

Draft CVPIA Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Work Plan

May 31, 2013

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

Responsible Entities

Staff Name	Agency	Role
Dan Strait	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)	Lead
Caroline Prose	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)	Co-Lead

The Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) was established in 1996 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 including: *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). To help achieve the provisions set forth in these documents, the HRP has established the following goals and objectives.

Program Goals and Objectives for FY 2014

Goals

The main goal of the HRP is to support activities that protect, restore, stabilize, and improve habitats that are critical to the protection and recovery of populations of federally listed species. To best achieve this goal in Fiscal Year 2014 (FY 2014), the HRP intends to fund four categories of conservation actions. These actions will contribute toward the protection and restoration of 2.7 million acres of habitat estimated to have been impacted by the construction and operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP) (USFWS 1995). Each action has species and habitat-specific “Priority Actions” associated with it which supports the goal and objectives (listed below). The Priority Actions are determined on an annual basis, reflect the most current evaluation of species needs and habitat trends, and are complementary to other on-going conservation actions within the Central Valley. An example of a land acquisition Priority Action for FY 2014 is *Protection of grassland habitats in Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Joaquin counties supporting large-flowered fiddleneck*. The conservation actions are stated, and the Priority Actions are listed, in the FY 2014 Funding Opportunity Action (FOA) through which all actions that meet the annual goal and objectives are proposed and selected. Additionally, some of the funded conservation actions will also help fulfill requirements put forth in the 1999 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Decision 1641. That ruling requires Reclamation to provide compensation and habitat values which mitigate for impacts associated with the delivery of CVP water to lands previously outside the authorized place of use (USBR 2010). Projects funded by the HRP must emphasize priority one and two tasks in Service Recovery Plans for the species, as applicable. Conservation actions for 2014 are described below and shown in Table 1, “Proposed Activities for FY 2014.”

1. “Construction/Implementation” Actions (**Habitat Restoration**) (Activity Number 2.7): Restoration of CVP-impacted habitats where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for federally listed and other special status CVP-impacted species.
2. “Land or Water Acquisition or Water Conveyance” Actions (**Land Acquisition**) (Activity Number 3.1): Protection of CVP-impacted species and/or their habitats by assisting conservation-oriented organizations and agencies to purchase lands in fee title or through conservation easements, where threats to these lands are significant. In FY 2014, land acquisition projects will have the highest priority over the other three actions.
3. “Research” Actions (Evaluations, Studies, Investigations) (Activity Number 4.2): Research that is correlated to and supports land acquisition and/or habitat restoration projects to benefit CVP-impacted species and facilitate species recovery. Research may include studies or surveys.
4. “Other” Actions (**Captive Propagation and Reintroduction**) (Activity Number 5.1): Captive breeding of federally listed species, and subsequent reintroduction to their native habitats, to assist with recovery of species populations.

Objectives

The HRP has four objectives for FY 2014: (1) protecting and restoring native habitats; (2) stabilizing and improving populations of native species; (3) increasing program effectiveness; and (4) establishing measurable outcomes. Meeting these objectives is accomplished through on-going management of the program, and through funding effective projects based on the four types of conservation actions described above. Descriptions of Program objectives for FY 2014 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 Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA).

The focus of the HRP in FY 2014, as in years past, will be on protecting (through fee title or conservation easement actions) and restoring habitats known to have experienced the greatest percentage decline in quantity and quality since construction of the CVP, where such decline could be attributed to the CVP (based on direct and indirect losses of habitat from CVP facilities and use of CVP water). Habitat loss and fragmentation due to urbanization and agricultural conversion (i.e., conversion of native lands to agriculture) are the primary impacts of CVP construction, as analyzed and documented in biological opinions related to CVP water operations, as well as the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the CVPIA. These include alkali sink and scrub, valley grassland, vernal pools, and serpentine soil habitats.

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.

Activities associated with stabilization and improvement of native species include protection and restoration of habitat, research on species that is linked to restoration and/or acquisition actions, and captive propagation and reintroduction of listed species. In FY 2014, focus will be given to federally listed species associated with the habitat types listed above. Examples include plant species found on riverine dunes; native invertebrate, amphibian, and plant species that depend on vernal pools and other wetlands; and numerous native mammal species that use upland and alkali sink and scrub habitats for breeding, raising young, 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), and various water contract renewals including *Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP* (USFWS 2004).

