

**CALFED Bay-Delta Program Project Information Form  
Watershed Program - Full Proposal Cover Sheet**

*Attach to the cover of full proposal. All applicants must fill out this Information Form for their proposal. Failure to answer these questions and include them with the application will result in the application being considered nonresponsive and not considered for funding.*

**1. Full Proposal Title:**

Concept Proposal Title/Number: Stanislaus River Watershed Stewardship Program/WSP01-0089

Applicant: S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.

Applicant Name: Doug Demko

Applicant Mailing Address: 386 Brookside Drive Chico, CA 95928

Applicant Telephone: 530.342.9262 Applicant Fax: 530.898.0956 Applicant Email: demko@dcs-chico.com

Fiscal Agent Name (if different from above): Same

Fiscal Agent Mailing Address: Same

Fiscal Agent Telephone: Same Fiscal Agent Fax: Same Fiscal Agent Email: Same

**2. Type of Project: Indicate the primary topic for which you are applying (check only one)**

Assessment

Capacity Building

Education

Implementation

Monitoring

Outreach

Planning

Research

**3. Type of Applicant:**

Academic Institution/University

Federal Agency

Joint Venture

Local Government

Non-Profit

Private party

State Agency

Tribe or Tribal Government

**4. Location (including County):**

What major watershed is the project primarily located in:

Klamath River (Coast and Cascade Ranges)

Sacramento River (Coast, Cascade and Sierra Ranges)

San Joaquin River (Coast and Sierra Ranges)

Bay-Delta (Coast and Sierra Ranges)

Southern CA (Coast and Sierra Ranges)

Tulare Basin (Coast, Sierra and Tehachapi Ranges)

**5. Amount of funding requested: \$537,936**

Cost share/in-kind partners?  Yes  No

Identify partners and amount contributed by each:

Oakdale Irrigation District, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, Tri-Dam Project and Stockton East Water District

Combined Total: \$85,032

6. Have you received funding from CALFED before?     Yes     No  
If yes, identify project title and source of funds:

By signing below, the applicant declares the following:

1. The truthfulness of all representations in their proposal
2. The individual signing this form is entitled to submit the application on behalf of the applicant (if the applicant is an entity or an organization)
3. The person submitting the application has read and understood the conflict of interest and confidentiality discussion in the Watershed Program Proposal Solicitation Package and waives any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant, to the extent provided in the Proposal Solicitation Package.

Doug Demko

Printed name of applicant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of applicant

## **1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**This three year project will create the Stanislaus River Watershed Stewardship Program (SRWSP) which will coordinate splintered efforts by various agencies, stakeholders, and consultants to achieve consensus based implementation of projects which are consistent with current AFRP and CALFED restoration goals. Currently, there are numerous entities involved in Stanislaus River fishery issues, yet there is little coordination between the groups. The SRWSP will act as an umbrella entity to develop a database of watershed partners, facilitate communication and participation among various groups, and establish and then help accomplish watershed management and restoration goals. The SRWSP will work closely with CALFED, AFRP, USFWS, CDFG, USBR, USACE, and the East and West Stanislaus Natural Resource Conservation districts, as well as with stakeholders, recreation interests, and the general public to maximize current and future efforts and funding.**

**The SRWSP will use a team of experienced basin biologists to create a Watershed Implementation Plan to accomplish specific watershed objectives. The team will also facilitate, guide and logistically support other watershed activities, such as field research projects, proposal development and funding, and coordination of annual watershed activities related to salmonid management. The expected outcome of the watershed approach is to reduce overlap in activities, allow managers to make better use of the information they already have, develop new and productive working relationships, and help increase outside funding of scientific research and habitat improvement and restoration projects. Further, the SRWSP will help conserve public monies by eliminating redundant projects and activities, increase the amount of private interest, money, and effort directed towards Stanislaus watershed issues, direct funds and effort at priority projects, and increase the overall efficiency of current spending. This program will coordinate current projects which includes over \$900,000 annually in current funding from AFRP, CVPIA, CAMP, CALFED, USACE, Oakdale Irrigation District, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, Stockton East Water District and Tri-Dam Project for gravel restoration, temperature modeling, public outreach and education, geomorphic assessment, and salmon and trout monitoring.**

**The SRWSP includes three objectives which serve to 1) collect, manage, and distribute information used to guide watershed partners and activities, 2) create and manage a historical online computer database, and 3) provide professional and administrative services to the Stanislaus Fish Group. These objectives were developed to address concerns expressed during numerous interviews with landowners, environmentalists, city and county officials, water rights holders, recreational interests, and the general public. The objectives and associated tasks are discussed below.**

**Objective 1: Manage information and coordinate watershed activities to maximize public and private resources.**

**Objective 1 consists of the foundation of the SRWSP, including the collection and dissemination of information, coordination of watershed activities, and public outreach and education. The objective consists of the following three tasks:**

**Task 1.1: Collect, manage, and distribute watershed information to stakeholders, managers, and public.**

**The SRWSP will collect, summarize, and distribute information on a real time basis to all watershed participants. Currently, there is an information divide between resource managers and the general public (including stakeholders, landowners, and recreational users of the watershed), which prevents awareness of watershed issues and limits public involvement. Information gathered at watershed meetings and events will be summarized, distributed to watershed partners, and then serve as the basis for future watershed coordination (Task 1.2) and outreach and education activities (Task 1.3). This readily available, reliable information will serve as the foundation for sound management decisions and will foster stewardship participation within the watershed. Information will be collected by participating in regular meetings with the Stanislaus Stakeholders, San Joaquin Salmonid Project Work Team, IEP steelhead and fall-run work teams, San Joaquin River Management Program, SPLAT, Resource Conservation Districts, the Water Operations group, VAMP, and others. Meeting summaries will be prepared and distributed to watershed partners. This collection and dissemination of information will foster more effective and timely communication between different interests. The SRWSP will actively seek to engage and meet with recreational interests, government agencies, the general public, and landowners to ensure that each watershed partner is informed, has reliable information, and has a legitimate sounding-board for concerns. Issues expressed by partners will be shared by the SRWSP through verbal communication at meetings, an e-mail newsletter, and via an internet site.**

**Task 1.2: Prepare a Watershed Implementation Plan and coordinate watershed issues with public and stakeholders.**

The SRWSP will look to similar programs and projects in adjacent watersheds for successful models to organize a watershed group involving local landowners, educational institutions, stakeholders, local state and federal agencies and other interested parties and groups, and through this organization will develop a community strategy for management of the Stanislaus watershed, which will be outlined in a Watershed Implementation Plan.

