

**Prepared for
California Department of Water Resources**

**Water Use Efficiency Proposal
Section B**

Central Valley Landscape Water Education Program

Prepared by

**Great Valley Center
201 Needham Street
Modesto, CA 95354**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM..... 3

SIGNATURE PAGE..... 7

STATEMENT OF WORK..... 8

 RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE 8

 TECHNICAL/SCIENTIFIC MERIT, FEASIBILITY 9

 PROJECT PLAN/WORK SCHEDULE/DELIVERABLES..... 11

 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION 11

 MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT 11

QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANTS AND COOPERATORS 12

OUTREACH, COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, AND ACCEPTANCE..... 13

INNOVATION 13

BENEFITS AND COSTS 13

APPENDIX G 24

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM 24

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 37

HONORS AND AWARDS..... 38

Attachments 1 -Disadvantaged Community Status 18

Attachments 2 - Project Plan/Work Schedule/Deliverables/Task Budget..... 19

Attachments 3 - 3-Year Budget by Task..... 22

Attachments 4 - Sample Environmental Checklist Form 24

Attachments 5 - Detail of Table C-1..... 36

Attachments 6 - Carolyn E. (Ratto) Lott Resume..... 37

Attachments 7 - Marilyn Creel Resume..... 40

Project Information Form

Applying for:

Urban

Agricultural

1. (Section A) **Urban or Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Implementation Project**

(a) implementation of Urban Best Management Practice, # _____

(b) implementation of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practice, # _____

(c) implementation of other projects to meet California Bay-Delta Program objectives, Targeted Benefit # or Quantifiable Objective #, if applicable _____

(d) Specify other: _____

2. (Section B) **Urban or Agricultural Research and Development; Feasibility Studies, Pilot, or Demonstration Projects; Training, Education or Public Information; Technical Assistance**

(e) research and development, feasibility studies, pilot, or demonstration projects

(f) training, education or public information programs with statewide application

(g) technical assistance

(h) other

3. Principal applicant (Organization or affiliation):

Great Valley Center

4. Project Title:

Central Valley Landscape Water Education Program

5. Person authorized to sign and submit proposal and contract:

Name, title

Mike Lynch

Mailing address

Chief Operating Officer

201 Needham Street

Modesto, CA 95354

Telephone

(209) 522-5103

Fax.

(209) 522-5116

E-mail

mike@greatvalley.org

6. Contact person (if different):	Name, title.	Carolyn Ratto
	Mailing address.	Program Manager
		<u>201 Needham Street</u>
		<u>Modesto, CA 95354</u>
	Telephone	<u>(209) 522-5103</u>
	Fax.	<u>(209) 522-5116</u>
	E-mail	<u>carolyn@greatvalley.org</u>

7. Grant funds requested (dollar amount):	1,585,000
---	------------------

(from Table C-1, column VI)

8. Applicant funds pledged (dollar amount):	-0-
---	-----

9. Total project costs (dollar amount):	1,585,000
---	-----------

(from Table C-1, column IV, row n)

10. Percent of State share requested (%)	100
--	-----

(from Table C-1)

11. Percent of local share as match (%)	-0-
---	-----

(from Table C-1)

12. Is your project locally cost effective?

Locally cost effective means that the benefits to an entity (in dollar terms) of implementing a program exceed the costs of that program within the boundaries of that entity.

(a) yes

(If yes, provide information that the project in addition to Bay-Delta benefit meets one of the following conditions: broad transferable benefits, overcome implementation barriers, or accelerate implementation.)

(b) no

11. Is your project required by regulation, law or contract?
 If no, your project is eligible. (a) yes
 (b) no

If yes, your project may be eligible only if there will be accelerated implementation to fulfill a future requirement and is not currently required.

Provide a description of the regulation, law or contract and an explanation of why the project is not currently required.