3. Increase Program Effectiveness.

- Program Managers for the HRP, and the interagency technical team which provides technical input and support to the Program, continually work to increase efficiencies in identification of program priorities. They continue to focus on efficiencies in project selection, management, and monitoring to improve program effectiveness that maximizes the value of the water and power users' investments through the HRP. Strategies for improving Program effectiveness in FY 2014 include: When submitting proposals for FY 2014, applicants will continue to be asked to explicitly state how and where program dollars would be expended if their projects are funded. This is, in part, because each year the scrutiny on funds being requested intensifies. Applicants will be asked to provide specific budget justifications, including monetary partnering and demonstrations of cost-effectiveness, and to explain how program funds would be maximized on-the-ground and in the future.
- Program managers will continue to emphasize the importance of partnering on project costs in FY 2014, and greatly encourage proposal applicants to seek other sources of funding in addition to the HRP. Working with public and private partners is a key to the success of the HRP through leveraging funds and maximizing the use of program resources. The level of project partnering is carefully considered during the proposal scoring and selection process. One of the scoring criteria that applicants will be asked to address in project proposals is "Partners" for which, in part, applicants must name the project funding partner(s), and describe all financial contributions to the project that are being pursued. The higher the commitment from other funding sources, the more points are given to the proposal for that scoring criterion. Since the establishment of the Program, 90 percent or more of HRP projects have received substantial funding from more than 150 conservation partners including The Nature Conservancy, Ducks Unlimited, River Partners, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, local land trusts, and State and Federal agencies.
- A new requirement for FY 2014 will be that applicants must provide evidence that partnering dollars are genuinely and wholly committed, by substantiating those dollars through a letter of confirmation from the partnering entity(ies) that are named with the submission of the proposal, i.e., this means that not only must the funding partners be named/identified, but the financial commitment must be supported through documentation. This is required in order for the applicant to receive credit towards numerical points during the scoring of the "Partners" criterion by the CVPCP/HRP Technical Team for partners dollars. In order for acquisition and restoration projects to be eligible for funding in FY 2014, proposal applicants must specifically identify the parcel(s) to be acquired or restored and confirm landowner support. The parcel(s) must be specifically identified in the proposal, and the landowner supporting the project must be identified in a letter of support. This requirement was established so that valuable time is not misspent pursuing properties that ultimately cannot be acquired or restored because of the lack of a willing seller or landowner support.
- Research projects supported by the HRP will be highly focused in FY 2014. Only research proposals that address the specific Priority Actions in the Program's FY 2014 Funding Opportunity Application will be eligible for funding, i.e., there will not be an

“other” research Priority Action to which any research can be proposed. Additionally, we will limit the number of research Priority Actions to two. And as in FY 2013, projects suitable for funding must help HRP managers to: (a) determine which habitats should be acquired and/or restored; (b) identify specific properties to be acquired and/or restored; (c) determine how habitats should be restored; and/or (d) help gauge biological responses to restoration projects. This more targeted approach of tying research actions to acquisition or restoration actions will help increase program effectiveness by providing more immediate and direct species and habitat benefits, so that the goals and objectives of the HRP can be achieved more quickly and efficiently.

