

- i. Proposal number.# 2001-I206 \***
- ii. Short proposal title .# Master River Teacher \***

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

**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 tie to any strategic objective.\*

**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 could increase awareness of San Jaoquin River flood plan issues.\*

**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 only apparent linkage is some increase in public awareness.\*

**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 has no apparent link 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.\***

**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 focuses on an area of the San Joaquin River that does not contribute to the ecological health of the Delta. It could be used to make the public aware of that circumstance. Overall this proposal is not likely 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 educational proposal could indirectly influence natural production in the long term through increasing education of local citizens in riverine and riparian issues. The proposal does not list any anadromous fish as benefitting but this education effort should include salmon and steelhead in the material. The benefit of increased ecological understanding could be helpful to steelhead and fall-run chinook salmon. The benefit would be indirect, small, but long term. \***

**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.# There are none listed, but if the education is successful, and water is returned to the San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to the confluence with the Merced, the steelhead,**

federally listed as threatened and Fall-run, a candidate species under ESA, could benefit from this educational effort. As it is, other aquatic organisms and organisms in the riparian corridor should benefit by increased understanding of community diversity and the need for increased habitat.\*

**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 effort does not discuss this, but natural channel and riparian values should be a big part of a riverine education program. The benefits are increased public awareness of riverine needs and processes. This awareness should be realized in the 5-10 year period and should be long term in nature. \*

**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).**# Indirectly, through increased local understanding of the watersheds need for water, there could be some modification of the CVP operations, via Friant Dam. Local watershed groups have been instrumental in changing dam operations around the nation and it could happen on the San Joaquin, especially since the recent decision and the Restoration Plan that is underway. \*

**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.**# While the program doesn't mention salmonids, it could benefit 3406 c, which deals with the area of the San Joaquin from Friant Dam to Mendota Pool, could be supported by this effort. \*

**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 could bring restoration of aquatic environments up a notch in the minds of the general public in the Fresno area. It could indirectly affect salmonids and riparian restoration, along with various other terrestrial species. As it is above Mendota Pool, the appropriate CVPIA program would be 3406 c. With some direction this could be a great educational tool for the salmonid populations. \*

#### **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.**#Teachers for this project will study past and future restoration projects throughout the San Joaquin/Bay-Delta to educate students and fellow teachers about CALFED, CVPIA, and other ecosystem restoration activities. 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 99B25 - River Studies Center Exhibits (Riverview Ranch)  
CVPIA - Acquisition and Restoration of Jensen River Ranch (San Joaquin River)\*

**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):**#Exhibits and programs under 99B25 are on schedule and will be completed by the end of 2000. Programs trace river conditions from turn of the century to present. Focus is to increase public awareness of the vision for the San Joaquin River Ecological Zone. Jensen River Ranch has been acquired and they are currently working to plan and implement habitat restoration. 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.**#99B25\*

**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. Once exhibits and materials developed, the next phase will be to create a core group of teachers, conduct lectures, and provide field experiences. They are ready for next phase. 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.**# This effort is supported by many local entities and also state and federal agencies. No third party impacts are discussed in the proposal \*

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as**

**identified in the PSP checklists.#** Did not answer number 3 on checklist. They will need to comply with CEQA and obtain permits for the research activities in the field. The proposal is too vague to determine what permits would be needed.\*

**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 15%.\*

#### **COST SHARING**

**6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.#** no\*

**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:#** \$0\*

**6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding**

requested along with calculation.# \$0\*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions  
6a - 6c3.#n/a\*