The Watershed Implementation Plan will serve as a guiding document for the duration of the program, but will also contain long range goals and other information useful to subsequent watershed groups and managers. The Plan will summarize existing research and data, describe existing watershed conditions, identify common watershed goals, and identify priority projects including an implementation plan for each project. The Watershed Implementation Plan will be prepared by the SRWSP, but the process will be guided by the Stanislaus Fish Group and document drafts will be reviewed by the group before being distributed for acceptance by other partners. Although the SRWSP will do the majority of the work on the plan, the Stanislaus Fish Group will be the final “author” of the plan such that it is a technically based document backed by a consensus of basin experts. Once the Plan is supported by the Stanislaus Fish Group, the SRWSP will begin implementing it while reporting to the Stanislaus Fish Group at every meeting.

The SRWSP will begin implementing the Watershed Implementation Plan by establishing a community based working group and build relationships among other fragmented groups. During our discussions with watershed partners, a common complaint by the public and stakeholders was that there is a lack of information available to them. They typically find out about management actions after they’ve been implemented, and therefore have no opportunity to get involved. This problem will be solved by establishing and then maintaining communication with stakeholders and the public, and then by working diligently to engage others using information collected under Task 1.1. The SRWSP will solicit partners such as the Natural Resource Conservation Districts, which are currently an underutilized resource by watershed managers that focus primarily on fisheries issues. Diverse interests such as these will be sought-out and incorporated into a more cohesive collection of interests which will be more efficient and more capable of managing watershed resources.

The establishment of the SRWSP will insure that there is always a team of knowledgeable basin managers available to conduct different basin tasks and resolve problems. In addition to planning and organizing activities well before their implementation, the SRWSP will be prepared to respond to urgent issues. Examples of activities coordinated by the SRWSP include: summarize issues and information for topics such as smolt survival releases and annual screw trap monitoring; guide proposal development by the agencies and outside consultants and help generate support and additional funding opportunities; prepare information papers for various Stanislaus and San Joaquin Basin subgroups, which will keep other groups informed and foster proper management decisions; find creative solutions to provide occasional support services for agency and private research projects; develop a database of watershed partners; and develop a database of funding sources for different watershed activities. These activities will be accomplished and coordinated in such a way as to maximize the efficiency of watershed partners, especially agency personnel.

**Task 1.3: Conduct outreach and develop watershed education tools.**

The SRWSP will develop programs and conduct public outreach activities that foster greater local watershed stewardship consistent with AFRP and CALFED restoration goals. To facilitate a greater awareness of watershed issues at the community level and develop increased community participation in watershed issues, we will distribute a monthly e-mail newsletter to share information among managers, landowners, agency biologists, recreational users, and the general public. The newsletter will rely on information collected during Task 1.1, and activities performed during Task 1.2, to thoroughly report and discuss monthly watershed activities.

The SRWSP will also work with different parties to increase the effectiveness of ongoing outreach programs. This includes working with the Corps to help prepare information, examples, and hands-on displays to strengthen the fish and river perspective of their program. The SRWSP will also appear at Corps events, as well as at other community events, to give slide presentations on fish biology, watershed processes, and why public involvement is crucial to successful watershed management. Presentations will also be made to local school assemblies, city and county governments, environmental groups, and the general public. Other outreach opportunities, such as the Caswell State Park Earth Day celebration, will be sought where outreach and educational activities can be accomplished. Different programs will be developed for different audiences such that information is uniquely tailored to effectively deliver

information and encourage public involvement. The coordinator will regularly take resource managers, stakeholders, and key public people on river and project tours to keep partners educated, informed, and help build consensus and trust.

The SRWSP will also use the internet site (Objective 2) as an outreach tool, since a much larger and more diverse audience can be reached. The internet site will include information for stakeholders and resource managers, including past and present research projects, and will also have tailored information for the general public.

The SRWSP will create unique partnerships to develop other novel, community based approaches to watershed management, such as the establishment of a Graduate Studies Research Assistance Program which will provide professional guidance, stipends, expense reimbursement, and equipment to graduate students that conduct research projects in the Stanislaus watershed. This program will provide young researchers with assistance while also benefitting the watershed by providing cost-effective research. The SRWSP will administer the program, but project selection will be made by the Stanislaus Fish Group. A maximum of \$10,000 will be awarded each year by Tri-Dam, South San Joaquin and Oakdale irrigation districts. This \$30,000 was factored in as "matching funds" in the development of this proposal.

**Objective 2: Create and maintain on-line information resource and database.**

**Task 2.1 Create and then maintain web page [www.stanislausriver.com](http://www.stanislausriver.com) to share watershed information and data, and facilitate communication between managers, stakeholders, and public.**

The SRWSP will create and then manage a Stanislaus Watershed Database which will include reports, information, and data which can be viewed and downloaded from the internet. A central location for all Stanislaus River documents is needed to help build a cohesive partnership program where real-time information is readily available to everyone. The site will give the public and stakeholder access to information and decision makers which are currently unavailable to them. The database created by tasks 2.1 and 2.2 will consist of all documents prepared that pertain to the Stanislaus River, including data, reports, project summaries, maps, GIS data, real-time river flow access, legal agreements, meeting notes, watershed partners database, and the basin newsletter. This task includes the construction of the site in the first 6 months of the project, and weekly updates, project tracking, and information, report and data posting for the three year project duration.

Under task 2.1 we will register the domain name [www.stanislausriver.com](http://www.stanislausriver.com), and then construct a web page. Custom graphics will be created such that the site has a watershed theme. Graphics will also be created to help users navigate the site to easily locate data or other information. The latest HTML and JAVA programming techniques will be used to minimize download time while also maximizing user interface. The mainframe server construction will allow for expansion to meet long term needs, and will be capable of supporting common programming and communication scripts. Programming will be accomplished such that the page is accessible to older computers and software.

Each watershed project occurring between 2002 and 2004 will be documented and tracked through an on-line project summary page which will allow all watershed partners to follow research activities. Project summaries will include proposals, study plans, weekly summaries, e-mail communication between the researchers and public, and photograph or video documentation. Each project summary will provide contact information for project participants and managers such that all watershed participants will have access to information and individuals. Community education and outreach will also be accomplished through the internet site, as described under Task 1.3.