- As described above, one of the HRP’s objectives for FY 2014 is to stabilize and improve populations of federally listed species impacted by the CVP. To help program managers prioritize projects that most benefit those species, a spreadsheet was developed containing information on species most impacted by the CVP. It is available at the HRP website at:
http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/docs/CPHRP_priority_species_2006_draft.pdf. On that spreadsheet, species are given a priority rating based on (1) the recovery priority assigned to the species, and (2) the extent to which the species is, or has been, impacted by the CVP. Ratings of “Very High,” “High,” “Medium,” and “Low” are assigned to each species, i.e., a species ranked “Very High” has been greatly impacted by the CVP and may be imminently threatened with extinction; a species ranked “Low” is one for which CVP actions have made minor contributions towards the decline of the species. For FY 2014, only CVP priority species ranked “High” or “Very High” will be considered when evaluating projects for funding, so as to focus on species most impacted by the CVP.
- Program Managers will continue to improve and refine the focus of the HRP. For example, Program Managers have developed a GIS-based, “Project Priority Area Map” available via the HRP website to proposal applicants at:
<http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/map/index.html>. This map helps direct conservation actions into high priority areas, while also assisting applicants to develop a competitive proposal.
- A GIS-based database for the HRP is available through which the public, including proposal applicants, may query data on past and current projects. Through use of the database, users can obtain information on program activities such as the number and type of projects funded by county, projects funded which benefit certain species or habitat types, and locations of HRP projects. This database underwent extensive upgrades and renovations in FY 2013 in order to substantially improve user capabilities for uploading, downloading, storing, printing, and reporting data so as to be more effective and useful to Program Managers, the public, and other interested parties. The database may be found at: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/cvpcp_query.cfm.
- The Program’s website continues to be refined and updated. The Program Managers continue to strive to make the site comprehensive, user-friendly, and informative. In addition to the updated database, final reports from past-funded projects may be downloaded for use and reference by the public. The website may be found at: <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/reports.html>.
- Monitoring of previously-funded land acquisition and habitat restoration project sites will continue in FY 2014. Sites to be monitored are prioritized by when they have last been

visited, and site visits are conducted by the Program Managers to verify that the properties are being managed properly, i.e., according to previously-approved management plans. Photos are taken and photo points are recorded on property location maps. A Project Site Monitoring Form is used to document data such as natural communities observed and their conditions; animal and plant species seen; and any problems or concerns discovered such as use of improper grazing regimes, or invasive species issues. Follow-up visits are conducted if needed to assess if problems identified during the first visit have been resolved.

4. Establish Measurable Outcomes Related to Biological Objectives.

Goals of the HRP include protecting and restoring a portion of the estimated 2.7 million acres of habitat impacted by the CVP in the Central Valley (USFWS 1995), and contributing to the requirements of SWRCB Decision 1641 (USBR 2010). To achieve these goals, an incremental amount of acreage associated with various priority habitats will be targeted to help compensate for CVP impacts through funding of land acquisition and habitat restoration projects. At this time, a precise acreage figure associated with a specific time frame for completion of this compensation has yet to be determined. The HRP continues to succeed in compensating for the loss of this acreage. Program Managers annually record acres of each habitat type that are protected through fee title and conservation easement acquisitions, and those that are restored and enhanced through restoration projects (i.e., post-project acres are recorded and tallied in Excel spreadsheets). Additionally, progress reports from grant recipients routinely describe measurable outcomes such as number of species surveyed through trapping and on-the-ground surveying (i.e., presence/absence surveys), and number of species propagated and released through captive propagation and reintroduction. This information is available to the public by way of a GIS-based database accessible on-line at the Program website at <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/> as described above under “Increase Program Effectiveness.”

Status of the Program, 1996 through 2013

Since the HRP commenced in FY 1996, it has funded 120 different projects with a total budget of \$32,445,865 through FY 2013. The projects have benefitted federally listed CVP-impacted species and their habitats, and have provided excellent leveraging of funds, i.e., HRP funds were used to attract additional funding partners, thereby decreasing the amount of HRP funds needed to implement a project; partners have contributed about 90 percent of total project costs. In 2013, the Program funded four projects with a budget allocation of \$1,500,000. Actions funded by the HRP have contributed toward benefitting numerous federally listed species including the 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 plant and invertebrate species, and gabbro soil plants.

Through FY 2013, HRP funds have helped protect almost 117,000 acres of habitat for federally listed, proposed, and candidate species and species of special concern, through **acquisition** of fee title or conservation easements. Through contributions to **restoration** projects, HRP funds have helped restore over 8,000 acres of habitat for listed, proposed, and candidate species and species of special concern, including alkali sink/scrub and valley grassland habitats to benefit San Joaquin kit fox and other listed San Joaquin Valley upland species. With contributions to **research** projects, HRP helped implement projects such as surveys for numerous listed species; vernal pool mapping; developing control methods for invasive species; assessing the potential for species reintroductions; and documenting and predicting the presence of listed vernal pool plants. And by contributing to **captive propagation and reintroduction** projects, HRP funds

have been used to implement projects that benefitted two critically endangered species as well as other federally listed species. In FY 2013, three land acquisition projects and one research project were funded by the HRP. Examples of projects the HRP funded over the years in these four categories are described below.

