

## Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2005

**I. Program Title.** Habitat Restoration Program CVPIA Section 3406(b)(1) other

### II. Responsible Entities

	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Staff Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
Co-Lead	USFWS	Caroline Prose	Program Manager
Co-Lead	USBR	John Thomson	Program Manager

### III. Program Objectives for FY 2005

The objectives for the Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) were originally listed in the CVPIA Habitat Restoration Program Draft Project Plan (September 2000, revised in August 2003). These objectives are listed below. They reflect priorities for 2005, as well as the overall goals of the program.

A. Protect and restore native habitats impacted by the Central Valley Project (CVP) that are not specifically addressed in the Fish and Wildlife Restoration Activities section of the CVPIA. The focus in 2005, as in years past, will be on habitats known to have experienced the greatest percentage decline in habitat quantity and quality since construction of the CVP, where such decline could be attributed to the CVP (based on direct and indirect loss of habitat from CVP facilities and use of CVP water). These habitats include riparian, aquatic (riverine, estuarine, and lacustrine), alkali desert scrub, wetlands (including vernal pools), foothill chaparral, valley-foothill hardwood, and grassland.

B. Stabilize and improve populations of native species impacted by the CVP that are not specifically addressed in the Fish and Wildlife Restoration Activities section of the CVPIA. Focus will be given to federally listed, proposed, or candidate species, other non-listed State and Federal species of special concern including resident fish and migratory birds, and other native wildlife species associated with the habitat types listed in "A" above. Examples of the latter include native herptofauna associated with riparian and/or valley-foothill hardwood habitat throughout the Central Valley, native raptor species dependent upon valley-foothill hardwood and grassland for nesting and foraging, and neotropical species that use riparian corridors for migration, nesting, and foraging.

The goals and objectives of the HRP are integrated with the goals and objectives of the CVP Conservation Program (CP), which include protecting, restoring, and mitigating or enhancing for past impacts of the CVP. Both Programs receive proposals through the same proposal solicitation process, and are reviewed, ranked, and selected for funding by the same multi-agency team, using established criteria such as listed species baseline benefits, number of multiple habitats that would benefit, etc. Meeting both the CP and HRP goals

and objectives help ensure that conditions continue to improve for species that were impacted by the CVP.

#### **IV. Status of the Program.**

The HRP is a continuing program which commenced in FY1996. As stated in the Final CVPIA Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, the estimated annual costs of the program are \$1.5 million. As of August 2004, the Program has funded 69 projects located throughout the Central Valley with a total budget of about \$19,668,298. In accordance with the CVPIA Biological Opinion, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) annually request that adequate funding be allocated to the HRP to protect and enhance ecosystems of listed species and support recovery of listed species. Projects funded through the HRP have contributed to implementing actions recommended in recovery plans for the following species: California red-legged frog, upland species of the San Joaquin Valley, valley elderberry beetle, riparian brush rabbit, vernal pools species, and Gabbro soil plants.

About 98,179 acres of habitat for listed, proposed, and candidate species, and species of special concern have been protected through acquisition of fee title or conservation easement. Habitats protected include vernal pool, riparian, alkali scrub, foothill chaparral, valley-foothill hardwood, and grassland. Additionally, the HRP has funded surveys for listed species, genetic research, and construction of a captive reproduction facility for the listed riparian brush rabbit. Other projects include funding habitat restoration at the Colusa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and Sacramento River NWR, and giant garter snake survey and trapping efforts at the Colusa NWR, San Luis NWR, and Grassland Water District. Although the restoration projects are only a few years old, the habitat has responded favorably to restoration efforts. Riparian vegetation at several locations (e.g., Llano Seco) has experienced about an 80% survival rate since being planted for restoration, and preliminary monitoring results have indicated that additional permanent wetland habitat restored at Colusa NWR has been actively used by giant garter snakes since spring 2000. Giant garter snake surveying and trapping results will ultimately be used by habitat managers to better manage wetland and upland habitats. At the Grassland Water District, for example, use of radiotelemetry will aid managers in learning about the size of the snakes's home ranges, location of hibernacula, and the activity periods of the snakes.

