

# Draft CVPIA Fiscal Year 2009 Annual Work Plan

*December 1, 2008*

**Program Title: *Habitat Restoration Program – CVPIA Section 3406(b)(1) “other”***

## ***Responsible Entities***

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

## ***Program Goals and Objectives for FY 2009***

The Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) places an emphasis on activities considered more effective and critical to species’ protection and recovery than others. Accordingly, HRP funds are prioritized as they are applied to proposals. The following conservation actions are reflected in the “Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables” table, and are in order of priority:

Task 1.6, Land Acquisition (Fee Title or Conservation Easements (approximate 50% of funds): Protection of species or existing habitats impacted by the Central Valley Project (CVP) through assistance to conservation organizations for purchase of fee title or conservation easements on lands where threats to these lands are significant.

Task 1.4, Habitat Restoration (20%): Restoration of CVP-impacted habitats where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for CVP-impacted species.

Task 1.5, Research (20% of funds): Research addressing status, habitat needs, and behavior of CVP-impacted species that will facilitate species recovery.

Task 1.7, Outreach/Planning/Other (10% of funds): Public outreach and education, formulation of land management plans, and other activities that generally contribute to improving conditions for CVP-impacted species and habitats.

The objectives shown below reflect priorities for Fiscal Year 2009 (FY 2009), as well as the overall goals of the program. Meeting these objectives is accomplished through funding the conservation actions shown above, which are used to improve conditions for federally listed CVP-impacted species, while recognizing that a balanced set of actions is needed. Our objectives for FY 2009 are as follows:

1. Protect and restore native habitats impacted by the CVP that are not specifically addressed in the Fish and Wildlife Restoration Activities section of the CVPIA.

The focus in FY 2009, 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). Habitat loss and fragmentation due to urbanization and agriculture conversion are the primary impacts of CVP construction, as analyzed and documented in recent biological opinions related to CVP water operations, as well as the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the CVPIA. These habitats include riparian, wetlands (*e.g.*, seasonal, permanent), foothill chaparral, alkali desert scrub, grassland, conifer forest, valley-foothill hardwood, vernal pools, and serpentine.

2. 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 migratory birds, and other native wildlife species associated with the habitat types listed 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 source documents that support this objective include: the Biological Opinion on Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP (USUSFWS 2000); various water contract renewals (*e.g.*, Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP (USUSFWS 2004).
3. Establish Measurable Outcomes Related to Biological Objectives. At this time, the HRP does not have identified and quantifiable performance goals in place. We are attempting to establish measurable outcome objectives, but have not yet reached consensus on the approach. Therefore, in FY 2009, the HRP Program Managers will continue to pursue establishment of “Measurable Outcomes.” This objective will seek to better correlate the relationship of the HRP to CVP impacts, and to refine assessment of whether HRP actions are addressing those impacts.

### **Status of the Program**

Since the HRP commenced in FY 1996, it has consistently funded many important projects for federally listed CVP-impacted species and their habitat; maintained excellent leveraging of funds; greatly improved and refined species and habitat priorities and focus of the program; and sustained a relatively low overhead rate.

The HRP has funded 95 new projects with a total budget of \$25,023,365 from 1996 to present. In accordance with prior and present justification documents; *Biological Opinion on Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP* (USFWS 2000), and various water contract renewals (*e.g.*, *Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP* (USFWS 2004); *Interim Renewal of Specific CVP Water Service Contracts from March 2001 to February 2002* (USFWS 2004); and *Interim Water Contract Renewal for March 1, 2004 through February 28, 2006* (USFWS 2004), the USFWS and 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. The HRP typically receives approximately \$1.5 million annually, although the Final CVPIA Programmatic

Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) estimated that annual costs of the program would be \$2 million (USUSFWS and USBR 1999). A variety of actions funded through the HRP have contributed to implementing actions recommended in recovery plans for numerous species including the following: San Joaquin kit fox, giant kangaroo rat, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, California red-legged frog, giant garter snake, bay-checkerspot butterfly, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, Lange's metalmark butterfly, vernal pools species, and Gabbro soil plants.

