Draft CVPIA Fiscal Year 2010 Annual Work Plan

October 1, 2009

Program Title: Habitat Restoration Program – CVPIA Section 3406(b)(1) "other"

Responsible Entities

Staff Name	Agency	Role
John Thomson	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR)	Lead
Caroline Prose	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Co-Lead

Program Goals and Objectives for FY 2010

The Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) places an emphasis on activities considered more effective and critical to species' protection and recovery. 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 (see Table 1), and are in order of priority:

Task 1.6, Land Acquisition (Fee Title or Conservation Easements) (approximately 60-80% 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 (approximately 10-20% of funds): Restoration of CVP-impacted habitats where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for CVP-impacted species.

Task 1.5, Research (approximately 10-20% of funds): Research addressing status, habitat needs, and behavior of CVP-impacted species that will facilitate species recovery.

The objectives shown below reflect priorities for Fiscal Year 2010 (FY 2010), 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 2010 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 2010, 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, riverine dune, 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 species associated with the habitat types listed above. Examples of the latter include plant species found in gabbro soils; native invertebrate, amphibian, and plant species that depend on vernal pools and other wetlands; and numerous native bird and mammal species that use riparian corridors for migration, breeding, 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 (USFWS 2000); various water contract renewals (*e.g.*, Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP (USFWS 2004).

3. Establish Measurable Outcomes Related to Biological Objectives. At this time, the HRP is seeking to identify quantifiable performance goals. Program managers are attempting to establish measurable outcome objectives, but have not yet reached consensus on the approach. One of the HRP's goals is to restore a portion of the estimated 2.7 million acres of habitat that were impacted by the CVP in the Central Valley (USFWS 1995). At this time, a "reasonable" amount of habitat is targeted, though a precise acreage figure assigned to a specific time frame has yet to be determined.

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 102 new projects with a total budget of $26,049,859 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 (USFWS 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 190,000 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 contributed funds which have been used to restore over 12,000 acres of habitat for listed, proposed, and candidate species and species of special concern, including over 1,700 acres of riparian restoration. 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 (ADNWR).

Captive propagation for the riparian brush rabbit has been very successful. From 2002 – 2009, about 920 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 2006, the peak count was 45 butterflies, which was the lowest number of butterflies observed in the last 20 years. In August 2008, 30 pupae and larvae, and 30 adults were released at the ADNWR, and as of August 2008, the peak count was 115 butterflies. In 2009, 88 larvae were released on the Stamm Unit of the ADNWR; counts will begin in August 2009. Restoration of habitat for the butterfly and listed plant species continues. The butterfly's larvae are dependent on its host plant, auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat. This plant is threatened with extirpation from the ADNWR due to the prolific overgrowth of invasive non-native plants. Restoration efforts have enhanced host plant survivability and dispersal, and also enhanced the recovery and dispersal of two federally listed plants, the Contra Costa wallflower and the Antioch Dunes evening primrose. Buckwheat has been planted on four acres with 8,000 plants (over 80% survival rate); new sand has been placed on one acre; and 40 acres have received removal of invasive vetch and grasses and fire management.

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 new GIS-based database is also now 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 2009 Accomplishments

Described below are the eight conservation actions that the HRP funded in FY 2009 at a cost of $1,026,494. Program administration and overhead costs totaled $473,061. One of these actions provided additional funding to continue a project that was initiated in FY 2007.

The seven actions that were new to the HRP in FY 2009 are as follows:

1. Funds ($415,000) were provided to the Shasta Land Trust for the conservation easement acquisition of 5,085 acres of Rickert Ranch in Shasta County. The acquisition will protect this working cattle ranch, and its cultural and natural resources, including riparian habitat, grasslands, vernal pools, vernal swales, and oak woodlands. Species to be benefited include valley elderberry longhorn beetle, California red-legged frog, vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, slender orcutt grass, bald eagle, etc.

2. Funds ($110,000) were provided to the American Land Conservancy for fee title acquisition of 80 acres of alkali desert scrub habitat in Kings County. The acquisition will enhance and improve conditions, and permanently protect habitat, for listed species near Atwell Island. Species to be benefited include Tipton kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, tri-colored blackbird, mountain plover, western spadefoot toad, etc.

3. Funds ($122,648) were provided to Mr. Eric Hansen, Private Consultant, to determine presence-absence of giant garter snakes (GGS) in the eastern Delta of San Joaquin County. The project will also establish control sites needed to evaluate the effects of seasonal variability in GGS activity and distribution on sampling results; assess current status of GGS and potential habitat within the Mid-Valley Recovery Unit; provide demographic and

methodological foundation for future research; and formulate recommendations for water and habitat management.