**Task 2.2 Compile historical information and data and put on-line.**

Currently, no central database exists where researchers or the public can access historical Stanislaus River data or reports. Historical information is crucial to aid future management decisions. Request on agency staff can be overwhelming such that requests are either not met, searches are incomplete, or searches are significantly delayed. Either way, the result is strained relationships and reduced trust between watershed partners. Locating, summarizing, and putting data and information on-line for all to access will alleviate future problems and help build productive relationships. This task will locate, put into electronic format, summarize, error check, and then distribute to the agencies and post on the internet all Stanislaus River data obtainable prior to the year 2002.

Private water rights holders have accumulated a significant amount of historical raw data located in archive searches conducted since 1993. Most or all of this historical information is in the form of raw data-sheets which does not exist in report or electronic format, so considerable time will be required to input the data into electronic format and error check

files. The SRWSP will catalog data obtained during the archive searches and compare it to data which is believed to exist, based on known past field activities. If data gaps are present, the SRWSP will request specific data from resource agencies for inclusion in the database, and provide the labor necessary to locate, summarize, enter into electronic format, and error check all files. The SRWSP will work closely with CDFG and other agencies to add additional data to the compilation, as well as to ensure that high quality standards are maintained such that the database is a reliable source of accurate information. All data will be reviewed by the Stanislaus Fish Group prior to its inclusion in the database. In addition to data, the SRWSP will place as many historical reports, maps, and other pertinent documents on-line as possible. Private interests have assigned a high value to this task and as such have contributed \$25,032 in matching funds for its completion.

**Objective 3: Increase efficiency of the Stanislaus River Fish Group.**

**Task 3.1: Coordinate regular Stanislaus River Fish Group meetings.**

The SRWSP will provide administrative support to the Stanislaus Fish Group, which will reduce demands on agency and AFRP staff and further serve to maximize efficiency of basin efforts and funding. The Stanislaus Fish Group is a collection of agency and private biologists that oversee technical issues relating to the fishery. None of the group participants are funded to do anything other than attend the meetings, so preparation of summary papers and meeting preparation time are limited for all participants, which hampers the effectiveness of the group. This task will fund the Watershed Coordinator to collect background information, prepare documents that summarize issues and possible solutions, and provide all-around support to the group.

## **2. QUALIFICATIONS**

### **Corporate Qualifications:**

S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc. was established in 1987 to provide innovative problem solving on issues relating to salmon and trout on the Pacific Coast. We are reputed for our investigative work in determining why fish populations have or may change in response to specific actions. The core of the firm is composed of three Senior Fisheries Consultants, each with over 20 years of noteworthy experience. Our support staff includes a Biologist Project Leader, four Biologist Assistant Project Leaders, a Computer Applications Specialist, a Statistician, a Fisheries Facilities Engineer, a GIS specialist and a seasonal staff of 10 to 18 Fisheries Technicians.

Our clients have included state and federal agencies, Indian tribes, consulting firms and a variety of resource users. Our work has been primarily with salmon and steelhead populations, or their predators and competitors, on the Pacific Coast. Because of our long history of experience and the diversity of our clients, we have developed unique expertise that enables us to find solutions that many others miss. Fisheries issues that we frequently address include habitat condition, watershed restoration, population status, environmental permitting, hatchery assessments, predator management, passage improvements, harvest impacts, and endangered species recovery.

We have been conducting research on the Stanislaus River for private water rights holders, CAMP, and AFRP since 1993, and are therefore very familiar with basin issues, key watershed participants, and the actions necessary to create the SRWSP. Since we have been involved in Stanislaus River issues for so long, we have had the opportunity to work with a number of different watershed interests, including agency biologists, private researchers, and the public. Due to prior work history, there is already a level of trust between us and basin landowners. The SRWSP will utilize existing community relationships to build consensus and grassroots efforts and encourage landowner participation.

The SRWSP will be administered through S.P. Cramer & Associates' Central Valley office located in Oakdale. Field research equipment and labor resources are available from this office to support research efforts within the basin. Maintaining equipment such as a 4x4 truck, specialized fish tagging equipment, seines, back-pack electroshocker, various electronic equipment, hauling tanks, net pens and 6 boats (including a jet boat and an electrofishing boat) has allowed our organization to provide support to many research projects within the basin. This equipment will be available to the SRWSP for use on Stanislaus watershed projects, and for outreach and educational activities, such as providing river and project tours.

The SRWSP will be coordinated by a team of biologists, each with significant and varying experiences with Stanislaus River issues, key watershed participants and surrounding communities. By combining the skills and personalities of three key individuals, Doug Demko, Andrea Phillips and Chrissy Sonke, we will have the ability to designate specific

tasks to the specific individuals most suited. Since basin issues can involve many types of people, we can use different managers for different tasks to build trusting relationships and effectively communicate and coordinate with all watershed participants.

The applicant, Doug Demko, has worked in the Stanislaus Basin since 1993. He has led a variety of field sampling projects and has gained the respect of state and federal fisheries biologists as an expert in migrant fish sampling. His experience in the Stanislaus River is more extensive than other researchers, and includes leading research projects such as screw trapping, smolt survival studies, radio tracking, predator surveys, resident trout population estimates, habitat surveys, and limiting factors analyses. Additionally, he recently obtained a law degree which has furthered his understanding of water law and endangered species issues. Since Doug has been a key watershed participant since 1993, he has had the opportunity to build trusting relationships with key watershed participants. This trust coupled with the understanding of the issues gained by representing both stakeholders and the resource agencies, equips Doug with the skills to facilitate communication between watershed partners.

Andrea Phillips has worked in the Stanislaus Basin since 1995 and grew up in Oakdale which has allowed her to develop both personal and professional relationships with landowners, concerned community members, recreational groups, researchers, educational institutions and many other watershed partners. Since 1995 she has coordinated field research projects on the Stanislaus River and other tributaries to the San Joaquin River which has required considerable networking and coordination with state, federal and local government personnel, private consultants, landowners and recreational groups. Her contacts within the basin and her knowledge of Stanislaus River research and recreational activities are an invaluable asset to the SRWSP.

Chrissy Sonke has worked in the Stanislaus Basin since 1999 and grew up in the nearby city of Ripon. In addition to her experience coordinating fisheries research on the Stanislaus River and other San Joaquin River tributaries with Doug and Andrea, she is also skilled in website creation and management. In the short time she has worked on the Stanislaus River, she has earned respect from and developed good working relationships with agency personnel.