12. Duration of project (month/year to month/year):	1/2006 thru 12/2008
13. State Assembly District where the project is to be conducted:	2,3,4,5,8,9,10,15,17,25,26,29,30,31,32,34
14. State Senate District where the project is to be conducted:	1,4,5,6,12,14,16,18
15. Congressional district(s) where the project is to be conducted:	1,2,3,4,5,10,11,18,19,20,21,22
16. County where the project is to be conducted:	Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yolo, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Tulare, Kings, and Kern
17. Location of project (longitude and latitude)	Redding, CA Longitude -122.38541 Latitude 40.61329 450 miles southeasterly to Bakersfield, CA Longitude -118.99885 Latitude 35.37773
18. How many service connections in your service area (urban)?	+435,099 Based on Single-Family Owner Occupied Homes (See Attachment 1)
19. How many acre-feet of water per year does your agency serve?	N/A
20. Type of applicant (select one):	<input type="checkbox"/> (a) City

- (b) County
- (c) City and County
- (d) Joint Powers Authority
- (e) Public Water District
- (f) Tribe
- (g) Non Profit Organization
- (h) University, College
- (i) State Agency
- (j) Federal Agency
- (k) Other
 - (i) Investor-Owned Utility
 - (ii) Incorporated Mutual Water Co.
 - (iii) Specify _____

21. Is applicant a disadvantaged community? If 'yes' include annual median household income.
(Provide supporting documentation.)

- (a) yes, Various median household income
- (b) no (See Attachment 1)

Signature Page

By signing below, the official declares the following:

The truthfulness of all representations in the proposal;

The individual signing the form has the legal authority to submit the proposal on behalf of the applicant;

There is no pending litigation that may impact the financial condition of the applicant or its ability to complete the proposed project;

The individual signing the form read and understood the conflict of interest and confidentiality section and waives any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant;

The applicant will comply with all terms and conditions identified in this PSP if selected for funding; and

The applicant has legal authority to enter into a contract with the State.

Signature

Name and Title

Date

Statement of Work

Relevance and Importance

California's projected population growth over the next 25 years will put demands on its natural resources, particularly water, to an extent that the existing water storage and conveyance systems will not be able to adequately provide the quantity and quality of water the people of California have grown to expect.

Because of its complexity, there is no one solution to the water quantity and quality problems for the state. The complexity of California's water is not understood by the landscape professionals or by the public. Therefore, the landscape professionals and public do not understand the significance of their individual roles in water quantity and quality.

It is the goal of this program to aid in the water supply reliability and water quality within the Bay-Delta system, by reducing the consumptive demand and the pollution of water in the urban landscape in the Central Valley of California, by educating landscape professionals and the public about the principles of water conservation and water quality. This goal has direct and indirect benefits to the Bay-Delta System in the following ways:

1. Upstream consumptive demand will decrease leading to water supply reliability and water quality will improve on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, therefore, the Bay-Delta will receive additional and better quality waters from its sources (direct benefit).
2. The downstream (conveyance) water from the Bay-Delta will have less consumptive demand and pollution in the service area of this program that receives water from the Bay-Delta or exchange partners (indirect benefit).

The California Department of Water Resources Water Management Objectives per the 2003 Draft California Water Plan recognizes a **Potential 2030 Supply Benefit of 1.5 – 2.0 million acre feet** for the state by employing **Urban Water Use Efficiency**. Approximately half of the urban water consumption is deemed to be on landscaped areas, hence, state wide 0.75 – 1.0 million acre feet Potential Supply Benefits are deemed possible just by reducing landscape demands. Further, the additional water management objectives of **Reducing Pollution, Reducing Ground Water Overdraft, and Drought Resilience** will be addressed by the program.

The Central Valley includes the two hydrologic regions that feed the Bay-Delta, the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River; and the Tulare Lake region. The three hydrologic regions are very intrinsically linked on social, economic, and environmental fronts. It is for these reasons that this program is to be developed for all three regions as one cohesive unit.

Outside of the proposed Central Valley program area there exist several regional landscape water conservation programs in the state. 'California Friendly Landscape Program' of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California is one such program that has been effective in educating the people in their area about water conservation. The Central Valley does not have a regional water conservation program in place. However, the Central Valley has many landscape water conservation programs being offered by various agencies and organizations. This program is designed to bring together existing urban landscape water conservation projects throughout the Central Valley and add additional projects in order to develop a cohesive program that will be more effective than the existing stand alone efforts.

