

# Draft CVPIA Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Work Plan

*January 31, 2011*

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

## **Responsible Entities**

<b>Staff Name</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Role</b>
Dan Strait	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR)	Lead
Caroline Prose	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Co-Lead

## **Program Goals and Objectives for FY 2011**

The goal of the Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) is to support activities that protect, restore, stabilize, and improve habitats and populations of federally listed species that are critical to species’ protection and recovery. To best achieve this goal, the HRP funds four categories of conservation actions through projects that are selected for funding on an annual basis. Additionally, projects that are funded must emphasize priority one and two tasks found in the USFWS’s Recovery Plans associated with the species and habitats, as applicable. The conservation actions are prioritized as follows, and are also shown in Table 1, “2011 Activities and Costs.”

Activity Number 1.6, Land Acquisition (Fee Title or Conservation Easements) (about 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.

Activity Number 1.4, Habitat Restoration (about 20% of funds): Restoration of CVP impacted habitats where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for CVP impacted species.

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

Activity Number 1.7, Captive Breeding/Management/Other (about 10% of funds): Captive breeding to help recover listed species populations, 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 four objectives shown below reflect priorities for Fiscal Year 2011 (FY 2011), 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 2011 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 2011, as in years past, will be on protecting and restoring 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 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 upland habitats and 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. Increase Program Effectiveness. HRP leadership, and the interagency technical team providing technical input and support, are working to increase efficiencies in project selection, delivery, management, and monitoring to improve program effectiveness and to maximize the value of the water users' investment through the HRP. Beginning in FY 2011, HRP applicants will be asked to be more specific in how and where program dollars will be expended; to provide additional budget justifications and demonstrations of cost-effectiveness; and to explain how program investments are to be maximized on the ground and in the future. Each proposal submitted for consideration will be evaluated as to how critical it would be to advancing the missions and regulatory responsibilities of the USFWS and USBR.

4. 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 107 new projects with a total budget of \$27,317,859 from 1996 to present. In accordance with prior and present justification documents, including the *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 about \$1.5 million annually, although the Final CVPIA PEIS estimated that annual costs of the program would be \$2 million (USFWS and USBR 1999), and in FY 2010, the program received \$1,268,000. 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 pool species, and Gabbro soil plants.

Since 1996, the HRP has funded numerous land acquisition, habitat restoration, research, and captive breeding/management/other projects. By contributing to land acquisition projects, HRP funds have been used to help protect over 100,000 acres of habitat for federally listed, proposed, and candidate species and species of special concern, through acquisition of fee title or conservation easement. Through contributions to restoration projects, HRP funds have been used to help restore over 7,000 acres of habitat for listed, proposed, and candidate species and species of special concern, including over 1,700 acres of riparian restoration. With contributions to research projects, HRP funds have been used for implementing projects such as surveys for numerous listed species, genetics research, vernal pool mapping, developing control methods for invasive species, assessing the potential for species reintroductions, documenting and predicting presence of listed vernal pool plants, etc. And finally, by contributing to "other" kinds of projects such as captive breeding, management, outreach and planning, HRP funds have been used to implement projects such as construction of a captive reproduction facility for the critically endangered riparian brush rabbit; captive propagation of the rabbit and the Lange's metalmark butterfly (LMB), a critically endangered species found only at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge (ADNWR); public outreach plan for gabbro plants at the Pine Hill Preserve, cataloging protected lands in the San Joaquin Valley using GIS, etc. Some examples of projects that the HRP has funded in these four categories are described below.

### **Land acquisition projects**

Land acquisitions, either fee title or conservation easement, have contributed towards the protection of numerous habitat types include vernal pool, riparian woodland, alkali scrub, foothill chaparral, valley-foothill hardwood, serpentine, and grassland. Projects are selected based, in part, on several ranking criteria including habitat biodiversity, project site connectivity, benefits to federally listed species, and urgency of the project, i.e., impending threats from development, etc. For example, the fee title acquisition of 640 acres of grassland habitat in the Ciervo Panoche area of Fresno County in FY 2010 will benefit several listed species including the San Joaquin kit fox and giant kangaroo rat. A proposed solar farm in Panoche Valley is slated to destroy thousands of acres of prime flatland kit fox and kangaroo rat habitat in this region, thus the urgency was high to protect this property.