4. Funds ($53,620) were provided to Vollmar Consulting for a study that will determine the current status of all known extant occurrences of the federally listed Hartweg's golden sunburst and San Joaquin adobe sunburst in San Joaquin County. A total of 62 known occurrences will be visited. Additionally, up to 1,000 acres of new potential habitat will also be surveyed. At each site, data will be collected on presence/absence of the target species, associated plant species and microhabitat conditions, overall site conditions, and potential threats.

5. Funds ($91,570) were provided to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for a study that will entail an evaluation of the genetic relationships among and within recovery units of the Alameda whipsnake in Alameda County. The study will aid in determining whether the recovery units and corridors accurately reflect the genetic structure of the species, and whether the current plan promotes recovery by protecting the full range of genetic variation that is present.

6. Funds ($60,000) were provided to the USGS for a study in Butte County that will: assess the probability of detecting populations of GGS at sites based on site conditions and survey method; quantify the relationship of habitat, microhabitat, and vegetative conditions with occurrence and abundance of the GGS; and develop a predictive model and map that can identify where GGS populations are likely to occur or identify sites appropriate for repatriation studies.

7. Funds ($48,000) were provided to the BLM for a public outreach plan for gabbro soil rare plants and their habitats in El Dorado County. The public outreach will promote protection, conservation, and recovery of several rare plant species. Species that will benefit include Stebbin's morning glory, Pine Hill ceanothus, Pine Hill flannelbush, El Dorado bedstraw, Layne's butterweed, Red Hills soaproot, Bisbee Peak rush-rose, and El Dorado mule-ears.

The continuing action for FY 2009 is as follows:

8. Funds ($125,656) were provided to ADNWR, 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 AD NWR will also continue.

Table 1. FY 2010 Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Restoration Fund Anticipated	Total All Sources Anticipated
1.1	**Program Management**					
1.1.1		0.31	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	$66,150	$66,150
1.1.2		1	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Program management activities are the same as for section 1.1 above.	on-going	$210,253	$210,253
	Subtotal Costs	1.31			$276,403	$276,403
1.2	**Program Support**					
1.2.1		0.11	USBR Contracting Support Person: 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	$23,812	$23,812
1.2.2		0.3	FWS Division Chief of Project Implementation Division: Provides oversight to Service PM.	on-going	$63,076	$63,076
1.2.3		0.075	FWS Contracting Support for CVPIA Programs. Includes Regional Office and SFWO staff.	annual	$15,769	$15,769
	Subtotal Costs	0.485			$102,657	$102,657
1.3	**Technical Support**					
1.3.1		0.06	USBR Tech. Support Person: Budget Analyst, USBR. Responsible for processing all contracts.	annual	$11,908	$11,908
	Subtotal Costs	0.06			$11,908	$11,908
1.4	**Restoration Actions**					
1.4.1			Restoration projects funded by USBR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2010, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	$101,796	101,796

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Restoration Fund Anticipated	Total All Sources Anticipated
1.4.2			Restoration projects funded by FWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2010, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	$65,616	$65,616
	Subtotal Costs				$167,412	$167,412
1.5	**Evaluations, Studies, Investigations, Research**					
1.5.1			Research projects funded by USBR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2010, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	$101,796	101,796
1.5.2			Research projects funded by FWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2010, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	$65,616	$65,616
	Subtotal Costs				$167,412	$167,412
1.6	**Land, Water, and Conveyance Acquisitions**					
1.6.1			Acquisition projects funded by BOR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2010, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	$305,386	$305,386
1.6.2			Acquisition projects funded by FWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2010, after proposals have been selected for funding.	annual	$196,850	$196,850
	Subtotal Costs				$502,236	$502,236
1.9	**Environmental Compliance**					
1.9.1		0.11	USBR Tech. Support Person #1: Environmental Specialist. Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding. USBR Tech. Support Person #2: Cultural Resources Compliance Specialist. Responsible for writing cultural resources compliance documents for projects selected for funding.	annual	$23,152	$23,152
1.9.2		0.08	FWS Environmental Compliance Support Person #1: Sac. Field Office staff person (TBD). Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding.	annual	$16,820	$16,820
	Subtotal Costs	0.19			$39,972	$39,972
	Total Costs	**2.045**			**$1,268,000**	**$1,268,000**
	Reclamation Total	**0.59**			$634,000	$634,000
	Service Total	**1.455**			$634,000	$634,000