The HRP has contributed funds which have been used to protect over 100,000 acres of habitat for listed, proposed, and candidate species and species of special concern, through acquisition of fee title or conservation easement. Habitats protected include vernal pool, riparian woodland, alkali scrub, foothill chaparral, valley-foothill hardwood, and grassland. The HRP has also funded 11 riparian restoration projects which have contributed to over 1,200 acres being restored. Additionally, the HRP has funded listed species surveys; genetic research; construction of a captive reproduction facility for the critically endangered riparian brush rabbit; and habitat restoration and captive propagation for the Lange's metalmark butterfly, a critically endangered species found only at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge (NWR).

Captive propagation for the riparian brush rabbit has been very successful. As of August 2008, 772 rabbits have been released into native habitat at three different locations. Captive propagation of the Lange's metalmark butterfly has also been very successful. In August 2008, 30 pupae and larvae, and 30 adults were released at the Refuge. Restoration of habitat for the butterfly has also been successful. The butterfly's larvae are dependent on its host plant, auriculate buckwheat. This plant is threatened with extirpation from the Refuge due to the prolific overgrowth of invasive non-native plants. Restoration efforts have enhanced host plant survivability and dispersal, and enhanced the recovery and dispersal of two federally listed plants, the Contra Costa wallflower and the Antioch Dunes evening primrose. In 2006, the peak count was 45 butterflies, which was the lowest number of butterflies observed in the last 20 years, and as of August 2008, the peak count was 115 butterflies.

Other successful projects include habitat restoration at the Colusa NWR and Sacramento River NWR, and giant garter snake survey and trapping efforts at the Colusa NWR, San Luis NWR, and Grassland Water District. These efforts contribute to the recovery of CVP-impacted listed species. For example, riparian restoration projects include high density elderberry plantings. These plantings are likely to raise baseline conditions for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Riparian vegetation at several locations (*e.g.*, Llano Seco) has experienced about an 80% survival rate since being planted for restoration. In addition, wetland restoration at Colusa NWR has resulted in increased populations of giant garter snake, according to ongoing surveys funded by the HRP.

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.

The program continues to emphasize the importance of partnering. The level of project

partnering is considered during proposal ranking. Since the program began implementation in 1996, at least 85 percent or more of HRP projects have received substantial funding from numerous conservation partners, including The Nature Conservancy, Ducks Unlimited, River Partners, local land trusts, State and Federal agencies, and CALFED.

Program Managers continue to improve and refine the focus of the HRP. In FY 2006, managers developed a GIS-based, "Project Priority Area Map" which is available via the HRP website to project proponents (go to <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/>). This map helps direct conservation actions into high priority areas while also assisting applicants in developing a competitive proposal. Managers have also developed and updated a "High Priority Species List" to accompany the project map. This list is also available on the HRP website and will help guide project actions. Additionally, a GIS-based database will soon be available, whereby the public, including project applicants, may query to locate various data on the HRP such as projects funded by county, projects funded to benefit certain species or habitat types, locations of all funded HRP projects, *etc.* Finally, the relatively low overhead rates used by the HRP (see "Budget Breakout" table) continues to allow the Program Managers to provide more "on-the-ground" funding of projects and less program administration and overhead costs.

### ***FY 2008 Accomplishments***

Described below are the seven conservation actions that the HRP funded in FY 2008 at a cost of \$1,194,692. Program administration and overhead costs totaled \$350,808. One of these actions provided additional funding to continue a project that was initiated in FY 2007.

The six actions that were new to the HRP in FY 2008 are as follows:

1. Funds (\$258,220) were provided to the National Audubon Society for the acquisition and restoration of 1,787 acres of Charter Ranch in Yolo County. This funding will contribute towards development of Best Management Practices for managing 587 acres of rice land, as well as restore 1,200 acres of land to wetland, riparian, and upland habitat by 2010. The project will benefit federally listed species including valley elderberry longhorn beetle and giant garter snake, as well as the Swainson's hawk and many species of shorebirds and waterfowl.
2. Funds (\$200,000) were provided to River Partners for restoration of 223 acres of high quality riparian habitat on the Arambel Unit of the San Joaquin River NWR in Stanislaus County over a 3-year period. The restoration will benefit several federally listed species including the riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, least Bell's vireo, and valley elderberry longhorn beetle.
3. Funds (\$186,114) were provided to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Field Office, for restoration of riparian habitats on 22.5 acres of private land on the Lower Mokelumne River (Vino Farms property) in San Joaquin County. The project will benefit several federally listed species including the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and least Bell's vireo, as well as the western yellow-billed cuckoo, willow flycatcher, and Swainson's hawk.