### **Habitat restoration projects**

The HRP has funded many successful habitat restoration projects for vernal pool, seasonal and permanent wetlands, riparian, chaparral, riverine dune, and other important habitat types. For example, riparian vegetation at several restored locations (*e.g.*, Llano Seco) has experienced about an 80% survival rate since planting. Riparian restoration projects at the Sacramento River NWR have included high density elderberry plantings, which have likely raised baseline conditions for the threatened valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Wetland restoration at the Colusa NWR has resulted in increased populations of the threatened giant garter snake. Riverine dune habitat restoration at ADNWR has benefited two federally listed plants, the Contra Costa wallflower and the Antioch Dunes evening primrose, as well as the auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat, which is the host plant for LMB larvae. These plants are 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 the LMB.

### **Research**

Surveys for the San Joaquin kit fox, giant garter snake, California red-legged frog, yellow-billed cuckoo, riparian brush rabbit, Buena Vista lake shrew, California tiger salamander, and riparian woodrat, have provided valuable data on the distribution of these species and their habitat requirements, which is used to contribute towards the recovery of these species. For example, giant garter snake survey and trapping efforts have been conducted at several locations including the Colusa NWR, San Luis NWR, Grassland Water District, and White Slough Wildlife Area, and have increased our knowledge of numbers of individuals, size of occupied areas, reproductive status, age distributions, habitat conditions, etc., and contributed to the recovery of this species. In particular, in FY 2009, the HRP funded a giant garter snake survey at the White Slough Wildlife Area. As a result of this study, 13 individual giant garter snakes were captured. The White Slough Wildlife Area had not been surveyed since 1994, and the population is potentially the southernmost extant population in the Sacramento Valley, and is the only known extant population in San Joaquin County.

### **Captive breeding projects**

The HRP funded captive propagation for the riparian brush rabbit, which has been very successful. From 2002 to May 2010, 1,041 rabbits were released into native habitat at three different locations. Personnel from the Endangered Species Recovery Program at CSU

Stanislaus continue to release, trap, and monitor rabbits at various locations in the San Joaquin Valley, including the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge. The HRP also funded captive propagation of the LMB in FY 2007, 2008, and 2009. If the HRP had not provided this funding, scientists would not have been able to intercede and augment the LMB population, and the species may have become extinct.

The HRP continues to emphasize the importance of partnering. Working with public and private partners is a key to the success of the HRP in leveraging funds and maximizing the effectiveness of the program. The level of project partnering is carefully 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 more than 150 different conservation partners including The Nature Conservancy, Ducks Unlimited, River Partners, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, 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 is available where the public, including project applicants, may query to locate various data 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 2010 Accomplishments***

Described below are the five conservation actions that the HRP funded in FY 2010 at a cost of \$878,016. Program administration and overhead costs totaled \$389,180.

1. Funds (\$200,515) were provided to River Partners to restore native vegetation at the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge in Stanislaus County. Restoration will be conducted along 1.8 miles of levee to provide habitat for priority riparian species. Species that will benefit include the riparian brush rabbit and riparian woodrat.
2. Funds (\$305,491) were provided to the California Rangeland Trust for acquisition of a conservation easement on 1,409 acres of the JCR Ranch (East) property in Merced County. Species that will benefit include the California tiger salamander, Hartweg's golden sunburst, vernal pool fairy shrimp, succulent owl's clover, burrowing owl, and others. The CVP Conservation Program is also helping to fund this project.
3. Funds (\$74,000) were provided to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to restore and prepare potential habitat for endangered Pine Hill flannelbush and El Dorado bedstraw transplants at the Pine Hill Preserve in El Dorado County. The project's objectives include:

(1) decreasing the canopy of shrubs to less than 15% at a 10-acre area of the Preserve's Pine Hill Unit to restore habitat for the Pine Hill flannelbush; and (2) decreasing the canopy of shrubs to less than 15%, while maintaining a tree canopy of 25% or higher at a 10-acre area of the Preserve's Salmon Falls Unit to restore habitat for El Dorado bedstraw. Species to benefit include Pine Hill flannelbush and El Dorado bedstraw.