Land Acquisition Projects

Land acquisitions, through either fee title or conservation easement, have contributed toward the protection of habitats including vernal pools, riparian woodland, alkali scrub, foothill chaparral, serpentine soil, and valley grassland. Projects are selected based, in part, on 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.). Examples of recent and important land acquisitions funded by the Program include the following:

- Fee title acquisition of 2,122 acres of habitat within the Ciervo-Panoche Hills area of Fresno County, including valley grassland, saltbush scrubland, and valley riparian. The projects will benefit several listed species including the San Joaquin kit fox, giant kangaroo rat, and San Joaquin woolly threads. A proposed solar farm in Panoche Valley is planned that would convert thousands of acres of prime kit fox and kangaroo rat habitat in this region, thus the urgency to protect these properties was high.
- Fee title acquisition of 473 acres of valley grassland and alkali scrub habitat in Tulare County at the Pixley National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). Species to benefit include the Tipton kangaroo rat, San Joaquin kit fox, and blunt-nosed leopard lizard. The project extends a connective corridor towards the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's Allensworth Ecological Reserve, which also provides habitat for federally listed species.

Habitat Restoration Projects

Since its inception, the HRP has funded many successful habitat restoration projects for vernal pools, seasonal and permanent wetlands, riparian woodland, foothill chaparral, riverine dune, and other habitats important to CVP-impacted species. Examples of habitat restoration efforts funded by the program include the following:

- Wetland restoration at the Colusa NWR has helped increase populations of the federally threatened giant garter snake.
- Riverine dune habitat restoration at the Antioch Dunes NWR (ADNWR) has benefited two federally listed plants (Contra Costa wallflower and Antioch Dunes evening primrose), and the auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat which is the host plant for larvae of the critically endangered Lange's metalmark butterfly. The listed plants are threatened with extinction at the ADNWR due to the prolific growth of invasive non-native plants. Restoration efforts have enhanced survival and dispersal of the butterfly's host plant, thereby improving the chances of recovery of the butterfly.
- Restoration of serpentine soil grasslands in Santa Clara County, being conducted by the County of Santa Clara Parks and Recreation Department, will benefit listed species including the threatened bay checkerspot butterfly and endangered Santa Clara Valley dudleya. The project involves installation of grazing infrastructure to reintroduce cattle grazing at the park in order to manage and enhance serpentine grasslands for these species.

Research Projects

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 federally listed species and their

habitat requirements, data which is being used to contribute toward the recovery of these species. Examples of important research funded by the HRP include the following:

- Survey and trapping efforts for GGS at the Colusa NWR, San Luis NWR, Cosumnes River Preserve, Grassland Water District, and White Slough Wildlife Area. Results of the surveys have increased our knowledge of the sizes of GGS populations, sizes of occupied areas, reproductive status, age distributions, and habitat conditions, and are contributing to the recovery of the species.
- Surveys for GGS at the White Slough Wildlife Area have helped the Service identify what is potentially the southernmost population of GGS in the Sacramento Valley, and the only known remaining population in San Joaquin County.
- Research funded by the HRP will quantify losses of vernal pool habitats that occurred between 2005 and 2009 in core recovery areas in several counties identified in the Service's Vernal Pool Recovery Plan.

Captive Propagation and Reintroduction Projects

The HRP has been instrumental in funding captive propagation and reintroduction projects for several species including the riparian brush rabbit, Lange's metalmark butterfly, and Metcalf Canyon jewelflower. Examples of these projects include the following:

- Construction of a captive reproduction facility, implementation of a captive breeding program, and reintroduction of the critically endangered riparian brush rabbit. With funding provided by the Program, over 1,000 riparian brush rabbits have been propagated and released into native habitat at three locations. Personnel from the Endangered Species Recovery Program of CSU Stanislaus continue to release, trap, and monitor rabbits at various locations in the San Joaquin Valley, including the San Joaquin River NWR.
- Captive propagation and reintroduction of the Lange's metalmark butterfly, a critically endangered species found only on two units at the ADNWR. The HRP has provided several years of funding for propagation of the butterfly at a breeding facility in southern California, and releases of the species to the Refuge. Had the HRP not provided this funding, scientists would not have been able to intercede and augment the population at the Refuge, and the species may have gone extinct.