4. Funds (\$70,000) were provided to the Bureau of Land Management for a fuels management reduction project on the 454-acre Cameron Park Unit of the Pine Hill Preserve in El Dorado County. The funds will contribute towards decreasing the number, size, and intensity of wildfires; improve habitat for seven rare plant species; contribute to the safety of the Cameron Park and Shingle Springs communities by providing defensible space around structures adjacent to the Preserve; and set up a program to monitor fuels reduction effects on rare plants by developing a Monitoring Plan. Species to be benefited include Stebbin's morning glory, Pine Hill ceanothus, El Dorado bedstraw, Layne's butterweed, El Dorado mule-ears, Bisbee-Peak rush-rose, and Red Hills soaproot.
5. Funds (\$147,800) were provided to Ms. Carol Witham, a sole proprietor consultant, to survey for federally listed vernal pool plants in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. The purpose of this project is to determine the current status of all California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) occurrences within the two valleys for the following plant species: Colusa grass, San Joaquin Valley orcutt grass, hairy orcutt grass, slender orcutt grass, Sacramento orcutt grass, Greene's tuctoria, Solano grass, and Hoover's spurge. The last comprehensive survey for these species was conducted in 1986-1987. Since that comprehensive survey, well over 100,000 acres of vernal pool habitat have been converted. Emphasis will be placed on determining the status of populations for these species that have not been reported on during the past decade or more.
6. Funds (\$142,225) were provided to the Bureau of Land Management for a study concerning research and restoration of priority wetlands for the giant garter snake at the Cosumnes River Preserve in Sacramento County. Funding will contribute towards determining how rapidly-changing hydrologic and vegetative conditions on and adjacent to the Preserve are impacting the giant garter snake population located on the Badger Creek Sub-unit of the Preserve. Project goals include: (1) understanding how and why the habitat is changing; (2) testing the hypothesis that changes in vegetation and hydrology have affected giant garter snake use of Snake Marsh, and potentially the snake population, since the last survey, by conducting a pilot restoration project; and (3) identifying long-term management and restoration strategies for giant garter snake habitat that the Preserve staff can implement.

The continuing action for FY 2008 is as follows:

7. Funds (\$112,069) were provided to Antioch Dunes NWR, located in Contra Costa County, for the continuation of a project for the federally endangered Lange's metalmark butterfly and two listed plant species. Captive propagation of the butterfly will continue at Moorpark College, located at the Exotic Animal Training and Management Program facility north of Los Angeles in the city of Moorpark, and operated by Jana Johnson. Restoration of dune habitat for the butterfly, Contra Costa wallflower, and Antioch Dunes evening primrose at Antioch Dunes NWR will also continue.

**Table 1. FY 2009 Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables**

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Total Cost	Anticipated Funding Source Restoration Fund	Anticipated Funding Source Water & Related Resources
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Program Management</b>						
		0.26	Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). Program management incorporates, at a minimum, the following: interdisciplinary approach; competitive process for soliciting for proposals; high integration with the CVP Conservation Program; focus on protecting, restoring, and enhancing federally listed species and habitats, which were directly or indirectly affected by the CVP; contribution towards priority recovery actions; funding based on established priorities; etc. Responsible for all aspects of program management including: obtaining annual priorities from Service Field Office, soliciting for proposals on Grants.gov, reviewing and ranking proposals, conducting site reviews, selecting projects to fund, writing Agreements, providing oversight on all funded projects, and coordinating technical team.	on-going			
1.1.1					\$55,125	\$55,125	\$0
1.1.2		1.00	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). Program management activities are the same as for section 1.1 above.	on-going	\$200,241	\$200,241	\$0
	<b>Subtotal Costs</b>	<b>1.26</b>			\$55,125	\$55,125	0
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Program Support</b>						
1.2.1		0.34	Service. Division Chief of Project Implementation Division. Provides oversight to Program Manager	on-going	\$66,880	\$66,880	\$0
	<b>Subtotal Costs</b>	<b>1.34</b>			\$267,121	\$267,121	\$0
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Program &amp; Technical Support<sup>1</sup></b>						
1.3.1		0.08	USBR Tech. Support Person #1 Environmental Specialist, USBR. Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding.	annual	\$17,064	\$49,059 <sup>2</sup>	\$0
1.3.2		0.07	USBR Tech. Support Person #2: Budget Analyst, USBR. Responsible for processing all contracts.	annual	\$14,931	\$14,931	\$0
1.3.3		0.08	USBR Tech. Support Person #3: Grants & Coop. Agreements Officer. Responsible for responding to all grant & coop. agreement issues and questions that arise; posting RFA on www.Grants.gov; etc.	annual	\$17,064	\$14,931	\$0