Surveys for the San Joaquin kit fox, giant garter snake, California red-legged frog, yellow-billed cuckoo, riparian brush rabbit, Buena Vista lake shrew, and riparian woodrat, have provided valuable data on the distribution of these species and their habitat requirements. This information will be used to contribute towards the recovery of these species. In 1999, the HRP funded a comprehensive GIS historic trend analysis to address habitat loss in the Central Valley. The project was completed by California State University, Chico in 2002 and has provided valuable information in developing annual priorities and in establishing long-term qualitative goals for the HRP. The priorities indicated in Section VI are in part reflective of the findings of this analysis.

Because the CVP impacted upland habitats throughout the Valley, it is appropriate for the HRP to focus on these communities, since they are not addressed by other programs established by the CVPIA. Riparian and aquatic habitats, and the species that depend on these habitats, can benefit from projects implemented through CVPIA programs such as the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, San Joaquin River Riparian Habitat Restoration Program, and Gravel Replenishment and Riparian Habitat Restoration Program. While the HRP funds projects specifically addressing upland terrestrial habitats and associated listed species, projects directed at restoring riparian habitats are also considered a valuable tool in meeting the goals of the HRP. Improving baseline conditions for riparian associated species impacted by the CVP, but not specifically addressed by other CVPIA programs, is continually evaluated as one of the HRP's annual priority actions.

## **V. FY 2004 Accomplishments**

Eight conservation actions were funded in FY04 at a cost of \$1,668,298 (does not include costs for Program Administration). Two of these actions provided additional funding to continue projects that were initiated in previous years.

The six actions that were new to the HRP in Fiscal Year 2004 are as follows:

- (1) Funds (\$32,300) were provided to a researcher for an Adaptive Vegetation Management on Serpentine Soils Study, to assess grazing impacts on native serpentine plant species on Coyote Ridge in Santa Clara County. Developing this information and applying it in adaptive land management are priority tasks for recovery of the Bay checkerspot butterfly, Santa Clara Valley dudleya, Metcalf Canyon jewelflower, and other species.
- (2) Funds (\$62,500) were provided to The Nature Conservancy for riparian restoration on 206 acres on the Ohm property along the Sacramento River in Tehama County. Species that would benefit include the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and bald eagle.
- (3) Funds (\$325,000) were provided to River Partners for the Drumheller Slough Riparian Restoration project. Riparian restoration would occur on 226 acres on Drumheller Slough within the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge in Glenn County. The valley elderberry longhorn beetle and giant garter snake would benefit.
- (4) Funds (\$541,000) were provided to the Bureau of Land Management for fee title acquisition of 5,810 acres of the Ansin property, located inside and outside of the Carizzo Plain National Monument in Kern County. Habitat is comprised of alkali scrub, saltbush scrub, and semi-desert scrub. Species that would benefit include the San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, giant kangaroo rat, San Joaquin woolly threads, and Kern primrose sphinx moth.
- (5) Funds (\$350,000) were provided to the Trust for Public Lands for fee title acquisition of 708 acres of oak woodland and riparian habitat at the mouth of Fine Gold Creek, tributary

to the San Joaquin River in Madera County. Species that would benefit include the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, bald eagle, and California tiger salamander.

- (6) Funds (\$31,000) were provided to the Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture for buy-in to a habitat restoration “clearinghouse” webpage, and to gain access to valley-wide project data. The webpage will delineate and provide data related to other habitat restoration projects throughout the Central Valley. The HRP will be included as part of the webpage data base and HRP managers will gain access to all project information. Access to this information will enable HRP managers to better evaluate site connectivity and cumulative effects of HRP proposals.

