

**i. Proposal number.# 2001-I207 \***

**ii. Short proposal title .# Environmental Stewardship Educational Conferences and Tours \***

**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.# This proposal could generate some limited water quality benefits over time\***

**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 is not limited to specific eco-water quality 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.# In a general way the proposal could address eco-water quality needs\***

**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.# Because of its potential to reduce improper use of pesticides, this proposal could be linked to Stage 1 actions\***

**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 linkage 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.# While the benefits of having more informed and careful application of pesticides are obvious, this appears to be more a responsibility of the manufactures and users than the ERP\***

#### **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).# All anadromous salmonids are listed in the proposal as benefitting from this educational effort. While all fish in the affected region would benefit from improved water quality, impacts would likely be limited to San Joaquin fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead. The benefits realized by the salmonids would be indirect and would include improved water quality due to reduced agricultural inputs (chemical and sediment) and reduced habitat degradation due to improved land of riparian habitat. These benefits could eventually indirectly impact natural production, but the certainty, immediacy and magnitude of these affects are low. This proposal address the low priority Central Valley-wide Actions 1 and 2 for the Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP. These Actions focus on salmonid and watershed education and outreach. \***

**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.**# Federally listed steelhead would indirectly benefit, and if improved water quality was realized through increased education and changed agricultural practices conceivably most aquatic species would benefit. This would include the entire range of aquatic organisms that reside in the specific region. Education on land use practices may also benefit migratory birds. Specific biointensive practices increase the diversity of flora and fauna available for forage of migratory birds. \*

**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.**# There are no direct affects on natural channel and riparian habitat values. Indirectly, educated farmers and landscapers who implement more watershed friendly land uses learned in this educational effort could improve the riparian habitat values in their respective area. The benefits would be realized in the near to distant future and would likely be long term in duration. \*

**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 does not affect 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 proposal doesn't contribute to supporting CVPIA 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.**

**#** Improved and increased education of the general public, specifically those who impact watersheds, is a priority of the AFRP and b (1) other programs. The focused audience is an important target group. Improved water quality and land use adjacent to rivers is difficult to legislate and can be greatly enhanced through educational efforts. There is question about measuring the success and the value of an effort like this. There may be more need for something added to the survey/evaluation process that determines actions actually taken, acres affected and specific measurable metrics of that nature. \*

## **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.**

**#**Proposed conferences complement previously funded CALFED projects in the effected ecozones including the Napa River Watershed and Merced River Corridor and they will coordinate with those projects developing conference sessions and will receive conference evaluation materials to assist their conservation efforts. 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.#**  
98B32 - Environmental Agriculture Conference and Field Tours.\*

**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):#Project is completed, with two conferences held and a summary report on attendance and feedback completed. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract materials.\***

#### **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.# No outstanding issues are identified in the proposal. \***

#### **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.# 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.#** Applicant indicates

incremental(1 year equals \$48,500)and per conference(1 conference equals \$12,125) funding is acceptable. Four events are provided for the total project request of \$97,000. Overhead is quoted at \$0.\*

#### **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:# \$15,000 proposed\***

**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.#** Applicant anticipates

in-kind services from several sources (no value assigned) and conference income per event of \$15,000.\*