**Table 1. FY 2009 Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables**

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Total Cost	Anticipated Funding Source Restoration Fund	Anticipated Funding Source Water & Related Resources
1.3.4		0.075	USFWS Contracting Support. Includes Regional Office and SFWO staff.	annual	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$0
1.3.5		0.08	USFWS Environmental Compliance Support Person #1: Sac. Field Office staff person (TBD). Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding.	annual	\$16,018	\$16,018	\$0
	<b>Subtotal Costs</b>	<b>0.385</b>			<b>\$80,077</b>	<b>\$80,077</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Restoration Actions</b>						
1.4.1		N/A	Restoration projects funded by USBR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$129,163	\$129,163	\$0
1.4.2		N/A	Restoration projects funded by USFWS Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$90,372	\$90,372	\$0
	<b>Subtotal Costs</b>	<b>N/A</b>			<b>\$219,535</b>	<b>\$219,535</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>Evaluations, Studies, Investigations, Research</b>						
1.5.1		N/A	Research projects funded by USBR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$129,163	\$129,163	\$0
1.5.2		N/A	Research projects funded by USFWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$90,372	\$90,372	\$0
	<b>Subtotal Costs</b>	<b>N/A</b>			<b>\$219,535</b> <b>[\$104,303]<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>\$219,535</b> <b>[\$104,303]<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>1.6</b>	<b>Land - Water - and - Conveyance - Acquisitions</b>						
1.6.1		N/A	Acquisition projects funded by USBR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$322,908	\$322,908	\$0
1.6.2		N/A	Acquisition projects funded by USFWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$225,931	\$225,931	\$0

**Table 1. FY 2009 Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables**

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Total Cost	Anticipated Funding Source Restoration Fund	Anticipated Funding Source Water & Related Resources
	Subtotal Costs	N/A			\$548,839	\$548,839	0
<b>1.7</b>	<b>Outreach and Public Involvement</b>						
1.7.1		N/A	Outreach/Planning/Mgt projects funded by USBR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$64,582	\$64,582	\$0
1.7.2		N/A	Outreach/Planning/Mgt projects funded by USFWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2009, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	\$45,186	\$45,186	\$0
	Subtotal Costs	N/A			\$109,768 [\$0] <sup>3</sup>	\$109,768 [\$0] <sup>3</sup>	\$0
	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>1.985</b>			<b>\$1,500,000</b> [\$1,275,000] <sup>3</sup>	<b>\$1,500,000</b> [\$1,275,000] <sup>3</sup>	<b>\$0</b>
	<b>Reclamation</b>	<b>0.49</b>			\$750,000 [\$637,500] <sup>3</sup>	\$750,000 [\$637,500] <sup>3</sup>	\$0
	<b>Service</b>	<b>1.495</b>			\$750,000 [\$637,500] <sup>3</sup>	\$750,000 [\$637,500] <sup>3</sup>	\$0
	<b>Potential 15% reduction</b>		\$115,232 from task 1.5; \$109,768 from task 1.7 for a total of \$225,000		\$225,000	\$225,000	
<b>Footnotes:</b> <sup>1</sup> Includes contracting support, environmental documentation, and appraisal review. <sup>2</sup> Total for all USBR support staff. <sup>3</sup> Numbers in brackets reflect potential 15% reduction in total funds for FY09; 8% of total program funding was reduced from "Outreach and Public Involvement" and 7% of total funding was reduced from "Evaluations, Studies, Investigations, Research."							