Adaptive Management

Each year, the HRP considers which priority species and habitats will be the focus of funding within each category of activity (land acquisition, habitat restoration, research, and captive propagation and reintroduction) through the establishment of "Priority Actions" that focus on specific species, habitats, and geographic areas within the HRP's Priority Project Area. Species and habitats are selected based on several criteria including the degree of threat (i.e., disease, habitat loss and fragmentation as a result of urbanization, invasive species); recovery potential; and extent the species and/or habitats were impacted by the CVP. Priority Actions consistently reflect the current evaluation of needs and habitat trends of high priority species (which may or may not change from year to year); account for historical levels of Program investment and future threats to specific ecosystems; and compliment other on-going actions within the Priority Project Area. Each year Priority Actions are developed, in part, based on projects the Program funded in prior years. When projects are funded under a Priority Action in one year, Program Managers may choose to not include that Priority Action among the subsequent year's funding priorities. Or, that Priority Action may move down the list in order of urgency in the subsequent year. Conversely, if it is determined through a monitoring or research-funded project, for example, that more information is needed on a particular species and/or habitat, a Priority Action for that species would likely be included again among the Priority Actions the following year. Priority Actions for FY 2014 are currently being developed by staff from the Recovery Branch

of the Service. These actions will be rigorously scrutinized by the Program Managers, and incorporate adaptive management strategies, as described above. Additionally, as described above, Program Managers have recently begun conducting on-the-ground monitoring of previously funded acquisition and restoration projects as part of a new effort to assess current conditions, and to confirm whether or not funded projects have been successful in achieving their stated goals. This monitoring is expected to continue on an annual basis.

Literature Cited

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). 2010. *Consolidated Place of Use Habitat Mitigation Plan and Monitoring and Reporting Program*. Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, CA. August 2010.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1995. *Biological Opinion for the Interim Water Contract Renewals*. February 27, 1995, Page 22, Sacramento, CA.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 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 (USFWS). 2004. *Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP; Interim Renewal of Specific CVP Water Service Contracts from March 2001 to February 2002; and Interim Water Contract Renewal for March 1, 2004 through February 28, 2006*. Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Sacramento, CA.

Table 1. FY2014 Proposed Activities and Costs

CVPIA Section 3406 (b)(1)Other, Habitat Restoration Program

	3406 (b)(1)Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014				
	Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources
Total Funding	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000
Reclamation	\$750,000	\$0			\$750,000
Service	\$750,000	\$0			\$750,000
CA DFG			\$0	\$0	\$0
CA DWR			\$0	\$0	\$0

1.1 Program Management												
AWP Activity Number	Activity Name	Activity Description	Agency		Program Performance Goal	FY2014 Projected Performance	3406 (b)(1)Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014					
			Name	Fractional FTE			Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
1.1.1	Program Lead for BOR	BOR program management incorporates: interdisciplinary approach; competitive process for soliciting proposals; integration with the CVP Conservation Program; protect, restore, and enhance federally listed species and habitats affected by the CVP; contribute to priority recovery actions; and funding based on established priorities. Responsible for all aspects of program management including: obtaining annual priorities from FWS Field Office; soliciting for proposals on www.grants.gov; reviewing and ranking proposals; conducting site reviews; selecting projects to fund; writing grant and other agreements; providing oversight on all funded projects; and coordinating the technical team. (Cost Authority (CA) # H3702142027)	BOR	0.50			\$95,984					\$95,984
1.1.2	Program Co-Lead for FWS	FWS program management incorporates: interdisciplinary approach; competitive process for soliciting proposals; integration with the CVP Conservation Program; protect, restore, and enhance federally listed species and habitats affected by the CVP; contribute to priority recovery actions; and funding based on established priorities. Responsible for all aspects of program management including: obtaining annual priorities from FWS Field Office; soliciting for proposals on www.grants.gov; reviewing and ranking proposals; conducting site reviews; selecting projects to fund; writing grant and other agreements; providing oversight on all funded projects; and coordinating the technical team. CA #: FRFR4833-0832CM0)	FWS	1.00			\$223,038					\$223,038
							Sub-Total for Program Management, FY2014					
							Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
Subtotal Funding							\$319,022	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$319,022	
Reclamation							\$95,984	\$0			\$95,984	
Service							\$223,038	\$0			\$223,038	
CA DFG									\$0	\$0	\$0	
CA DWR									\$0	\$0	\$0	