Technical/Scientific Merit, Feasibility

This program is designed to aid local programs by supporting each agency's current projects, giving logistical support to develop additional local projects in the form of display gardens, and integrating all projects into a framework of communication which will better reach the landscape professionals and the public. Future funding after initial development of the program may come from a levy on the cooperators as some of their current in-house costs could be transferred to this program.

Cohesive program would give:

1. broader scope to local programs,
2. reach a larger audience than is now being reached,
3. give the audience a better understanding of their role in the water picture,
4. give the audience the knowledge, skills, and resources necessary to apply water conservation and water quality strategies in urban landscapes.

The program methodology is as follows:

1. develop a cohesive relationship between organizations with existing programs in order to integrate and expand local programs while allowing each organization to retain its autonomy;
2. develop a combined informational campaign on concepts of water conservation and water quality in the urban landscape through such venues as garden displays, water bills, newspaper, TV, radio, newsletters and the internet that reaches across localities,
3. support the further development of major botanical/demonstration gardens in the Central Valley by regranteeing up to \$ 250,000 under well-defined guidelines which will require the installation of a SWAT* controller in part of the garden;

*SWAT-Smart Water Application Technology-electronic controller governed by the receipt of weather and/or soil moisture data.

4. establish 35-40 passive display gardens in various towns and cities in high foot traffic areas such as on grounds of libraries, commercial strips, and city halls with a maintenance commitment for after the initial project period;
5. develop and place signage and literature that explains the concepts of water conservation and water quality at each botanical and display garden;
6. develop and present classes to landscape professionals and the public on the following subjects to teach water conservation and water quality:
 - a. overview of California and the local region's water
 - b. philosophy of sustainable landscaping
 - c. irrigation design-drip and sprinkler
 - d. irrigation scheduling
 - e. hydrozoning-theory of plant placement
 - f. appropriate plant material
 - g. integrated pest management
 - h. fertilizing
 - i. mulching
7. develop a website which will include an overview of the program, contacts, Central Valley water events calendar, recaps on subject matter taught in classes, and links.
8. develop vehicle by which participating organizations will sustain program once initial program funding is completed.

The technical subject matter taught will be based on information gleaned from publications from the Department of Water Resources, Bureau of Reclamation, University of California, California State University system, and other sources. Three primary resources being:

1. Costello, et al, UCCE, A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and Water Use Classification of Landscape Species III, 2000, University of California Cooperative Extension, California Department of Water Resources, and the United States Bureau of Reclamation.
2. The California Water Plan Update, Bulletin 160-98, California Department of Water Resources.
3. The California Water Plan Update, Bulletin 160-03, California Department of Water Resources, when published.

If this program were to be implemented on a statewide basis the strategy would remain on regionalizing the program as the public identifies itself regionally because of the

social, economic, and environmental differences between the regions. Choice of plant material differs because of regional climatic conditions. Therefore, the strategy calls for a three-tiered approach - state to region to local - whereas this program is region to local.

Project Plan/Work Schedule/Deliverables

See Attachment 2.

Environmental Documentation

The development of display gardens will, by CEQA's definition # 15378, require that an Environmental Checklist Form be filed for presumably each display garden. However, because of the size of each garden and that in most cases the garden will be a retrofit to an existing landscape site it is expected that a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be granted on all gardens by CEQA.. Essentially the gardens will be retrofits to a more efficient irrigation system with the use of more drought tolerant plant material. This retrofit will be an enhancement to the hydrology and water quality and there will be no negative impact on any environmental question. Because of the number of gardens to be developed the contractor will have a discussion with CEQA to determine the best way to handle the environmental documentation; or if by its scope as retrofitting existing landscapes the Environmental Checklist Form does not have to be submitted.

Part of the negotiated contract agreement with local organizations for each display garden will identify who is responsible for obtaining any locally required permits and who is required to do the filing of the Environmental Checklist Form with CEQA. Since the program responsibility of the requesting organization, the Great Valley Center, has a finite time commitment to the program it is deemed that responsibility for all legal commitments to permitting government agencies should be held by either the landowner or local agency which will be taking responsibility of long term garden maintenance. The filing of all appropriate environmental documentation shall commence within one month of the signing of a display garden contract. Once approval is received, the development of the garden will commence.