4. Funds (\$238,970) were provided to Vollmar Consulting to map vernal pool habitat within the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys that were present in 2005, and to map and quantify acreages of occupied and suitable habitat present in 2005 and 2009 for three large branchiopods and succulent owl's-clover within the priority core recovery areas in Sacramento, Placer and Merced Counties. The project's objectives include: (1) mapping extant vernal pool habitat throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys using National Agriculture Imaging Program (NAIP) 2005 georeferenced aerial photography; and (2) mapping extant vernal pool habitat in Sacramento, Placer and Merced counties using NAIP 2009 georeferenced aerial photography, and quantifying losses of habitat in the core recovery area. Species to benefit include vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, succulent owl's clover, and mid-valley fairy shrimp.
5. Funds (\$59,040) were provided to BLM for the fee title acquisition of 640 acres (one section) of land on Peppergrass Flat at the Elgorriaga Ranch in Fresno County. Species to benefit include San Joaquin kit fox, giant kangaroo rat, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, and San Joaquin woolly threads. The CVP Conservation Program is also helping to fund this project.

**Table 1. FY 2011 Activities and Costs**

AWP Activity Number	Type of Activity	# of FTEs	Activity Name & Description	NMFS OCAP RPA#	Performance Metric	Performance Target	Complete this FY? Y/N	Total Project Cost	FY2011 Anticipated Funding				
									Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State or Other Sources*	Total All Sources	
1.1	<b>Program Management</b>												
	total FTEs		1.31										
1.1.1		0.31	Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). 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.				Y	\$68,796	\$68,796	\$0	\$0	\$68,796	
1.1.2		1.00	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Program management activities are the same as for section 1.1.1 above.				Y	\$218,663	\$218,663	\$0	\$0	\$218,663	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$287,459	\$287,459	\$0	\$0	\$287,459
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$68,796	\$68,796	\$0	\$0	\$68,796
								<b>Service</b>	\$218,663	\$218,663	\$0	\$0	\$218,663
1.2	<b>Program Support</b>												
	total FTEs		0.453										
1.2.1		0.11	BOR Contracting Support Person: Responsible for responding to all grant & coop. agreement issues and questions that arise; posting RFA on www.Grants.gov; etc. Rose Stefani, GOTR for assigned projects. Writes agreements and provides oversight on assigned projects.				Y	\$24,764	\$24,764	\$0	\$0	\$24,764	
1.2.2		0.30	FWS Program Support Person: Division Chief of Project Implementation Division. Provides oversight to Service Program Manager.				Y	\$65,599	\$65,599	\$0	\$0	\$65,599	
1.2.3		0.043	FWS Contracting Support for CVPIA Programs. Includes Regional Office and SFWO staff.				Y	\$7,305	\$7,305	\$0	\$0	\$7,305	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$97,668	\$97,668	\$0	\$0	\$97,668
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$24,764	\$24,764	\$0	\$0	\$24,764
								<b>Service</b>	\$72,904	\$72,904	\$0	\$0	\$72,904

AWP Activity Number	Type of Activity	# of FTEs	Activity Name & Description	NMFS OCAP RPA#	Performance Metric	Performance Target	Complete this FY? Y/N	Total Project Cost	FY2011 Anticipated Funding				
									Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State or Other Sources*	Total All Sources	
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Technical Support</b>												
1.3.1		0.06	BOR Tech. Support Person: Budget Analyst, BOR. Responsible for processing all contracts.				Y	\$12,384	\$12,384	\$0	\$0	\$12,384	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$12,384	\$12,384	\$0	\$0	\$12,384
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$12,384	\$12,384	\$0	\$0	\$12,384
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Habitat Restoration Actions</b>												
1.4.1		0	Restoration projects funded by BOR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Acres	TBD	Y	\$143,996	\$143,996	\$0	\$0	\$143,996	
1.4.2		0	Restoration projects funded by FWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Acres	TBD	Y	\$108,188	\$108,188	\$0	\$0	\$108,188	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$252,184	\$252,184	\$0	\$0	\$252,184
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$143,996	\$143,996	\$0	\$0	\$143,996
								<b>Service</b>	\$108,188	\$108,188	\$0	\$0	\$108,188
<b>1.5</b>	<b>Research Actions (Evaluations, Studies, Investigations)</b>												
1.5.1		0	Research projects funded by BOR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Studies, surveys	TBD	Y	\$143,996	\$143,996	\$0	\$0	\$143,996	
1.5.2		0	Research projects funded by FWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Studies, surveys	TBD	Y	\$108,188	\$108,188	\$0	\$0	\$108,188	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$252,184	\$252,184	\$0	\$0	\$252,184
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$143,996	\$143,996	\$0	\$0	\$143,996
								<b>Service</b>	\$108,188	\$108,188	\$0	\$0	\$108,188
<b>1.60</b>	<b>Land Acquisition Actions</b>												
1.6.1		0	Acquisition projects funded by BOR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Acres	TBD	Y	\$359,989	\$359,989	\$0	\$0	\$359,989	
1.6.2		0	Acquisition projects funded by FWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Acres	TBD	Y	\$270,470	\$270,470	\$0	\$0	\$270,470	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$630,459	\$630,459	\$0	\$0	\$630,459
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$359,989	\$359,989	\$0	\$0	\$359,989
								<b>Service</b>	\$270,470	\$270,470	\$0	\$0	\$270,470