The two continuing actions for Fiscal Year 2004 are as follows:

- (1) Funds (\$88,619) were provided to the Colusa NWR and USGS to continue monitoring giant garter snakes at the Colusa NWR in Colusa County. Identification of a significant population of snakes in the central portion of the refuge has led to implementation of best management practices and creation of a restored wetland area that benefit the snake.
- (2) Funds (\$237,879) were provided to the Grassland Water District (\$102,620) and San Luis NWR (\$135,259) to conduct a second year of surveys of giant garter snake populations in Merced County. Tasks included investigating the feasibility of radiotracking the snake during subsequent surveying seasons; collecting and analyzing information to characterize giant garter snake wetland habitat; and studying seasonal habitat use of the giant garter snake in managed wetlands.

## **VI. Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables.**

### **A. Narrative Explanation of Tasks.**

1. Program Management. The USFWS and USBR Program Managers are responsible for co-managing this program. The tasks and sub-tasks associated with managing the program are divided among the agencies based on efficiencies as shown below.
  - 1.1 Program Management (USFWS) - The USFWS Program Manager is responsible for developing all grants and cooperative agreements for projects which the USFWS is lead. The Program Manager, in coordination with the USBR, is responsible for developing and implementing the overall program including outreach, coordinating with stakeholders, and identifying partnering funds. Project development and prioritization is closely coordinated with the USFWS’s Endangered Species Program and the USBR’s Central Valley Project Conservation Program.

- 1.2 Program Management (USBR) - The USBR Program Manager has similar responsibilities to the USFWS Program Manager. The Program Manager is also responsible for the full development and implementation of the USBR's Central Valley Project Conservation Program (CVPCP), which is complementary to, but independent of, the HRP and CVPIA. A significant portion of the USBR's Program Manager salary is paid through CVPCP funding.
- 1.3 Technical Support (USBR) - The USBR's Area Office staff will provide technical support in the development of individual projects for which the USBR is lead.
- 1.4 Contracting Support (USBR) - USBR contracting staff will process all contracts for projects for which the USBR is lead.
  
2. Environmental Documentation and Appraisal Review. Program Managers will coordinate with appropriate offices and divisions within their respective agencies to ensure that all necessary environmental documentation and appraisal reviews are completed for the projects they manage as described below.
  - 2.1 Environmental Documentation (USFWS) - USFWS Program Manager will coordinate with Habitat Conservation Division and Endangered Species Program staffs to complete all required NEPA, ESA, and cultural resource environmental documentation for the projects for which USFWS is the lead agency.
  - 2.2 Environmental Documentation (USBR) - USBR staff will complete all necessary NEPA and ESA environmental documentation for the projects which the USBR is lead.
  - 2.3 Appraisal Review (USFWS) - For projects in which the USFWS is the lead, appraisal reviews for any proposed fee title or conservation easement acquisitions will be completed in coordination with the USFWS's Realty Office.
  - 2.4 Appraisal Review (USBR) - Appraisal review and archaeological review will be completed by the USBR on all projects for which the USBR is lead.
  
3. Project Funding and Implementation. Through integration of the goals and objectives of the HRP with the goals and objectives of the CP, the HRP and CP will jointly identify all of the projects of that the two programs will support in 2005. Projects will be identified for funding based on their contribution to the programs' objectives and consistency with the priorities listed below. Some of the specific projects may be a continuation of previously-funded projects, and others will be new to the programs.
  - 3.1 Giant Garter Snake Monitoring, Colusa NWR - Initiate the sixth and final year of monitoring giant garter snake use of restored habitat on the Zumwalt Tract at Colusa National Wildlife Refuge by USGS.
    - 3.1.1 Giant Garter Snake Monitoring, Colusa NWR - Staff at Colusa NWR will coordinate on a daily basis with USGS BRD biologist during field surveys.