Attachment 4 is a guideline sample of a completed Environmental Impact Checklist.

Monitoring and Assessment

Monitoring:

All tasks that have specific established deadlines on which future task developments depend will be pursued relentlessly to meet said deadline. For example Tasks 3 through 7 are dependent on the completion of Tasks 1 and 2 in order for Tasks 3 through 7 to progress. For tasks that are not dependent on one another spreadsheets will be developed

and posted weekly to track status. For example Task 4, Establishing 35-40 Passive Display Gardens, sub-tasks a, b, and part of c require timely actions so that contracts may be let. The contract negotiation task and future sub-tasks on any one garden are independent of other garden development. Each garden's development will be tracked on a spreadsheet on a weekly basis to assure that if a problem arises it may be recognized and action may be taken to resolve the problem.

Assessment:

The program will be assessed on following basis:

1. level to which participating organizations are committed to self-fund the continuing program,
2. landscape professionals and the public's response on evaluation questionnaires developed for presentations,
3. attendance records at special functions where attendance can be tracked, and
4. website hits.

Qualifications of Applicants and Cooperators

1. Resumes of Project Manager and Contractor attached in Attachments 6 and 7.
2. It is the role of the applicant to bring the many external cooperators from three hydrologic regions into a cohesive program which would give a broader scope to local education programs, reach a larger audience, and give the audience the knowledge, skills, and resources to apply water conservation and water quality strategies in urban landscapes.
3. The applicant has not participated in prior water use efficiency programs; however, they possess the skills to assist in developing a cohesive unit by facilitating conflict resolution, developing informational campaigns, and contracting with a skilled professional experienced in the development of demonstration gardens and water education programs.
4. The applicant represents a large number of disadvantaged communities in its program area. A review of the urban centers that are in the program area shows that 60% or 1,548,554 people come from disadvantaged cities and towns out of 2, 573,313 people. Only two of 33 communities exceed the median California income. The information source used is the U. S. Census Bureau 2000 Census. Attachment 1 gives details.

Outreach, Community Involvement, and Acceptance

This program is designed to develop a cohesive working relationship between various local governments, municipal water providers, flood control districts, community based organizations, watershed groups, and all other organizations that have an interest in water conservation and water quality in the program area of the entire Central Valley. Because the program is being developed across such broad boundaries it is not possible to make contact with, work with, and develop a cohesive unit without funding. Because of the nature of educational programs there is a benefit to localities if the person who receives the education lives outside the locality as the subsequent application of the knowledge may have a positive direct or indirect benefit on water quantity and quality to the local area. This benefit concept is one of the tenets of underlying the belief that working on a regional basis may help the local community solve its problems.

Innovation

The innovation of the program is not that it covers such a large geographic area, but rather the subject matter breadth; not just how to conserve, but where we truly stand today on water in the whole state and various regions.

The innovation in this program lies in teaching about the complexity of California and even local regions' water systems; that is, truly educating people about what it takes to get water from nature - ground or surface - to the spigot. A significant element of this includes helping people understanding how water flowed 150 years ago and how it flows today because of man's intervention at the state, regional, and local level. Increasing the understanding of the water system and its history will lead to a greater appreciation of water. Because of this increased appreciation people will be motivated to make changes in their water consumption in the landscape and lead to outreach to others, thereby having a multiplier effect.

Benefits and Costs

The benefits of knowledge far outweigh ignorance. With the application of knowledge gained through this program the change in any one person's behavior toward landscape practices will have a positive effect on the quality and quantity of water in the Bay-Delta though individual action may not be measurable. However, because of the number of people in the program area there will be a significant cumulative effect.