AWP Activity Number	Type of Activity	# of FTEs	Activity Name & Description	NMFS OCAP RPA#	Performance Metric	Performance Target	Complete this FY? Y/N	Total Project Cost	FY2011 Anticipated Funding				
									Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State or Other Sources*	Total All Sources	
<b>1.7</b>	<b>Captive Breeding/Management/Other Actions</b>												
1.7.1		0	Outreach/Planning/Mgt projects funded by BOR. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Captive breeding, management projects	TBD	Y	\$71,997	\$71,997	\$0	\$0	\$71,997	
1.7.2		0	Outreach/Planning/Mgt projects funded by FWS. Specific actions will be determined around March 2011, after proposals have been selected for funding.		Captive breeding, management projects	TBD	Y	\$54,094	\$54,094	\$0	\$0	\$54,094	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$126,091	\$126,091	\$0	\$0	\$126,091
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$71,997	\$71,997	\$0	\$0	\$71,997
								<b>Service</b>	\$54,094	\$54,094	\$0	\$0	\$54,094
<b>1.9</b>	<b>Environmental Compliance</b>												
	<i>total FTEs</i>	0.19											
1.9.1		0.11	BOR Tech. Support Person #1: Environmental Specialist. Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding. BOR Tech. Support Person #2: Cultural Resources Compliance Specialist. Responsible for writing cultural resources compliance documents for projects selected for funding.				Y	\$24,078	\$24,078	\$0	\$0	\$24,078	
1.9.2		0.08	FWS Environmental Compliance Support Person #1: Sac. Field Office staff person. Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding.				Y	\$17,493	\$17,493	\$0	\$0	\$17,493	
								<b>Subtotal Funding</b>	\$41,571	\$41,571	\$0	\$0	\$41,571
								<b>Reclamation</b>	\$24,078	\$24,078	\$0	\$0	\$24,078
								<b>Service</b>	\$17,493	\$17,493	\$0	\$0	\$17,493
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>													
<b>Total Funding Breakdown by Agency:</b>								<b>\$1,700,000</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>	
<b>Reclamation</b>													
<b>Service</b>								\$850,000	\$850,000	\$0	\$0	\$850,000	
								\$850,000	\$850,000	\$0	\$0	\$850,000	
<b>1.16</b>	<b>Unfunded Needs</b>												
1.16.1	<b>Land Acquisitions</b>	0	Achieve compliance with the 1999 State Water Resources Control Board Decision 1641 requiring fulfillment of the Habitat Mitigation Plan and Monitoring and Reporting Program for delivery of water to lands outside the CPOU. Acquisition or restoration of 21,687 acres of grassland and alkali scrub remain to achieve compliance. Provision of \$2.6M per year for 10 years is needed.					\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,600,000	
<b>Total Unfunded Need</b>								<b>\$2,600,000</b>	<b>\$2,600,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,600,000</b>	