1.2		Program Support				3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014						
AWP Activity Number	Activity	Activity Name & Description	Agency		Program Performance Goal	FY2014 Projected Performance	Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
			Name	Fractional FTE								
1.2.1	BOR Contracting Support	Responds to all grant and other agreement issues and questions that arise; posts FOA on www.grants.gov; and other program support duties. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.10			\$12,137				\$12,137	
1.2.2	BOR GOTR for assigned projects	Writes agreements and provides oversight on assigned projects. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.13			\$21,640				\$21,640	
1.2.3	BOR Management Support	Provides oversight to BOR Program Manager. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.02			\$5,431				\$5,431	
1.2.4	FWS Management Support	Provides oversight to FWS Program Manager. (CA #: FRFR4833-08C2CM0)	FWS	0.25			\$54,666				\$54,666	
							Sub-Total for Program Support, FY2014					
							Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
							<i>Subtotal Funding</i>	\$93,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$93,874
							<i>Reclamation Service</i>	\$39,208	\$0			\$39,208
							<i>CA DFG</i>	\$54,666	\$0			\$54,666
							<i>CA DWR</i>			\$0	\$0	\$0

2.4		Environmental Compliance				3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014						
AWP Activity Number	Activity	Activity Name & Description	Agency		Program Performance Goal	FY2014 Projected Performance	3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014					
			Name	Fractional FTE			Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
2.4.1	BOR Environmental Compliance Support	Environmental Specialist, responsible for writing NEPA compliance documents for BOR-relevant projects selected for funding. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.06	n/a	0	\$12,773				\$12,773	
2.4.2	BOR Environmental Compliance Support	Cultural Resources Compliance Specialist, responsible for writing Cultural Resources-compliance documents for BOR-relevant projects selected for funding. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.03	n/a	0	\$4,984				\$4,984	
2.4.3	FWS Environmental Compliance Support	Fish and Wildlife Biologist(s), responsible for writing NEPA and ESA compliance documents for FWS-relevant projects selected for funding. (CA #: FRFR4833-0832CM0)	FWS	0.03	n/a	0	\$6,878				\$6,878	
							Sub-Total for Environmental Compliance, FY2014					
							Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
							<i>Subtotal Funding</i>	\$24,635	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,635
							<i>Reclamation Service</i>	\$17,757	\$0			\$17,757
							<i>CA DFG</i>	\$6,878	\$0			\$6,878
							<i>CA DWR</i>			\$0	\$0	\$0

2.7		Construction/Implementation				3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014					
AWP Activity Number	Activity	Activity Name & Description	Agency		Program Performance Goal	FY2014 Projected Performance	Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources
			Name	Fractional FTE							
2.7.1	BOR Habitat Restoration Projects	Habitat restoration projects funded by the BOR Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.00	Restore up to 2,700,000 ac of habitat	Contribute indirectly towards 2.7 million acres of habitat losses.	\$99,509				\$99,509
2.7.2	BOR Habitat Restoration Projects	Habitat restoration projects funded by the BOR Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. The acres of alkali scrub and grassland that are restored under 2.7.1 may count towards meeting the goals of D-1641. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.00	Restore up to 45,391 ac of habitat	Contribute directly towards 45,391 acres of D-1641 goal.					\$0
2.7.3	FWS Habitat Restoration Projects	Habitat restoration projects funded by the FWS Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. Costs include 6% FWS contract administration (\$4,479). (CA #: FRFR4833-08C2CM0)	FWS	0.00	Restore up to 2,700,000 ac of habitat	Contribute indirectly towards 2.7 million acres of habitat losses.	\$79,121				\$79,121
2.7.4	FWS Habitat Restoration Projects	Habitat restoration projects funded by the FWS Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. The acres of alkali scrub and grassland that are restored under 2.7.3 may count towards meeting the goals of D-1641. (CA #: FRFR4833-08C2CM0)	FWS	0.00	Restore up to 45,391 ac of habitat	Contribute directly towards 45,391 acres of D-1641 goal.					\$0
							Sub-Total for Construction/Implementation, FY2014				
							Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources
Subtotal Funding							\$178,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,630
Reclamation							\$99,509	\$0			\$99,509
Service							\$79,121	\$0			\$79,121
CA DFG									\$0	\$0	\$0
CA DWR									\$0	\$0	\$0

