

**i. Proposal number:#2001-J200 \***

**ii. Short proposal title .# Genetic Identification of Watershed--Dependent Species of Special Concern in the Central Valley \***

**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# Directly linked to A., indirectly linked to B. and D. \***

**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.# Genetic research would determine distinct population units of at risk species. This would then lead to protection of those units preserving genetic diversity and assisting in recovery. To that extent, it fully contributes to goal A. The protection of the distinct genetic units would then lead to some degree of protection and enhancement of biotic communities and habitats therefore marginally contributing to B and D. \***

**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.# Objectives 3&4 under Goal 1. See above. \***

**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.# Other Topic Areas. Special status species surveys and studies. However, none of the species involved were any of the "critical" species. Only 1, the yellow warbler, is designated an MSCS "r" species. \***

**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 proposal does not appear to be linked to any Stage 1 action. \***

**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 proposal is linked to the MSCS only through the information it would provide on species distribution and status. Information may provide guidance on locating site-specific projects or mitigation in order to maximize benefit to subject species. \*

**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.#** It doesn't appear that the proposal addresses any of the 12 Scientific Uncertainties.\*

**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 is a purely scientific research proposal to continue an ongoing genetic study of 4 birds, 3 amphibians and 1 reptile species. Information derived from the study may assist watershed managers in providing necessary protection of species specific management units. The proposal indicates that sampling of these species has been done in the past throughout the ERP study area, yet it does not indicate how increasing the sampling will add to what has already been done, and what information they have derived from the data to date. The previous sampling was not done with CALFED funding. \*

#### **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).#** No species and races of anadromous fish are expected to benefit from the project.\*

**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.**# No anadromous fish are expected to benefit. Special status reptiles and amphibians and migratory birds are expected to benefit from project.\*

**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 project does not apply to 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).**# The proposed project will not contribute to modified 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 project will not contribute to implementing the supportive measures in CVPIA, except possibly the (b)(1) other, Habitat Restoration Program\*

**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.** # The Habitat Restoration Program, 3406(b)(1) other, may fund the proposal through

its focus on at-risk species by identifying management units of these species. Also the project helps set priorities for habitat restoration decisions. The proposal is not applicable to anadromous fishes but has some benefit to migratory birds and reptiles and amphibians to identify population units for management. This has possible application of the ESA implementation.\*

## **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 will help increase information base for current CALFED projects including watershed "Action Plan" efforts and smaller scale efforts like the Silver Creek Watershed Management and Action Plan the TNC's site - specific management planning on the Sacramento River. 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.# No.\***

**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 discuss local entities support or opposition to the project and degree of their importance on project implementation.\*

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE**

**4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.#** Project proponent states collections will be made under permits already in hand by Pis for ongoing studies. You can not collect under another permit. Each permit is issued for a specific project. They must comply with CESA because the species they are collecting are threatened.\*

**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.#** Indirect rates of 10

%-state for a total project amount of \$640,176 and 46-48.5%-federal for a total project amount of \$851,669 are quoted. No severability of tasks or funding years is addressed by applicant. Project management services are provided as in-kind services and are not valued.\*

## **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:# \$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.#** Dr. Smith, Clegg,

Lovette and Shaffer are providing in-kind services that have not been valued by the applicant.\*