**Table 2. FY 2011 Budget Breakout**

Task	Agency	FTE	LABOR		CONTRACTS		USBR Only Misc. Costs	Total Costs <sup>3/</sup>
			Direct Salary and Benefits Costs <sup>1/</sup>	FWS Only Overhead Assess: 22% of Direct Salary and Benefits Costs <sup>2/</sup>	Contract, Grant, and Agreement Costs	FWS Only Overhead Assess: 6% Contract Costs <sup>2/</sup>		
1.1 Program Management	FWS (Prose)	1	\$179,232	\$39,431	\$0	\$0		\$218,663
	USBR (Strait)	0.31	\$68,796		\$0		\$0	\$68,796
1.2 Program Support	FWS	0.343	\$59,757	\$13,147	\$0	\$0		\$72,904
	USBR	0.11	\$24,764		\$0		\$0	\$24,764
1.3 Technical Support	FWS	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0
	USBR	0.06	\$12,384		\$0		\$0	\$12,384
1.4 Restoration Actions	FWS	0	\$0	\$0	\$102,064	\$6,124		\$108,188
	USBR	0	\$0		\$143,996		\$0	\$143,996
1.5 Evaluations, Studies, Investigations, Research	FWS	0	\$0	\$0	\$102,064	\$6,124		\$108,188
	USBR	0	\$0		\$143,996		\$0	\$143,996
1.6 Land, Water and Conveyance Acquisitions	FWS	0	\$0	\$0	\$255,160	\$15,310		\$270,470
	USBR	0	\$0		\$359,989		\$0	\$359,989
1.7 Captive Breeding/ Mgt/Other	FWS	0	\$0	\$0	\$51,032	\$3,062		\$54,094
	USBR	0	\$0		\$71,997		\$0	\$71,997
1.9 Environmental Compliance	FWS	0.08	\$14,339	\$3,154	\$0	\$0		\$17,493
	USBR	0.11	\$24,078		\$0		\$0	\$24,078
Administrative Total - FWS			\$253,328	\$55,732		\$30,619		\$339,679
Contracts, Grants and Agreements					\$510,321			\$510,321
<b>FWS Total Costs</b>		1.423	\$253,328	\$55,732	\$510,321	\$30,619		\$850,000
Administrative Total - USBR			\$130,022				\$0	\$130,022
Contracts, Grants and Agreements					\$719,978			\$719,978
<b>USBR Total Costs</b>		0.59	\$130,022		\$719,978		\$0	\$850,000
<b>TOTAL ALL</b>		<b>2.013</b>	<b>\$383,350</b>	<b>\$55,732</b>	<b>\$1,230,299</b>	<b>\$30,619</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>

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 biologist's 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.

3/ Contract costs were derived as follows: Acquisition costs are 50% of total available contract costs; Restoration costs are 20%; Research costs are 20%; and Planning/Management/Outreach costs are 10%.

**Table 3. Three-Year Budget Plan FY 2012 – 2014**

(\$ amounts in thousands)

Year	Description of Activities	Requested RF Funding	Requested W&RR Funding
2012	The major activities are the same for each year and include, at a minimum, the following:	\$2,850 <sup>1</sup>	\$0
	<b>Program Management:</b> Tasks include obtaining annual priorities from the FWS 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.	\$482	
	<b>Program Support:</b> Tasks include contracting, program oversight, and staff support to assure completion of grant agreement requirements.	\$164	
	<b>Technical Support:</b> Tasks include budget support and processing of contracts and agreements.	\$21	
	<b>Land Acquisition Actions:</b> Protection of habitats for federally listed species impacted by the CVP through purchase of fee title or conservation easement. About 50% of project funds are directed toward land acquisition.	\$1,057	
	<b>Habitat Restoration Actions:</b> Restoration of native wetland, riparian, and upland habitats for federally listed species impacted by the CVP. About 20% of project funds are directed toward habitat restoration.	\$423	
	<b>Research Actions:</b> Supports research on the status, habitat needs, and behavior of federally listed species to facilitate species recovery. About 20% of project funds are directed toward research.	\$423	
	<b>Captive Breeding/Management/Other Actions:</b> Support for other types of projects that improve conditions for CVP impacted species and habitats. About 10% of project funds are directed toward those activities.	\$211	
	<b>Environmental Compliance:</b> Tasks include writing of documents to assure that projects are in compliance with ESA, NEPA, Cultural Resources, and other regulatory requirements.	\$69	
	<b>Unfunded needs (see Table 1, section 1.16.1):</b> Support for land acquisition and habitat restoration projects to achieve compliance with habitat mitigation requirements for SWRCB Decision 1641.	\$2,600	
2013	Total for 2012:	\$5,450	\$0
	See description for 2012.	\$3,000 <sup>2</sup>	
	<b>Unfunded needs (see Table 1, section 1.16.1)</b>	\$2,600	
2014	Total for 2013:	\$5,600	\$0
	See description for 2012.	\$3,150 <sup>3</sup>	
	<b>Unfunded needs (see Table 1, section 1.16.1)</b>	\$2,600	
	Total for 2014:	\$5,750	

Note: The FY 2012 - 2014 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.

<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, 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.