The following is a list of projects selected to describe our knowledge of the Stanislaus River, our understanding of Chinook Salmon and Steelhead issues in California and the Pacific Northwest, our experience identifying key issues for watershed planning, and our ability to coordinate with other entities.

#### **Selected Projects:**

**Juvenile Chinook Outmigration, Stanislaus River. Tri-Dam Project (1992-2001).** S.P. Cramer & Associates reviewed existing data and reports on fish populations in the Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers to determine the probable impacts of Tri-Dam Project's water storage and release practices on chinook salmon. We fished a rotary screw trap at RM 40 in the Stanislaus River during winter and spring in most years since 1993 to determine the size, timing and abundance of juvenile chinook emigrants. We conducted a variety of mark-recapture tests to estimate migration rate, survival and trapping efficiency.

**Radio Tracking of Juvenile Chinook in the Stanislaus River. Tri-Dam Project (1998-99).** S.P. Cramer & Associates radio tagged and tracked subyearling chinook (100-115 mm fork length) as they migrated through the lower Stanislaus River. Mobile tracking via jet sled and fixed station monitors were used in each year. We found specific locations in the river where predation on tagged chinook was consistently greater than elsewhere. Diel timing of migration, daily migration distances, and habitat use were also determined.

**Annual Production of Juvenile Chinook, Stanislaus River. USFWS (1995-2001).** S.P. Cramer & Associates fished two rotary screw traps on the lower Stanislaus River to estimate size, time and total abundance of juvenile chinook migrating out of the river. Mark-recapture tests were used to estimate trap efficiency, and data were compared to that at a trap 30 miles upstream to describe migration rates and survival between the trapping stations.

**Predation on Juvenile Chinook in the Stanislaus River. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1999).** S.P. Cramer & Associates used a boat electrofisher and radio tracking to determine the species of fish that was preying on radio-tagged subyearling chinook. Periodic electrofishing surveys at night showed that striped bass were the most common predator in the main river channel and largemouth bass were the most common predator in backwater areas. We succeeded at tracking and electrofishing three radio-tagged juveniles that showed unusual behavior, and each was found in the gut of a striped bass. Live cage tests showed that radio tags consumed by either largemouth or striped bass remained in the predator's gut for at least one week, and the tag remained easily detected by tracking equipment.

**The Status of Puget Sound Chinook Salmon and an Assessment of Approaches to their Recovery, Consortium of Seattle Area Corporations (1999).** S.P. Cramer & Associates led a team of Northwest consultants to prepare a source book on the status of chinook on all rivers in Puget Sound. The report also addresses the specific factors limiting recovery of chinook; and described a framework for prioritizing restoration actions and judging their probable benefits. Our efforts were coordinated with Governor Locke's Salmon Recovery Team, and the report was designed to serve as a working reference for businesses and local governments as they engaged in recovery issues.

**Candidate Conservation Agreement for the lower Stanislaus River, TriDam Project, Oakdale Irrigation District, and South San Joaquin Irrigation District (1998).** We assembled available information on the abundance, distribution and dynamics of chinook salmon, and rainbow trout in the lower 60 miles of the Stanislaus River. Synthesis of this information was used to identify the factors driving abundance of these fish and design a plan of action for the irrigation districts in the basin that would conserve the fish and habitat influenced by those districts. The plan was used in consultation with NMFS during their ESA status review of chinook salmon.

**Status and Dynamics of Steelhead in California.** Association of California Water Agencies (1994-95). S.P. Cramer & Associates was retained to lead a team of fisheries consultants throughout California to assemble and analyze available information on all steelhead populations in the state. We quantified several life-history characteristics of hatchery and wild stocks, and compared them to genetics data to identify Evolutionary Significant Units. We examined several indices of ocean survival of steelhead, including dam counts, hatchery returns, angler catch, diver counts, and juvenile densities. We produced two reports that were submitted to NMFS for their status review of steelhead as a candidate for ESA listing. The first was on the structuring and trends of steelhead populations throughout the state, and the second was on recommendations for restoring steelhead populations.

**Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment, Grande Ronde Basin.** Mobrاند Biometrics, Inc. (1995-96). S.P. Cramer & Associates teamed with Mobrاند Biometrics, Inc. to provide expert consultation services to (1) develop and describe habitat conditions that presently inhibits the achievement of spring chinook salmon restoration in the Grand Ronde Basin, (2) identify habitat conditions that produced healthy populations of spring chinook in the Grande Ronde Basin, and (3) develop scientifically based methods for analyzing habitat restoration trade-offs. The project was designed to assist the Grande Ronde Model Watershed planning efforts.

### **3. BUDGET DESCRIPTION**

The budget for each objective and associated tasks includes labor, travel, and all other materials necessary to complete the work. Labor totals include individual salary or hourly employee wages, benefits, and company overhead. The total requested from CALFED over three years is \$537,936 with \$85,032 of cost share provided by Tri-Dam Project, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, and Oakdale Irrigation District. Budgets for 2002 and 2003 are higher as a result of subtasks which will be completed during the first two years of the project.

Travel is estimated on a per mile basis at the rate of \$0.35 per mile. The expendables category includes the cost of copying, cell and wire phone charges, office supplies, lodging, miscellaneous equipment rental, computer server space rental, URL registration costs, and all other supplies necessary to complete the project.

#### **Objective 1:**

Objective 1 consists of the majority of the SRWSP, including the establishment of a Watershed Coordinator. The objective consists of 1) collecting, managing, and distributing information, 2) preparation of Watershed Implementation Plan and coordination of watershed activities, and 3) conduct outreach and education. The total budget for Objective 1 and its three tasks is \$396,792 of which \$60,000 will be cost shared. The total requested from CALFED is \$336,792 for Objective 1 and its three tasks.

Task 1.2 includes the preparation of the Watershed Implementation Plan and coordination of watershed activities. The budget is \$64,104 for the first year and \$63,104 for the second and third years. Although the Watershed Implementation Plan will require a significant amount of time in 2002, there is not a significant reduction in time or cost in 2003 or 2004. This is due to the fact that more time will be spent in 2003 and 2004 implementing the Plan created in 2002. One computer is planned for purchase. Travel costs for Objective 1 are \$10,000 in 2002 and \$8,000 in 2003 and 2004. A significant amount of travel will be required due to the frequency with which the SRWSP will meet with partners, and the long distances that we will be required to travel.