Program Priorities for 2005:

- a) Serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species, such as the bay checkerspot butterfly, in Santa Clara County. Serpentine habitat in the San Francisco Bay area has been severely reduced and fragmented by urban development and related activities in recent decades (Kruckeberg 1984; 57 **FR** 59053 in USFWS 2000). In addition to the bay checkerspot butterfly, serpentine habitat supports such listed species as the Metcalf Canyon jewelflower, Santa Clara dudleya, and showy Indian Clover. To date, only one project has been funded in Santa Clara County by the HRP, yet CVP water is responsible for thousands of acres of development there, thus, much work is still needed to mitigate for this impact. Proposals should emphasize implementation of Priority One tasks for serpentine soil species found in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998).
- b) Grassland, alkali sink, and alkali scrub habitat located in the Central Valley, with emphasis on the Tulare Basin, and on habitat linkages for San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Tipton kangaroo rat, Buena Vista lake shrew and others dependent upon this habitat complex. Through construction of the CVP alone, over 100,000 acres of bottomland wildlife habitat was lost (USFWS and USBR 2003). Additionally, only about 5% of historical grassland habitat and 2% of alkali scrub habitat are present in the Central Valley today (USFWS and USBR 2003), in part because of the CVP. Therefore, much mitigation of these habitats is still needed. Proposals should emphasize implementation of Priority One tasks for upland species of the San Joaquin Valley found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998).
- c) Vernal pool habitats throughout the Central Valley supporting federal vernal pool invertebrates, California tiger salamander, and plant species such as slender orcutt grass. Through construction of the CVP alone, about 250,000 acres of wetland habitat were lost (USFWS and USBR 2003). In fact, only about 6% of historical wetlands are present in the Central Valley today (USFWS and USBR 2003), in part because of the CVP. Numerous listed species of plants, invertebrates, and amphibians rely on vernal pools for their survival. Therefore, many more acres of wetlands, including vernal pools, still need to be mitigated. Proposals should emphasize implementation of high priority tasks for vernal pool habitat species found in the Draft High Priority Actions for the Interim Water Contract Renewals and Friant Water Contract Renewals.
- d) Riparian upland habitat mosaic throughout the southern Central Valley (particularly in Tulare, Kern, Madera, Merced, Fresno, and Kings counties), supporting species such as giant garter snake, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, California red-legged frog, and

neotropical migratory birds. In part because of the CVP, only about 13% of historical riparian habitat are present in the Central Valley today (USFWS and USBR 2003). As a result, riparian-dependent species are some of the most critically endangered species in the Central Valley, and include the California red-legged frog, riparian brush rabbit, and valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Proposals should emphasize implementation of Priority One tasks for riparian upland mosaic species found in the following recovery plans: *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999); *Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan* (USFWS 1984); *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998); *Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog (Rana aurora draytonii)* (USFWS 2002); *Final Recovery Plan, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus)* (USFWS 2002); *Draft Recovery Plan for the Least Bell's Vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus)* (USFWS 1998); Draft High Priority Actions for the Interim Water Contract Renewals and Friant Water Contract Renewals–Riparian Species.

- e) Gabbro soils chaparral habitat in El Dorado County, supporting federally listed plant species, with special emphasis in the southern region of the Pine Hills Preserve. Conversion of gabbro soils habitat to urban and industrial uses, and impacts from the CVP, have extirpated occurrences of several listed plant species and degraded their habitat (USFWS 2002). Proposals should emphasize implementation of Priority One tasks for Gabbro soils chaparral habitat species found in the *Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills* (USFWS 2002).
  
- f) Oak woodland habitats found in association with other habitat types listed above and in the Central Valley. Many listed species depend on oak woodland habitat including the California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, and American peregrine falcon. As of 1990, it was estimated that there has been a decline of oak woodland of 24% in the San Joaquin Valley; 30% in the Tulare Basin; and 78% in the San Francisco Bay area (USFWS 2003). Proposals should emphasize implementation of Priority One tasks for oak woodland habitat species found in the Draft High Priority Actions for the Interim Water Contract Renewals and Friant Water Contract Renewals.

