

i. Proposal number.# 2001-I205 *

ii. Short proposal title .# Traveling Film Festival/San Joaquin River Oral History Film *

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, B, C, D, 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 .#The educational films developed and shown by the project proponent promotes the goals of recovery of at-risk species, habitat restoration, rehabilitation of natural processes, water quality improvements, and maintenance of harvested species. This project expands on the Bay-Delta films with a program on the San Joaquin River.*

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, these films promote the goals and objectives through films and videos about CALFED ecosystems wildlife, habitats, urban and suburban threats, restoration efforts and shows how the public can influence habitat restoration.*

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.# This proposal contributes to early implementation action 14, Environmental Education Programs to develop a broader understanding of natural conservation issues and promotes habitat restoration.*

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 promotes the Multi Species Conservation Strategy by depicting Bay-Delta ecosystem special status species and habitats and provides information on threats to the species and restoration efforts for the species. This expansion of earlier work targets species and habitats on the San Joaquin River.*

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 physically 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 is an expansion of a highly successful effort to produce and showcase films, videos and exhibits about the Bay-Delta ecosystem. This project will produce and show a film targeting habitats and species on the San Joaquin River through history. This is a good expansion of earlier work.*

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 proposal lists spring-run, steelhead and San Joaquin and East-side Delta tributaries fall-run chinook salmon as anadromous species that would benefit from this project. As an environmental education tool this project could have some indirect future affect on natural production of anadromous fish through environmental education and increased awareness of local San Joaquin Valley citizens. The project would have a traveling educational program and would create a TV documentary of the San Joaquin River, focusing on it's historic greatness, to provide a context for the public to understand current and future restoration plans. The indirect affect to natural production would be difficult to quantify, impossible to measure and slow in coming. The effort would support the Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP Central Valley-Wide Actions 1 and 2. These low priority Actions are focused on educational outreach in local involvement and restoration, and education of the general public about anadromous fishes and the impacts and influences of society on their life history. *

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 lists spring-run, a federal and state listed threatened species, steelhead, a federally listed threatened species, and the San Joaquin and East-side Delta tributaries fall-run chinook salmon, a candidate species under the federal ESA . It also lists the Delta smelt (federally listed as threatened) and the splittail, a species of concern, as non-anadromous species that are expected to benefit from this educational project. The benefit would be indirect and futuristic as education of the public would not directly affect these listed species. The education of the public could carry indirect benefits such as increased support for protection and restoration of at-risk species; increased understanding of the complexity and fragility of our Bay-Delta ecosystems and the organisms that inhabit them (multi-species/community benefits); also it could include increased understanding of all the stakeholders roles in this ecosystem, (i.e., farmers, environmentalists, public...). *

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 project could indirectly affect natural channel and riparian habitat values by educating the public. The San Joaquin River before Friant Dam had flows from it's headwaters to the confluence with the Sacramento River that formed the channels and influenced the riparian habitats. Currently the San Joaquin River is de-watered in large sections of the river between Friant Dam and the confluence with the Merced River. By showing pictures of how the San Joaquin used to look and sharing the restoration plan and vision for what the San Joaquin could look like again the project could build support and understanding for these restoration measures and hence indirectly affect natural channel and riparian habitat values. *

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 support CVP modifications by building public support for restoration of the San

Joaquin River, including returning flows from CVP Friant Dam to those portions of the river that are dry. *

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 doesn't contribute to supporting measures.*

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 is aimed at expanding a traveling educational program and producing a television documentary of the San Joaquin River Before Friant Dam, environmental education and provide a context for the public to understand and support restoration. This educational effort addresses AFRP low priority Central Valley-wide Actions 1 and 2. It also has applicability to the San Joaquin River Riparian Restoration Program and the Habitat Restoration Program because of the support for those actions through the educational process and experience.*

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.#Complements previous work completed for CALFED under 99B24 and expands the program with the additional film.

Furtheres the goals in the San Joaquin River restoration pilot project and the development of a long-term restoration plan for the river. 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.#99-B24 - Traveling Film Festival Exhibit*

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 project has progressed on schedule and have completed most of the film screenings and events in the Bay Area counties. CALFED receives deliverables and information summaries on time. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract materials*

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.#99-B24*

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.
Next phase is to continue outreach into the Central Valley, targeting little-served communities and expand on information presented. They are ready for the next phase. Source: Proposal, contract materials*

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 proposal doesn't relate any negative issues and no third party impacts. *

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.# 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.#no*

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.# Applicant did not

address severability of tasks, however independent nature of tasks indicates implementation is possible with no effect costs per task Task 1, \$70,900 and Task 2, 145,650.*

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:# \$2,500 proposed*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 3.5% or $2,500/70,900=0.03526093$ for film festival*

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

6a - 6c3.#