The budget for Task 1.3 is \$37,448 in 2002, but only \$30,496 in 2003 and 2004. Additional time and expenses were budgeted in the first year to develop educational tools and specific outreach programs. Funds were included each year to pay for printing costs for reports, pamphlets, and preparation of other outreach and educational materials.

#### **Objective 2:**

Objective 2 consists of two tasks and the total budget is \$126,240 in 2002, \$34,272 in 2003, and only \$24,240 in 2004. Watershed partners will cost share \$25,032, so the total requested from CALFED is \$159,720. Task 2.1 includes funds to create and maintain the web page, and since the page will be created within 6 months of the project start, the budget is lower in 2003 and 2004 because it only includes funds to update the page and post additional data each week.

The budget for Task 2.2 is \$74,240 in 2002, \$10,032 in 2003, and \$0 in 2004. The task is scheduled to take 16 months to complete, with the majority of the work accomplished in the first 12 months of the project. The task is labor intensive, since raw data will have to be entered into the computer and error checked several times. Descriptions of the work and other assumptions about the data may also have to be written and included with the database. Additional time was also included for computer programming, since a large database can be complicated to run effectively over the internet.

#### **Objective 3:**

Objective 3 consists of one task which will be performed equally each year from 2002 to 2004. The budget is \$13,808 each year for a three year total of \$41,124.

#### **4. TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY**

Although the lower Stanislaus River does not have a watershed stewardship program, several San Joaquin tributaries have developed and implemented community-based stewardship programs with high levels of success. The lower Tuolumne and Mokelumne rivers have established stewardship programs to direct restoration efforts and ensure effective communication among participants. These stewardship programs are on-going and have acquired support from the community in a variety of ways, and are good examples that much can be accomplished on the watershed level with proper guidance.

The SRWSP will look to similar programs and projects in adjacent watersheds for successful models to organize a watershed group involving local landowners, educational institutions, stakeholders, local state and federal agencies and other interested persons and groups, and through this organization will develop a community strategy for management of the Stanislaus watershed. The SRWSP will work with successful watershed programs to apply common principles of watershed management and public outreach to the Stanislaus watershed. We will follow a similar approach to the Lower Mokelumne River Watershed Stewardship Program (LMRWSP), which successfully provided a forum for community-based meetings to develop a shared vision and stewardship plan for the watershed. Community involvement in developing a watershed stewardship program has been shown to result in substantial benefits to stakeholders, anadromous fisheries, wildlife, and riparian ecosystem integrity and diversity.

The SRWSP has a high degree of implementability because it has widespread support, is community based, and will be implemented by a qualified team of biologists with substantial experience in the Stanislaus River watershed. Because of our basin experience, we have already made many of the contacts necessary within and beyond the scientific community to bolster support and to build a solid technical advisory team.

The SRWSP headquarters will be S.P. Cramer & Associates' Central Valley office located in Oakdale. Field research equipment and labor resources are available from this office to support research efforts within the basin. Maintaining equipment the appropriate field sampling equipment will allowed our organization to provide assistance to many research projects within the basin. We also have access to nearby conference facilities at many of the local irrigation districts including Oakdale Irrigation District (OID), Stockton East Water District (SEWD), South San Joaquin District (SSJID), and Tri-Dam Project where public meetings and workshops can be held. These entities have provided labor and equipment to various Stanislaus River projects in the past, and we believe by maintaining a productive relationship with them, they will continue to generously support both public and privately conducted projects.

Information from research, restoration, monitoring, and education programs will be made available to all parties through meetings, newsletters, and by accessing stanislausriver.com. The SRWSP will provide information and tools to community groups and schools to promote watershed education, will work with agencies such as the Army Corps of

Engineers to increase effectiveness of current outreach programs, and will work with city and county governments to develop educational programs and increase community awareness of watershed issues. The SRWSP will coordinate a series of public meetings and workshops to engage watershed partners in the development of the Stanislaus Watershed Implementation Plan. The creation of a Watershed Implementation Plan will provide necessary direction in prioritizing watershed activities. By increasing community awareness and encouraging continued involvement and feedback the effectiveness of the organization will increase.

At the end of three years, the SRWSP will have produced a well defined implementation plan for the watershed, and together with watershed partners will be working towards restoration, outreach, and education goals. We expect the SRWSP will prove valuable to the watershed and there will be local support and funding to continue the program.

## **5. MONITORING**

There will be no physical or biological monitoring required for the SRWSP; however, the SRWSP will be evaluated with a performance survey each year. We will also gauge the effectiveness of the SRWSP through constant feedback received from the watershed community, and by measuring community participation at watershed events and meetings. We will monitor the usage of the website by using a counting device that tracks how often the site is visited, and by creating a discussion board within the website where questions and comments can be posted.

## **6. CONSERVATION, MAINTENANCE AND RESTORATION ACTIONS**

No significant effort has been put into locating and preserving historical data and documents relating to the Stanislaus River watershed. The watershed will benefit immediately, as well as in the future, by taking the time to compile and summarize historical information. It is already believed that historical data has been lost due to field biologist staffing changes at some of the agencies. Additional delays in the completion of this task will only increase that loss.

Due to extensive experience in the Stanislaus basin, the SRWSP's team of biologists have knowledge of the types of information that should exist, and have relationships with the managers with whom they will need to work to preserve this data. With an office located in Oakdale, the SRWSP's biologists can efficiently meet with watershed partners as often as necessary, and with little advanced notice.

All activities performed by the SRWSP will be aimed at preserving native species and their habitats. This may occur directly, such as supporting salmon habitat restoration, or indirectly, such as through preserving historical data files.

## **7. CALFED OBJECTIVES**

The SRWSP concept was conceived based on the value that local watershed management lends to achieving CALFED goals by creating an effective feedback loop and establishing a means of educating the community about current watershed issues. Community awareness and the free exchange of ideas are essential to creating a consensus based management plan tailored to the unique needs of individual watershed communities. Implementing community supported management plans will help to achieve the goals of the CALFED program efficiently.

This proposal promotes CALFED's Watershed Program objectives by facilitating and improving coordination and assistance among government agencies and other organizations. This requires coordination and a central entity to bring all parties together and create channels through which information and ideas can be exchanged and integrated into a watershed management plan. The SRWSP will provide this leadership which presently does not exist in the Stanislaus River watershed.