### **Opportunistic/Emergency Projects.**

HRP Program Managers will contact the CVPIA Program Coordinators as soon as possible during the fiscal year, when opportunistic or emergency projects that warrant funding considerations are identified that were not included or approved as part of the program's work plan. The CVPIA Program Coordinators will provide further direction on a case-by-case basis.

## B. Schedule and Deliverables

#	Task	Dates		Deliverable
		Start	Complete	
<b>1.</b>	<b>Program Management</b>	10/01/04	09/30/05	A revised FY2005 Annual Work Plan (AWP); a draft FY2006 AWP; and final grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts for projects supported by the HRP.
1.1	Program Management (USFWS)	10/01/04	09/30/05	Final grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts for USFWS-led projects.
1.2	Program Management (USBR)	10/01/04	09/30/05	Final grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts for USBR-led projects.
1.3	Technical Support (USBR)	10/01/04	09/30/05	Technical comments on proposals and ongoing projects for USBR-led projects.
1.4	Contracting Support (USBR)	10/01/04	09/30/05	Final grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts for USBR-led projects.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Environmental Documentation and Appraisal Review</b>	10/01/04	06/01/05	Final NEPA and ESA documents required for obligation of program funds and appraisal reviews as required for each of the projects supported by the program.
2.1	Environmental Documentation (USFWS)	10/01/04	06/01/05	Final NEPA and ESA documents for USFWS-led projects.
2.2	Environmental Documentation (USBR)	10/01/04	07/01/05	Final NEPA and ESA documents for USBR-led projects.
2.3	Appraisal Review (USFWS)	11/01/04	06/01/05	Completed reviews for all appraisals to ensure they meet Federal guidelines for USFWS-led projects.
2.4	Appraisal Review (USBR)	11/01/04	08/01/05	Completed reviews for all appraisals to ensure they meet Federal guidelines for USBR-led projects.

#	Task	Dates		Deliverable
		Start	Complete	
3.	<b>Project Funding and Implementation</b>	01/15/05	09/30/05	Deliverables will be listed in the scopes of work for each of the projects supported by the HRP, including quarterly reports, draft and final planning documents, monitoring reports, and any environmental documents and appraisals necessary for project implementation.
3.1	Monitoring Giant Garter Snakes at Colusa NWR by USGS	2/05	9/05	Draft and final reports from USGS on results of monitoring by December 2005 and January 2006, respectively.
3.1.1	Monitoring Giant Garter Snakes at Colusa NWR by CNWR staff	02/03	09/05	CNWR staff support of GGS monitoring.

**Schedule and Deliverables - Additional Funding Needs.**

To be determined based upon the number of high priority projects which are recommended for implementation through the CALFED proposal solicitation and review process and any directed actions proposed after the completion of the CALFED process.

**C. Summary of Program Costs and Funding Sources.**

#	Task	Total Cost	Funding Sources
			RF
<b>1</b>	<b>Program Management (Total)</b>	\$232,418	\$232,418
1.1	Program Management (USFWS)	\$166,418	\$166,418
1.2	Program Management (USBR)	\$50,000	\$50,000
1.3	Technical Support (USBR)	\$9,000	\$9,000
1.4	Contracting Support (USBR)	\$7,000	\$7,000
<b>2</b>	<b>Environmental Documentation and Appraisal Review (Total)</b>	\$77,048	\$77,048
2.1	Environmental Documentation (USFWS)	\$31,698	\$31,698
2.2	Environmental Documentation (USBR)	\$17,500	\$17,500
2.3	Appraisal Review (USFWS)	\$15,850	\$15,850
2.4	Appraisal Review (USBR)	\$12,000	\$12,000
<b>3</b>	<b>Project Funding and Implementation</b>	\$1,075,774	\$1,075,774
3.1	Giant Garter Snake Monitoring by USGS at CNWR	\$96,460	\$96,460
3.1.1	GGS Monitoring by USFWS at CNWR through coordination with USGS	\$18,300	\$18,300
<b>Total Program Budget</b>		<b>\$1,500,000</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>