**Table 2. Budget Breakout**

Task	Agency	FTE	LABOR			CONTRACTS			Total Costs
			Direct Salary and Benefits Costs	Overhead Costs on Salary & Benefits (35%)	USFWS Overhead Assess: 22% of Direct Salary and Benefits Costs	Contract, Grant, and Agreement Costs	USFWS Overhead Assess: 6% Contract Costs	Misc. Costs	
1.1 Program Management	USFWS	1.00	106,686	57,446	36,109	0	0	0	200,241
	USBR	0.26	33,409	21,716	0	0	0	0	55,125
1.2 Program Support	USFWS	0.415	43,625	23,490	14,765	0	0	0	81,880
	USBR	0.09	12,026	7,817	0	0	0	0	19,843
1.3 Technical Support	USFWS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	USBR	0.05	6,014	3,909	0	0	0	0	9,923
1.4 Restoration Actions	USFWS	0	0	0	0	85,257	5,115	0	90,372
	USBR	0	0	0	0	129,163	0	0	129,163
1.5 Evaluations, Studies, Investigations, Research	USFWS	0	0	0	0	85,257	5,115	0	90,372
	USBR	0	0	0	0	129,163	0	0	129,163
1.6 Land, Water and Conveyance Acquisitions	USFWS	0	0	0	0	213,142	12,789	0	225,931
	USBR	0	0	0	0	322,908	0	0	322,908
1.7 Outreach and Public Involvement	USFWS	0	0	0	0	42,628	2,558	0	45,186
	USBR	0	0	0	0	64,582	0	0	64,582
1.9 Environmental Compliance	USFWS	0.08	8,534	4,595	2,888	0	0	0	16,018
	USBR	0.09	11,693	7,600	0	0	0	0	19,293
<b>USFWS Total Costs</b>		<b>1.495</b>	<b>158,845</b>	<b>85,532</b>	<b>53,763</b>	<b>426,284</b>	<b>25,557</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>750,000</b>
<b>USBR Total Costs</b>		<b>0.49</b>	<b>63,142</b>	<b>41,042</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>645,816</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>750,000</b>
<b>TOTAL ALL</b>		<b>1.985</b>	<b>221,987</b>	<b>126,574</b>	<b>53,763</b>	<b>1,072,100</b>	<b>25,557</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,500,000</b>

**Table 3. Three-Year Budget Plan FY 2010 – 2012**

Year	Description of Activities	Requested RF Funding	Requested W&RR Funding
2010	<p>The major activities are the same for each year and include, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•<b>Program Management:</b> Tasks include obtaining annual priorities from the Service’s Sacramento Field Office; soliciting for proposals on <a href="http://www.Grants.gov">www.Grants.gov</a>; reviewing and ranking proposals; conducting site reviews; selecting projects to fund; writing Coop./Grant Agreements; providing oversight on all funded projects; and coordinating the technical team.</li> <li>•<b>Protection, restoration, and enhancement of federally listed species and habitats.</b></li> <li>•<b>Contribution towards priority recovery actions.</b></li> </ul> <p>Please note that the HRP is a grants program. The needs (<i>i.e.</i>, priorities) of federally listed species and their habitat are determined on an annual basis, therefore, the actions that are funded are dependent on what proposals are received, based on the priorities for the fiscal year. As stated on page 1 of this Work Plan, the HRP routinely funds about 50% land acquisition projects; about 20% habitat restoration projects; about 20% research projects; and about 10% “other” projects, such as public outreach and land management plans.</p>	\$2,850,000 <sup>1</sup>	\$0
2011	See description for 2010.	\$3,000,000 <sup>2</sup>	\$0
2012	See description for 2011.	\$3,150,000 <sup>3</sup>	\$0

Note: The FY 2010 – 2012 Budget Plan provides estimates of capability only. The amounts are displayed are those that might be reasonably appropriated each year. These figures do not reflect the future Congressional Appropriations process. All of these estimates will be adjusted annually as RF collections are realized.

<sup>1</sup>This figure reflects a 90% increase from \$1.5 million; <sup>2</sup>this figure reflects a 100% increase from \$1.5 million; <sup>3</sup>this figure reflects a 110% increase from \$1.5 million. This is based on the fact that each fiscal year, the Program receives requests for funding well above the amount that is available to spend on projects.

### **Literature Cited**

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. 2004. Biological Opinion, Interim Water Contract Renewal Consultation for the Period March 1, 2004 through February 28, 2006. Sacramento, California.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Reclamation. 1999. Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Page II-42, Table II-10. Sacramento, California.