Another Watershed Program objective is to develop watershed monitoring and assessment protocols to be integrated into the CALFED monitoring program. These protocols cannot be established unless the community is aware of the success or failure of past projects or the status of projects underway. The SRWSP will serve as a clearinghouse for the dissemination of this information to the community on a realtime basis for feedback. Providing this realtime feedback loop allows for adaptive management of the watershed.

Another primary Watershed Program objective is education and outreach. Under the leadership of the SRWSP, channels for the flow of information among watershed constituents are created. Bringing ideas and information together will

create a pool of knowledge available for the education of the community which will encourage involvement and allow for more informed decision making on watershed management issues.

By targeting the objectives of CALFED's Watershed Program, the SRWSP will provide local leadership, create a science based and community supported management plan, and establish channels for the flow of information between watershed partners and CALFED Program managers.

Since the SRWSP will be utilizing existing information, no field activities will be conducted which would require environmental permits.

## **8. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

### **Compliance with Standard Terms and Conditions**

Our program has been developed in compliance with all of CALFED's standard terms and conditions presented in section 8 of the 2001 PSP. We have reviewed CALFED's standard terms and conditions and will comply. The SRWSP applicant and participants/collaborators assisting in implementing this program have no real or perceived conflict of interest, and the SRWSP is designed to comply with all applicable laws and regulations, does not prejudice the ultimate decision on the CALFED long-term program and involves willing, voluntary participants.

### **Program Support**

In soliciting comments during draft proposal preparation we made time to meet with a significant number of watershed partners. All were supportive of the stewardship concept and all agreed that there is an immediate need for coordination of information and activities in the basin. All the input we received from the community has been integrated into this final proposal, one way or another. Overall, the SRWSP concept is supported by government agencies (USBR, USACE, CDFG, USFWS), landowners, environmentalists, angling groups, recreational interests, city and county officials, water right holders, irrigation districts, a hydroelectric power provider in the basin, and many members of the general public. Specific private entities that strongly support the proposal are Oakdale Irrigation District, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, San Joaquin River Authority, Tri-Dam Project, and Stockton East Water District.

Stanislaus River Watershed Stewardship Program Budget Summary					
	Task Description	Completion Date	Matching Funds	CAL FED Funds	Total
Objective 1	Manage info and coordinate watershed activities.	2002-2004	\$60,000	\$336,792	\$396,792
<i>Task 1.1. Collect, manage, and distribute watershed information.</i>	Collect information from various sources and distribute to watershed partners on real-time basis. Meet with watershed partners often to coordinate activities. Seek guidance from Stan Fish Group at each meeting. Oversight provided by Demko, with Phillips and Sonke providing majority of services.	Task ongoing for 3 years.	\$0	\$108,040	\$108,040
<i>Task 1.2. Prepare watershed plan and coordinate activities.</i>	Prepare draft plan and seek review and input from Stan Fish Group at each meeting. Plan will be completed in first 6 months of project, while coordination aspect of task will continue for 3 years. Oversight and watershed coordination provided by Demko, with Phillips and Sonke supporting. Plan created by Stan Fish Group and Demko with support from Phillips, and Sonke.	6 months to complete Plan, 3 years for coordination aspect of project.	\$30,000	\$160,312	\$190,312
<i>Task 1.3. Conduct outreach and education.</i>	Meet with Stan Fish Group every 2 months, with stakeholders and public as often as needed and at least once every month. Coordinate with agencies regularly. Most of outreach and education conducted by Phillips, due to established relationships and personality that is well suited to public outreach. Demko providing oversight and technical aspects of outreach.	Task ongoing for 3 years.	\$30,000	\$68,440	\$98,440
<b>PRODUCT</b>	Task 1.1 will produce regular summaries of watershed meetings and will be distributed to partners and placed on the internet. Task 1.2 will include the completion of a Watershed Implementation Plan which will be reviewed by the Stan Fish Group and distributed to watershed partners, then used to guide basin activities through 2004. Slide presentations, on-line video clips and photos, and other educational tools will be prepared for Task 1.3. Distribute annual report detailing all activities and accomplishments.				
<b>SUCCESS CRITERIA</b>	Success will be judged on public and stakeholder participation; number of projects implemented and funded; direct feedback from stakeholders and public. Project success will be continually monitored via discussions with basin stakeholders, the public, and the Stan Fish Group. An on-line survey evaluation will also solicit continual performance feedback.				

<b>Objective 2.</b>	<b>Create and maintain on-line info resource and database.</b>	<b>2002-2004</b>	<b>\$25,032</b>	<b>\$159,720</b>	<b>\$184,752</b>
<i>Task 2.1. Create web page.</i>	Establish URL, construct web page, post data and documents created after year 2002 by agencies and private consultants. Update site weekly with data from various projects, meeting notes, project summaries, outreach and education tools.	W e b p a g e completed within 6 months. Weekly updates and other data posting will occur for 3 years.	\$0	\$100,480	\$100,480
<i>Task 2.2. Compile historical information</i>	Search private consultant and agency files for documents and data. Enter documents and data into electronic format, summarize and graph, and upload to web site. Work with agencies to locate all historical documents and assure accuracy of data.	The majority of this task will be completed in the first year (2002) of the project, with only 304 hours scheduled for 2003.	\$ 25,032	\$59,240	\$84,272
<b>PRODUCT</b>	Task 2.1 will create a web site which will be updated each week for the duration of the project. Task 2.2 will produce a historical paper and electronic database available to all watershed partners on the internet. Copies (paper and electronic) will be supplied to CDFG and USFWS.				
<b>SUCCESS CRITERIA</b>	Success will be judged by the number of documents found, summarized, and placed on the internet. Thousands of pages of data and information have already been located, so it is certain that a substantial amount of historical fish data will be summarized and placed on the internet. Records will be kept on the number of people that use the web site, how long they stay, and what type of information they download to help assess the usefulness of the site. A user survey will also be used to help determine what is most useful to watershed partners.				
<b>Objective 3.</b>	<b>Increase efficiency of Stan Fish Group.</b>	<b>2002-2004</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$41,424</b>	<b>\$41,424</b>
<i>Task 3.1 Coordinate regular meetings.</i>	Provide professional and administrative services to the Stan Fish Group. Organize meetings, prepare summary documents, prepare project summaries, host tours of river and project sites.	2002-2004	\$0	\$41,424	\$41,424
<b>PRODUCT</b>	Primary product will be a more efficient group which accomplishes more, and reduced demands on agency staff time.				
<b>SUCCESS CRITERIA</b>	Success will be evaluated by the Stan Fish Group on a meeting by meeting basis. Comparison of productivity of group over last 4 years will be possible.				