Explanatory Notes: Total costs for each of the primary tasks shown in bold (for example, Task 1, Program Management) show the total for each of the sub-tasks shown in normal type directly below the primary task (for Task 1, Sub-tasks are 1.1 through 1.4)

#### D. CVPIA Program Budget

#	Task	FTE <sup>a</sup>	Direct Salary and Benefits Costs	Contract Costs	Misc. Costs	Admin Costs	Total Costs
<b>1.</b>	<b>Program Management (Total)</b>	1.56	\$176,408	\$0	\$0	\$56,010	\$232,418
1.1	Program Management (USFWS)	1.06	\$136,408	\$0	\$0	\$30,010 <sup>b</sup>	\$166,418
1.2	Program Management (USBR)	0.3	\$30,303 <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0	\$19,697	\$50,000
1.3	Technical Support (USBR)	0.1	\$5,455 <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0	\$3,545	\$9,000
1.4	Contracting Support (USBR)	0.1	\$4,242 <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0	\$2,758	\$7,000
<b>2.</b>	<b>Environmental Documentation and Appraisal Review (Total)</b>	0.6	\$56,853	\$0	\$0	\$20,195	\$77,048
2.1	Environmental Documentation (USFWS)	0.2	\$25,982	\$0	\$0	\$5,716 <sup>b</sup>	\$31,698
2.2	Environmental Documentation (USBR)	0.2	\$10,606 <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0	\$6,894	\$17,500
2.3	Appraisal Review (USFWS)	0.1	\$12,992	\$0	\$0	\$2,858 <sup>b</sup>	\$15,850
2.4	Appraisal Review (USBR)	0.1	\$7,273 <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0	\$4,727	\$12,000
<b>3.</b>	<b>Project Funding and Implementation</b>	0.1	\$15,000	\$1,014,881	\$0	\$60,893 <sup>d</sup>	\$1,075,774
3.1	GGs Monitoring by USGS at CNWR	0.0	\$0	\$91,000	\$0	\$5,460 <sup>d</sup>	\$96,460
3.1.1	GGs Monitoring by USFWS at CNWR through coordination with USGS	0.1	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,300 <sup>b</sup>	\$18,300
<b>Total by Category</b>		<b>2.36</b>	<b>\$248,261</b>	<b>\$1,105,881</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$145,858</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>

Explanatory Notes: Costs for each of the primary tasks shown in bold show the total for each of the sub-tasks shown in normal type directly below the primary task. Contracts and Administrative costs are estimates; actual costs will be determined subsequent to the proposal solicitation and review process. Projects needs are dependent upon the number, value and urgency of project proposals submitted after October 1, 2004, which exceed the current budget. <sup>a</sup>1 FTE = \$128,856; <sup>b</sup>calculated as 22% of the Direct Salary and Benefit Costs; <sup>c</sup>calculated as 60.6% of the Total Costs; <sup>d</sup>calculated as 6% of Contract Costs.

## **VII. Future Years Commitments/Actions.**

Some actions planned for FY04 may require maintenance and/or monitoring activities in future years. This is particularly relevant for any proposed restoration projects or any multi-year survey requests. Property acquisitions (fee title or conservation easements) may require future funding for the development and/or implementation of management activities. Continuing activities should contribute towards the recovery of federal and state listed species and their habitat.

### **LITERATURE CITED**

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1984. Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon. 62pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake. Portland, Oregon. ix+ 192pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Draft Recovery Plan for the Least Bell's Vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area. Portland, Oregon. 330+pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California. Portland, Oregon. 319pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2000. Biological Opinion on Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP. Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Sacramento, California.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*). Portland, Oregon. viii + 173 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Final Recovery Plan, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*). Albuquerque, New Mexico. i-ix + 210pp. + Appendices A-O.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills. Portland, Oregon. xiii + 220pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2003. Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Section 3406(b)(1) "other", Habitat Restoration Program, Project Plan. Recovering species and habitats in California's Central Valley. Sacramento, California.