3.1		Land or Water Acquisition or Water Conveyance				3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014					
AWP Activity Number	Activity	Activity Name & Description	Agency		Program Performance Goal	FY2014 Projected Performance	3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014				
			Name	Fractional FTE			Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources
3.1.1	BOR Acquisition Projects	Land acquisition projects funded by the BOR Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. Overall, about 50% of funding may go towards land acquisition actions between BOR and FWS. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.00	Protect up to 2,700,000 ac of habitat	Contribute indirectly towards 2.7 million acres of habitat losses.	\$298,525				\$298,525
3.1.2	BOR Acquisition Projects	Land acquisition projects funded by the BOR Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. Overall, about 50% of funding may go towards land acquisition actions between BOR and FWS. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.00	Protect up to 45,391 ac of habitat	Contribute directly towards 45,391 acres of D-1641 goal.					\$0
3.1.3	FWS Acquisition Projects	Land acquisition projects funded by the FWS Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. Overall, about 50% of funding may go towards land acquisition actions between BOR and FWS. Costs include 6% FWS contract administration (\$13,172). (CA #: FRFR4833-08C2CM0)	FWS	0.00	Protect up to 2,700,000 ac of habitat	Contribute indirectly towards 2.7 million acres of habitat losses.	\$232,709				\$232,709
3.1.4	FWS Acquisition Projects	Land acquisition projects funded by the FWS Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. The acres of alkali scrub and grassland that are acquired under 3.1.3 may count towards meeting the goals of D-1641. (CA #: FRFR4833-08C2CM0)	FWS	0.00	Protect up to 45,391 ac of habitat	Contribute directly towards 45,391 acres of D-1641 goal.					\$0
							Sub-Total for Acquisition or Water Conveyance, FY2014				
							Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources
Subtotal Funding							\$531,234	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$531,234
Reclamation							\$298,525	\$0			\$298,525
Service							\$232,709	\$0			\$232,709
CA DFG									\$0	\$0	\$0
CA DWR									\$0	\$0	\$0

4.2		Research (Evaluations, Studies, Investigations)										
AWP Activity Number	Activity	Activity Name & Description	Agency		Program Performance Goal	FY2014 Projected Performance	3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014					
			Name	Fractional FTE			Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
4.2.1	BOR Research Projects	Research projects funded by the BOR Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.00	Protect up to 2,700,000 ac of habitat	Contribute indirectly towards 2.7 million acres of habitat losses.	\$99,509				\$99,509	
4.2.2	FWS Research Projects	Research projects funded by the FWS Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. Costs include 6% FWS contract administration (\$4,479). (CA #: FRFR4833-08C2CM0)	FWS	0.00	Protect up to 2,700,000 ac of habitat	Contribute indirectly towards 2.7 million acres of habitat losses.	\$79,121				\$79,121	
							Sub-Total for Research, FY2014					
							Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
							<i>Subtotal Funding</i>	\$178,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,630
							<i>Reclamation</i>	\$99,509	\$0		\$99,509	
							<i>Service</i>	\$79,121	\$0		\$79,121	
							<i>CA DFG</i>			\$0	\$0	\$0
							<i>CA DWR</i>			\$0	\$0	\$0

