

i. Proposal number.# 2001-I213 *

ii. Short proposal title .# Educating Farmers and Landowners in Biological Resource Management *

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 addresses goals relative to water quality and habitat restoration*

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 educational in nature, this proposal could result in quantifiable progress toward water quality and habitat goals and 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.# The demonstration projects proposed could meet some of the targeted 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.# The demonstration projects proposed could meet some of the targeted 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.# This proposal could result in MSCS species benefits*

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.# An adaptive management element could be incorporated into the demonstration projects*

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 worthwhile proposal that could generate quantifiable 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 effort addresses AFRP Central Valley-wide Actions 1 and 2 which focus on outreach and education of the public. This project could indirectly affect natural production by educating Solano County (out of AFRP area) and Merced watershed farmers and landowners in management practices and influencing their farming practices. Through this education, farmers would select biologically sound means of farming thereby reducing agricultural inputs (pesticides, herbicides, etc...) into waterways and restoring functional habitat. Improved water quality and restored functional habitat via educated farmers and changed farming practices would be indirect affects that would contribute to natural production. This contribution to production would be hard to quantify. The proposal lists all salmonids as species that would benefit from this project. If increased water quality and restored functional habitat indeed was accomplished through this education effort, and it occurred on the Merced River, then steelhead, and fall-run chinook salmon could benefit from increased water quality, restored habitat and environmentally friendly farming practices. These benefits would be realized in 5-15 year period and would be long termin nature. Because of the nature of education, the certainty is low. *

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 project could indirectly benefit steelhead, which are listed under the federal ESA as threatened, and the fall-run chinook salmon which is a candidate species. This indirect benefit would occur through farmers and landowners who reduced toxic input into streams and restored functional habitat because of the education they received. *

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 proposal could restore and/or protect natural channel and riparian habitat values indirectly. Biologically sound farming practices exist that when incorporated provide increased habitat for riparian and aquatic species. The education provided through this proposal could cause some farmers to adopt these practices and thus increase channel stability, natural processes or riparian habitat in a particular area. This would be a long term benefit that would be a few years out in the future. *

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 is an educational effort that would not contribute to the 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.# This proposal 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 is an educational effort focused on educating farmers and landowners in biologically sound practices that could result in increased water quality because of reduced agricultural inputs and restored functional habitat through modified farming practices. It could benefit salmonids in the region selected (Solano County and Merced watershed). This effort is a low priority for AFRP and likely a low priority for b (1) other programs. *

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 work complements and expands on first phase, which significantly reduced use of pesticides and fertilizers in the Delta, contributing to other CALFED projects to reduce use and improve water quality. 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.# 97N20 - Reduction of Synthetic Pesticides and Fertilizers in five California Counties - The BIOS Strategy.*

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):#Through their program, CAFF has reduced pesticide and fertilizer use by BIOS participants: 58% of organophosphates, 80% pyrethrins, 91% diazinon, and increased use of biological control with bt by 27x that of non BIOS growers (CA Institute for Rural studies report 4/2000, Villarejo and Moore 1998) 1st phase will be completed by early 2001. 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.#97N20.*

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. In addition CAFF has been instrumental in creating other programs to reduce use of additional pesticides and fertilizers through Biologically Integrated Farm systems (BIFS) and the California Biological Agriculture Initiative. 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.# The proposal does not list any negative or outstanding issues and lists no third party impacts.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

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

identified in the PSP checklists.# If the sites are in farmland production now, a grading permit and Williamson Act cancellation may apply.*

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.# Severability between project implementation in Merced and Solano County is not addressed or valued by the applicant.*

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***