to a major expansion of this education project as proposed, applicant should first develop effective participation of all local watershed groups. Since this has been a very effective program in the past, some level of funding is appropriate pending the applicant developing coordination with each of the affected watershed groups.*

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 environmental education project

complements the ongoing CALFED funded projects on Butte Creek designed to improve habitat conditions for fish and wildlife, develop a watershed management strategy, and complete improvements in the Butte Sink, on Butte and Sacramento sloughs. This project helps link those projects to improve conditions for anadromous fish recovery the full length of Butte Creek.

Source: Proposal, Project tracking table*

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.#

Both--98B35 - Butte Creek Watershed 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): #The program has established a core group of teachers who reviewed the curriculum and developed a strategy to train educators and trained 75 teachers in the past two years. Have established linkage with other focused education projects, such as the Sacramento River Discovery Center, Chico Unified School District, Butte County Office of Education, and the CA Departments of Fish and Game and Water Resources. 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.#98B35*

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 an outgrowth of Phase I, evolving into a new project focused on all the creeks and watersheds, and all of the schools in the area. It is ready for next phase funding. 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. # Project applicant has developed and implemented a very high quality educational program and has demonstrated the value of additional funding. There is however a serious concern over the lack of inclusion and coordination with all local watershed groups and efforts such as the Butte Creek Watershed Conservancy, and lower Butte Creek restoration project coordination efforts through the California Waterfowl Association and Ducks Unlimited. This oversight, while probably unintentional and a factor of short time lines for grant applications, is never-the-less a major concern.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists. # If they will be collecting invertebrates, they will need a scientific collecting permit from CDFG.*

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 4.98%. Service contract costs per task are provided as lump-sum amounts with no further detail. Acceptability of incremental funding 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:# \$0*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$18,000 proposed*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 18% or $18,000/100,865=.178456352$ *

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

6a - 6c3.# Applicant indicates volunteer and intern services, as well as, agency (Americorp, CSU, Learn and Serve, Butte County, etc.) in-kind contributions are considerable, however amounts are not provided in the proposal.*