5.1		Other										
AWP Activity Number	Activity	Activity Name & Description	Agency		Program Performance Goal	FY2014 Projected Performance	3406 (b)(1) Other Requested Funding for Fiscal Year 2014					
			Name	Fractional FTE			Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
5.1.1	BOR Captive Propagation Projects	Captive propagation and reintroduction projects funded by the BOR Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. (CA # H3702142027)	BOR	0.00	n/a	Numbers of species that are successfully captive propagated and reintroduced.	\$99,508				\$99,508	
5.1.2	FWS Captive Propagation Projects	Captive propagation and reintroduction projects funded by the FWS Regional Office. Specific actions will be determined around March 2013, after all proposals have been reviewed, scored, and ranked, and projects have been selected for funding. Costs include 6% FWS contract administration (\$4,215). (CA #: FRFR4833-08C2CM0)	FWS	0.00	n/a	Numbers of species that are successfully captive propagated and reintroduced.	\$74,467				\$74,467	
							Sub-Total for Other, FY2014					
							Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	State In-Kind	Total All Sources	
							<i>Subtotal Funding</i>	\$173,975	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$173,975
							<i>Reclamation</i>	\$99,508	\$0			\$99,508
							<i>Service</i>	\$74,467	\$0			\$74,467
							<i>CA DFG</i>			\$0	\$0	\$0
							<i>CA DWR</i>			\$0	\$0	\$0

Outyear activities are estimates of funding capability only and do not reflect the future Congressional Appropriations process.

Table 2. FY2015 Proposed Activities and Costs

CVPIA Section 3406 (b)(1)Other, Habitat Restoration Program

	3406 (b)(1)Other Requested Funding For Fiscal Year 2015			
	Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	Total All Sources
Total	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000
US Bureau of Reclamation	\$1,000,000	\$0		\$1,000,000
US Fish and Wildlife Service	\$1,000,000	\$0		\$1,000,000
California Dept of Fish and Wildlife			\$0	\$0
California Dept of Water Resources			\$0	\$0

Task	Project Name	Project Description	Federal Costs(\$)				State Cost Share (\$)		Total Costs (\$)
			BOR Restoration Fund	BOR W&RR Fund	FWS Restoration Fund	FWS W&RR Fund	CA DFW	CA DWR	
Program Mgmt & Support			\$156,008		\$290,274			\$446,282	
Project 1	Project #1	Land acquisition project	\$690,794		\$0			\$690,794	
Project 2	Project #2	Land acquisition project	\$0		\$354,864			\$354,864	
Project 3	Project #3	Restoration project	\$0		\$212,917			\$212,917	
Project 4	Project #4	Research project	\$0		\$141,945			\$141,945	
Project 5	Project #5	Captive breeding project	\$153,198		\$0			\$153,198	

Outyear activities are estimates of funding capability only and do not reflect the future Congressional Appropriations process.

Table 2. FY2016 Proposed Activities and Costs
 CVPIA Section 3406 (b)(1)Other, Habitat Restoration Program

			3406 (b)(1)Other Requested Funding For FY 2016						
			Restoration Fund	Water and Related Resources	State Cash	Total All Sources			
Total			\$1,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000			
US Bureau of Reclamation			\$900,000	\$0		\$900,000			
US Fish and Wildlife Service			\$900,000	\$0		\$900,000			
California Dept of Fish and Wildlife					\$0	\$0			
California Dept of Water Resources					\$0	\$0			
			Federal Costs(\$)				State Cost Share (\$)		Total Costs (\$)
Task	Project Name	Project Description	BOR Restoration Fund	BOR W&RR Fund	FWS Restoration Fund	FWS W&RR Fund	CA DFW	CA DWR	Total Costs (\$)
Program Mgmt & Support			\$159,128		\$296,079				\$455,207
Project 1	Project #1	Land acquisition project	\$618,610		\$0				\$618,610
Project 2	Project #2	Land acquisition project	\$0		\$301,960				\$301,960
Project 3	Project #3	Restoration project	\$0		\$181,177				\$181,177
Project 4	Project #4	Research project	\$0		\$120,784				\$120,784
Project 5	Project #5	Captive breeding project	\$122,262		\$0				\$122,262