

i. Proposal number:# 2001-I209*

ii. Short proposal title .# Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Institute*

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 benefit to rehabilitate natural process and functional habitat 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.# There are many strategic objectives that could be touched on by this proposal*

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.# Although this proposal doesn't address any specific actions it could through its field element*

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 could bring focus and awareness to the ERP demonstration streams*

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.# The longer term nature of this proposal could address some MSCS issues in particular watersheds*

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.# Adaptive management could be built into the program*

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 considerable merit. It could be tied to the various ERP demonstration streams over time*

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 is a professional training program for teams of teachers, community coordinators, higher education representatives for grades k-12. The proposal expands an existing educational program that directly addresses watershed restoration efforts that benefit all Sacramento River anadromous fish species. Because of the permanent nature of the Adopt-A-Watershed Training Institute and the large numbers of teachers and students that have already been trained (90,000 students and 3600 teachers trained to date)and receiving training, the indirect contribution of this proposal to natural production of anadromous fish species is longterm. While most benefits from this proposal are indirect, relative to increasing production of anadromous fish, some teaching scenarios include actual watershed restoration activities that are carried out by the students which, although small in nature, can directly contribute to increasing production of anadromous fish. Educational programs as represented by this proposal benefits local education and communication which are essential to the implementation and long-term effectiveness of CVPIA restoration efforts that target all anadromous fish species in Central Valley streams. Indirect contribution with small to significant effects, immediacy of benefits would be slow in realizing but once realized would be longterm.*

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 for 1200 teachers and training to 30,000 K-12 students in 10 new communities associated with the upper Sacramento River and Bay-Delta, hence, would cover all upper Sacramento River listed salmonids and their habitats, to include fall and late-fall-run (candidate), spring-run (threatened) and winter-run (endangered) chinook salmon, and steelhead (threatened). There are multi-species benefits since teachers in cited schools will be introducing specific watershed training on Central Valley watershed plant and wildlife ecosystems to students throughout their environmental education in K-12 grades. *

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. In some teaching scenarios, there are actual watershed restoration activities carried out by the students which directly benefit natural channel processes and riparian habitat values. This educational process is longterm and when applied to many students should result, directly and indirectly, in immediate and continuous benefits to improving 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). # 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. *

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 is education and provides both direct and indirect benefit to the implementation and long-term success of all 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.

Applicant proposes to expand upon a professional training program for teams of teachers, community coordinators, higher education representatives for grades k-12. The proposal expands an existing educational program that directly addresses watershed restoration efforts that benefit all Sacramento River anadromous fish species. The expanded program would provide continued funding for teacher training and provide expanded opportunities for student participation in field studies and restoration projects throughout their environmental education years. It would provide coordination with other locally based watershed education programs, and provide support to an Americorp education and restoration teams. 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 that have specifically benefited spring run salmon and steelhead. Students, under this program, have participated in actual restoration activities in their watersheds. With the development of locally based watershed restoration groups, it is becoming increasing imperative that effective lines of communication be established and maintained with them. This project supports AFRP Restoration Plan Central Valley-Wide Action 1.*

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.#The AAW complements watershed ecosystem restoration projects by bringing together schools and local stakeholders to help students and communities learn about the Bay-Delta Watershed with field monitoring and restoration and education in Tehama, Shasta, Butte, Contra Costa, Sonoma, and San Joaquin county's, to promote watershed restoration on a community level. 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.#none.*

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.#

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.#

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:##

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):##

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.## Prior funded Adopt-A-Watershed projects have been well accepted by local entities. Project applicant has developed and implemented a very high quality educational program and has demonstrated the value of additional funding. There are no apparent issues or third-party impacts associated with this 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 training tasks (1 course of curriculum over a year) are inseparable, however, fully funding an entire year of the program or a select number of teams (1 team equals 10% of the annual budget or \$19,763) would be acceptable. Overhead is quoted at 10%.*

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:# 609,984 proposed*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$0*

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

requested along with calculation.# 103% or $609,984/592,884=1.028842066^*$

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

6a - 6c3.# Applicant indicates several in-kind and matching sources of cost share are committed.*