Annual Stanislaus River Watershed Stewardship Program Budget 2002-2004

<i>BUDGET 2002</i>	Tech 2/1	Bio 1/1	Bio 1/2	Bio 3/5	Labor			Total	Matchin	Total
	Hours Rate	Hours Rate	Hours Rate	Hours Rate	Subtotal	Travel	Expendables	Cost	Funds	CALFED
Objective 1: Manage information and coordinate watershed activities.										
Task 1.1: Collect, manage, and distribute watershed information.	-	384 \$60	-	96 \$90	\$31,680	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$37,680	\$0	\$37,680
Task 1.2: Prepare Watershed Implementation Plan and coordinate watershed activities.	-	-	192 \$62	480 \$90	\$55,104	\$6,000	\$3,000	\$64,104	\$10,000	\$54,104
Task 1.3: Conduct watershed outreach and develop education tools.	-	-	384 \$62	96 \$90	\$32,448	\$1,000	\$4,000	\$37,448	\$10,000	\$27,448
Objective Subtotal	0	384	576	672	\$119,232	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$139,232	\$20,000	\$119,232
Objective 2: Create and maintain on-line information resource and database.										
Task 2.1: Create and maintain web page www.stanislausriver.com.	-	800 \$60	-	-	\$48,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$52,000	\$0	\$52,000
Task 2.2: Compile historical information and data and put on-line.	1280 \$33	480 \$60	-	-	\$71,040	\$1,200	\$2,000	\$74,240	\$15,000	\$59,240
Objective Subtotal	1280	1280	0	0	\$119,040	\$1,200	\$6,000	\$126,240	\$15,000	\$111,240
Objective 3: Increase efficiency of the Stanislaus River Fish Group.										
Task 3.1: Coordinate regular Stanislaus River Fish Group meetings.	-	-	64 \$62	96 \$90	\$12,608	\$600	\$600	\$13,808	\$0	\$13,808
Objective Subtotal	0	0	64	96	\$12,608	\$600	\$600	\$13,808	\$0	\$13,808
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,280</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>\$250,880</b>	<b>\$11,800</b>	<b>\$16,600</b>	<b>\$279,280</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$244,280</b>

\*Tech 2/1 is a Fisheries Technician Step 2, Level 1; Bio 1/1 is a Fisheries Biologist Step 1, Level 1; and so on.

<i>BUDGET 2003</i>	Tech 2/1	Bio 1/1	Bio 1/2	Bio 3/5	Labor			Total	Matchin	Total
	Hours Rate	Hours Rate	Hours Rate	Hours Rate	Subtotal	Travel	Expendables	Cost	Funds	CALFED
Objective 1: Manage information and coordinate watershed activities.										
Task 1.1: Collect, manage, and distribute watershed information.	-	384 \$60	-	96 \$90	\$31,680	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$35,680	\$0	\$35,680
Task 1.2: Prepare Watershed Implementation Plan and coordinate watershed activities.	-	-	192 \$62	480 \$90	\$55,104	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$63,104	\$10,000	\$53,104
Task 1.3: Conduct watershed outreach and develop education tools.	0	-	288 \$62	96 \$90	\$26,496	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$30,496	\$10,000	\$20,496
Objective Subtotal	0	384	480	672	\$113,280	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$129,280	\$20,000	\$109,280
Objective 2: Create and maintain on-line information resource and database.										
Task 2.1: Create and maintain web page www.stanislausriver.com.	-	384 \$60	-	-	\$23,040	\$0	\$1,200	\$24,240	\$0	\$24,240
Task 2.2: Compile historical information and data and put on-line.	304 \$33	-	-	-	\$10,032	\$0	\$0	\$10,032	\$10,032	\$0
Objective Subtotal	304	384	0	0	\$33,072	\$0	\$1,200	\$34,272	\$10,032	\$24,240
Objective 3: Increase efficiency of the Stanislaus River Fish Group.										
Task 3.1: Coordinate regular Stanislaus River Fish Group meetings.	-	-	64 \$62	96 \$90	\$12,608	\$600	\$600	\$13,808	\$0	\$13,808
Objective Subtotal	0	0	64	96	\$12,608	\$600	\$600	\$13,808	\$0	\$13,808
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>\$158,960</b>	<b>\$8,600</b>	<b>\$9,800</b>	<b>\$177,360</b>	<b>\$30,032</b>	<b>\$147,328</b>

\*Tech 2/1 is a Fisheries Technician Step 2, Level 1; Bio 1/1 is a Fisheries Biologist Step 1, Level 1; and so on.

<i>BUDGET 2004</i>	Tech 2/1		Bio 1/1		Bio 1/2		Bio 3/5		Labor			Total	Matchin	Total	
	Hours	Rate	Hours	Rate	Hours	Rate	Hours	Rate	Subtotal	Travel	Expendables	Cost	Funds	CALFED	
Objective 1: Manage information and coordinate watershed activities.															
Task 1.1: Collect, manage, and distribute watershed information.	-	-	384	\$60	-	-	96	\$90	\$31,680	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$34,680	\$0	\$34,680	
Task 1.2: Prepare Watershed Implementation Plan and coordinate watershed activities.	-	-	-	-	192	\$62	480	\$90	\$55,104	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$63,104	\$10,000	\$53,104	
Task 1.3: Conduct watershed outreach and develop education tools.	-	-	-	-	288	\$62	96	\$90	\$26,496	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$30,496	\$10,000	\$20,496	
Objective Subtotal	0	-	384	-	480	-	672	-	\$113,280	\$8,000	\$7,000	\$128,280	\$20,000	\$108,280	
Objective 2: Create and maintain on-line information resource and database.															
Task 2.1: Create and maintain web page www.stanislausriver.com.	-	-	384	\$60	-	-	-	-	\$23,040	\$0	\$1,200	\$24,240	\$0	\$24,240	
Task 2.2: Compile historical information and data and put on-line.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Objective Subtotal	0	-	384	-	0	-	0	-	\$23,040	\$0	\$1,200	\$24,240	\$0	\$24,240	
Objective 3: Increase efficiency of the Stanislaus River Fish Group.															
Task 3.1: Coordinate regular Stanislaus River Fish Group meetings.	-	-	-	-	64	\$62	96	\$90	\$12,608	\$600	\$600	\$13,808	\$0	\$13,808	
Objective Subtotal	0	-	0	-	64	-	96	-	\$12,608	\$600	\$600	\$13,808	\$0	\$13,808	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$148,928</b>	<b>\$8,600</b>	<b>\$8,800</b>	<b>\$166,328</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>\$146,328</b>	

\*Tech 2/1 is a Fisheries Technician Step 2, Level 1; Bio 1/1 is a Fisheries Biologist Step 1, Level 1; and so on.

