

i. Proposal number.# 2001-I-210*

ii. Short proposal title .# 2001-I-210*

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 address all the ERP goals to some extent*

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.# Although the ERP has no specific education objectives, this proposal could contribute through increased awareness*

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 focus on ERP projects in the Yolo Basin area*

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 Yolo bypass is a significant focus area in Stage 1*

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.# Several MSCS species use the Yolo Basin. This proposal could increase awareness*

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.# Overall this is a potentially valuable education proposal. Its proximity to the Delta, its Stage 1 focus and its on-going nature are 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 does not directly or in the near term contribute to natural production of anadromous fish. It strives to develop an ecological awareness of teachers and students through environmental education, and has potentially long term indirect benefits to fish and wildlife resources by ultimately changing social values and perspectives on fish and wildlife. This project supports Central Valley Wide, Action 1, which is a low priority action in the revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP*

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 no direct benefits to any species. Indirect benefits would be to all species. It is

indicated that the educational project addresses fall-run chinook salmon, federal candidate, Delta smelt, state and federal threatened, splittail, federal threatened, giant garter snake, state and federal threatened, greater sandhill crane, state threatened, and Swainson's hawk, state threatened, green and white sturgeon, and striped bass. There are intangible multi-species and habitat benefits (aquatic and terrestrial).*

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.# This project does not restore natural channel and riparian values or natural processes. This program has potential long term indirect benefits to restoration of natural channel and riparian values through education and ultimately changing social values and perspectives on fish and wildlife.*

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).# The project does not contribute to efforts to modify 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.# There is no direct contribution to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA.*

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 project does not directly benefit anadromous fish. This program has potentially long term indirect benefits to anadromous fish through education and ultimately changing social values and perspectives on fish and wildlife. Also, there are intangible multi-species and habitat benefits (aquatic and terrestrial). The project does not contribute to modification of CVP operations nor does it contribute to supporting measures in the CVPIA. This project does support Central Valley Wide, Action 1, which is a low priority action in the revised Draft Restoration Plan for the AFRP*

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 program promotes education and wildlife friendly farming and better understanding of wetland ecosystems and habitats in the Yolo Bypass Ecological zone, working with the Yolo Bypass Workgroup and the Yolo Bypass Foundation. 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. #
98B34 - Discover the Flyway.
98E11 - Management Strategy for the Yolo Bypass.*

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):#98B34 year one and most of year two of the project completed on time and within budget, 2nd year activities ongoing and will be completed by early 2001. 98E11 will be completed by end of 2000. 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.#98B34.*

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):#All deliveries to date have been completed, including grass seedings planted, training completed, workshops and evaluations completed. Work on year 2 has progressed well and will be completed on schedule. Ready for next phase. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports, contract documents.*

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.# **4c.** The Board of Directors for the Yolo Basin Foundation consists of a variety of community members representing significant local involvement, including local elected officials, farmers, board of education members, hunters, and members of the business community. All adjacent landowners are supportive of the Foundation programs and contribute financially.*

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 that tasks 2, 3 and 5 are inseparable. A three year funding request is made to better establish the project. Overhead is quoted as 32%. Year 1 cost schedule is incomplete - maybe missing costs for Task 1, Teacher Watershed Academy. Service contracts are expressed as lump-sum amounts with no further detail.*

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:# \$45,000 in-hand*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 23% or $45,000/197,987=.22728765$ *

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

6a - 6c3.# CDFG provides 15,000 annually in cost share and an undefined amount of cost share is available through numerous supporters of the Foundation.*