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Restoration Fund Anticipated	Total All Sources Anticipated
	Unfunded Needs					
1.7	**Outreach/Planning/Management**					
1.7.1			Outreach/Planning/Management projects. These are usually funded with about 10% of contract dollars. With the 15% reduction in funds to the HRP, we are unable to fund these projects in FY 2010. Specific actions would be determined after funding.	annual	$232,000	$232,000
	Total Unfunded Need				$232,000	$232,000

Table 2. Budget Breakout

Task	Agency	FTE	LABOR		CONTRACTS		USBR Only Misc. Costs	Total Costs
			Direct Salary, Benefits, and Admin Costs 1/	FWS Only Overhead Assess: 22% of Direct Salary and Benefits Costs 2/	Contract, Grant, and Agreement Costs	FWS Only Overhead Assess: 6% Contract Costs 2/		
1.1 Program Management	FWS (Prose)	1	$172,339	$37,914	$0	$0	$0	$210,253
	USBR (Thomson)	0.31	$66,150	$0	$0	$0	$0	$66,150
1.2 Program Support	FWS	0.375	$64,627	$14,218	$0	$0	$0	$78,845
	USBR	0.11	$23,812	$0	$0	$0	$0	$23,812
1.3 Technical Support	FWS	0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
	USBR	0.06	$11,908	$0	$0	$0	$0	$11,908
1.4 Restoration Actions	FWS	0	$0	$0	$61,902	$3,714	$0	$65,616
	USBR	0	$0	$0	$101,796	$0	$0	$101,796
1.5 Evaluations, Studies, Investigations, Research	FWS	0	$0	$0	$61,902	$3,714	$0	$65,616
	USBR	0	$0	$0	$101,796	$0	$0	$101,796
1.6 Land, Water and Conveyance Acquisitions	FWS	0	$0	$0	$185,708	$11,142	$0	$196,850
	USBR	0	$0	$0	$305,386	$0	$0	$305,386
1.9 Environmental Compliance	FWS	0.08	$13,787	$3,033	$0	$0	$0	$16,820
	USBR	0.11	$23,152	$0	$0	$0	$0	$23,152
Administrative Total - FWS			$250,752	$55,166		$18,571		$324,489
Contracts, Grants and Agreements Total - FWS					$309,511			$309,511
FWS Total Costs		1.455	$250,752	$55,166	$309,511	$18,571		$634,000
Administrative Total - USBR			$125,022				$0	$125,022
Contracts, Grants and Agreements Total - USBR					$508,978			$508,978
USBR Total Costs		0.59	$125,022		$508,978		$0	$634,000
TOTAL ALL		**2.045**	**$375,774**	**$55,166**	**$818,489**	**$18,571**	**$0**	**$1,268,000**

1/ For FWS only: The FWS develops a bio-rate which is the combination of both the salary/benefit and related administrative costs. The FWS simple definition reads, "It is an average $$ rate that is developed and used for estimating project costs. It incorporates a biologists' salary and benefits, supervisory, clerical and biologist support costs and all other office operating costs related to completing project tasks.

2/ FWS assesses an O/H Burden charge of 6% on all contracts/agreements related to budget object codes starting with 25, 41, and 32, and a charge of 22% on costs under all other budget object codes.

Table 3. Three-Year Budget Plan FY 2011 – 2013

($ amounts in thousands)

Year	Description of Activities	Requested RF Funding	Requested W&RR Funding
2011	The major activities are the same for each year and include, at a minimum, the following: •**Program Management:** Tasks include obtaining annual priorities from the Service's Sacramento Field Office; soliciting for proposals on www.Grants.gov; 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. •**Protection, restoration, and enhancement of federally listed species and habitats**. •**Contribution towards priority recovery actions**. Please note that the HRP is a grants program. The needs (*i.e.*, 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.	$2,850[1]	$0
2012	See description for 2011.	$3,000[2]	$0
2013	See description for 2011.	$3,150[3]	$0

Note: The FY 2011 - 2013 Budget Plan provides estimates of capability only. The amounts 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.

[1]This figure reflects a 90% increase from $1.5 million; [2]this figure reflects a 100% increase from $1.5 million; [3]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, CA.

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, CA.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1995. Biological Opinion, Interim Water Contract Renewals. February 27, 1995, Page 22, Sacramento, CA.

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, CA.