<i>TOTAL BUDGET 2002-2004</i>	Labor			Total	Matchin	Total
	Subtotal	Travel	Expendables	Cost	Funds	CALFED
Total to Complete All Objectives and Tasks	\$558,768	\$29,000	\$35,200	\$622,968	\$85,032	\$537,936

**Environmental Information Form**

**Successful applicants are responsible for complying with all applicable laws and regulations for their projects, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

**NEPA/CEQA**

*Any necessary NEPA or CEQA documents for an approved project must tier from the CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR. Approved projects must incorporate mitigation strategies listed in Appendix A of the CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision to avoid or minimize the projects adverse environmental impacts. Applicants are encouraged to review the Programmatic EIS/EIR and incorporate the applicable mitigation strategies from Appendix A of the Programmatic Record of Decision in developing their projects and the NEPA/CEQA documents for their projects.*

1. Will this project require compliance with CEQA, NEPA, or both? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

If you checked no to question 1, please explain why compliance is not required for the actions in this proposal> **The SRWSP will be utilizing existing information and no field activities will be conducted which would require environmental permits.**

If the project will require CEQA and/or NEPA compliance, identify the lead agency(ies).

CEQA Lead Agency \_\_\_\_\_

NEPA Lead Agency \_\_\_\_\_

Please check which type of document will be prepared.

CEQA	NEPA
Categorical Exemption _____	Categorical Exclusion _____
Initial Study _____	Environmental Assessment/FONSI _____
EIR _____	EIS _____

5. If you anticipate relying on either or both the Categorical Exemption or Categorical Exclusion for this project, please specifically identify the exemption and/or exclusion that covers this project. (Example: Fish and Wildlife Service Manual at 516 DM 6 Appendix 1.4 Categorical Exclusions Section B Resources Management: (1) Research, inventory, and information collection activities directly related to the conservation of fish and wildlife resources.)

If the CEQA/NEPA process is not complete, please describe the estimated timelines for the process and the expected date of completion.

6. If the CEQA/NEPA document has been completed:

What is the name of the document? \_\_\_\_\_

Please attach a copy of the CEQA/NEPA document to the application.  
Environmental Permitting and Approvals

Successful applicants must tier their project's permitting from the CALFED Record of Decision and attachments providing programmatic guidance on complying with the state and federal endangered species acts, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act. The CALFED Program will provide assistance with project permitting through its newly established permit clearing house.

Please indicate what permits or other approvals may be required for the activities contained in your proposal and which have already been obtained. Please check all that apply.

**No permits are required for this proposal.**

<b>LOCAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS</b>	<b>Needed?</b>	<b>Obtained?</b>
Conditional use permit		
Variance		
Subdivision Map Act		
Grading permit		
General plan amendment		
Specific plan approval		
Rezone		
Williamson Act Contract cancellation		
Other		
<b>STATE PERMITS AND APPROVALS</b>	<b>Needed?</b>	<b>Obtained?</b>
Scientific collecting permit		
CESA compliance: 2081		
CESA compliance: NCCP		
1601/03		
CWA 401 certification		
Coastal development permit		
Reclamation Board approval		
Notification of DPC or BCDC		
Other		
<b>FEDERAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS</b>	<b>Needed?</b>	<b>Obtained?</b>
ESA compliance Section 7 consultation		

ESA compliance Section 10 permit		
Rivers and Harbors Act		
CWA 404		
Other		

<b>PERMISSION TO ACCESS PROPERTY</b>		
Permission to access city, county or other local agency land. If yes, indicate the name of the agency: _____		
Permission to access state land. If yes, indicate the name of the agency: _____		
Permission to access federal land. If yes, indicate the name of the agency: _____		
Permission to access private land. If yes, indicate the name of the agency: _____		

**CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM  
PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE  
LAND USE CHECKLIST**

All applicants must fill out this Land Use Checklist for their proposal. Applications must contain answers to the following questions to be responsive and to be considered for funding. Failure to answer these questions and include them with the application will result in the application being considered nonresponsive and not considered for funding.

- 1) Do the actions in the proposal involve physical changes in the land use? Yes No 
  - a) If you answered yes to # 1, describe what actions will occur on the land involved in the proposal?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  - b) If you answered no to # 1, explain what type of actions are involved in the proposal (i.e., research only, planning only). The proposal involves research of existing data and planning. No physical or on-the-ground work will be involved.
  
- 2) How many acres of land will be subject to a land use change under the proposal? \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 3) What is the current land use of the area subject to a land use change under the proposal? What is the current zoning and general plan designation(s) for the property? Does the current land use involve agricultural production?
  - a) Current land use \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Current zoning \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Current general plan designation \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) Does current use involve agricultural production? YES NO
  
- 4) Is the land subject to a land use change in the proposal currently under a Williamson Act contract?  
YES NO
  
- 5) What is the proposed land use of the area subject to a land use change under the proposal?
  
- 6) Will the applicant acquire any land under the proposal, either in fee or through a conservation easement?  
YES NO
  - a) If you answered yes to # 6, describe the number of acres that will be acquired and whether the acquisition will be of fee title or a conservation easement:
  
  
  
  
  
  - b) Total number of acres to be acquired under proposal \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Number of acres to be acquired in fee \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) Number of acres to be subject to conservation easement \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 7) For all lands subject to a land use change under the proposal, describe what entity or organization will manage the property and provide operations and maintenance services.

**8) Will the applicant require access across public or private property that the applicant does not own to accomplish the activities in the proposal? Yes No**

**a) If yes, the applicant must attach written permission for access from the relevant property owner(s). Failure to include written permission for access may result in disqualification of the proposal during the review process. Research and monitoring field projects for which specific sites have not been identified will be required to provide access needs and permission for access within 30 days of notification of approval.**

**9) For land acquisitions (fee title or easements), will existing water rights be acquired? Yes No**

**10) Does the applicant propose any modifications to the water right or change in the delivery of the water? Yes No**

**a) If yes to #10, please describe the modifications or changes.**