Table C-1: Project Costs (Budget) in Dollars)

	Category (I)	Project Costs \$ (II)	Contingency % (ex. 5 or 10) (III)	Project Cost + Contingency \$ (IV)	Applicant Share \$ (V)	State Share Grant \$ (VI)	Life of investment (years) (VII)	Capital Recovery Factor (VIII)	Annualized Costs \$ (IX)
	Administration ¹								
	Salaries, wages	\$204,000	0	\$204,000	\$0	\$204,000	0	0.0000	\$0
	Fringe benefits	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
	Supplies	\$10,000	0	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	0	0.0000	\$0
	Equipment	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
	Consulting services	\$195,000	0	\$195,000	\$0	\$195,000	0	0.0000	\$0
	Travel	\$25,000	0	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000	0	0.0000	\$0
	Other	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
(a)	Total Administration Costs	\$434,000		\$434,000	\$0	\$434,000			\$0
(b)	Planning/Design/Engineering	\$70,000	0	\$70,000	\$0	\$70,000	0	0.0000	\$0
(c)	Equipment Purchases/Rentals/Rebates/Vouchers	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	10	0.0000	\$0
(d)	Materials/Installation/Implementation	\$535,000	0	\$535,000	\$0	\$535,000	0	0.0000	\$0
(e)	Implementation Verification	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
(f)	Project Legal/License Fees	\$5,000	0	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000	0	0.0000	\$0
(g)	Structures	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
(h)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
(i)	Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
(j)	Construction	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0000	\$0
(k)	Other (Regrant to Botanical Gardens, facility rental & supplies, printing)	\$436,000	0	\$436,000	\$0	\$436,000	0	0.0000	\$0
(l)	Monitoring and Assessment	\$52,500	0	\$52,500	\$0	\$52,500	0	0.0000	\$0
(m)	Report Preparation	\$52,500	0	\$52,500	\$0	\$52,500	0	0.0000	\$0
(n)	TOTAL	\$1,585,000		\$1,585,000	\$0	\$1,585,000			\$0
(o)	Cost Share -Percentage				0	100			

**Table C-2:
Annual
Operations and
Maintenance
Costs**

Operations (1) (I)	Maintenance (II)	Other (III)	Total (IV) (I + II + III)
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

(1) Include annual O & M administration costs here.

Table C-3: Total Annual Project Costs

Annual Project Costs (1) (I)	Annual O&M Costs (2) (II)	Total Annual Project Costs (III) (I + II)
1,585,000	\$0	1,585,000

Applicant:

Great Valley Center

THE TABLES ARE FORMATTED WITH FORMULAS: FILL IN THE SHADED AREAS ONLY

Table C-5 Project Annual Physical Benefits (Quantitative and Qualitative Description of Benefits)

	Qualitative Description - Required of all applicants¹			Quantitative Benefits - where data are available²
Description of physical benefits (in-stream flow and timing, water quantity and water quality) for:	Time pattern and Location of Benefit	Project Life: Duration of Benefits	State Why Project Bay Delta benefit is Direct ³ Indirect ⁴ or Both	Quantified Benefits (in-stream flow and timing, water quantity and water quality)
<p>Bay Delta: Decrease in consumption on individual landscapes will lead to more available water into and out of the bay-Delta. Application of less chemicals on landscapes will lead to better water quality if run off occurs.</p>	<p>Decrease in consumption will occur during late spring, summer, and early fall. When irrigation of landscapes normally occurs, benefiting the Bay-Delta during its high demand time.</p>	<p>3 year project, once community outreach is in place 1 ½ years into the program the benefits will start to occur. The benefits shall continue to occur indefinitely.</p>	<p>Both direct and indirect benefits starting during the last half of the program period and will continue to grow indefinitely.</p>	<p>Can not be quantified. Individual action may not be measurable within the system. However, because of the number of people in the system there will be a significant cumulative effect.</p>
<p>Local: Decrease in consumption on individual landscapes will lead to decrease in water demand for the local agencies. Less chemicals applied will lead to better water quality to surface and ground water if run off occurs.</p>	<p>Decrease in consumption will occur during late spring, summer, and early fall. When irrigation of landscapes normally occurs, benefiting the local area during its high demand time.</p>	<p>3 year project, benefits will strt occurring during the last half of the lproject and shall continue to occur indefinitely.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Can not be quantified. Individual action may not be measurable with in the local system. However, because of the number of people in the system there will be a significant cumulative effect.</p>

Table C-6. Project Annual Local Monetary Benefits

ANNUAL LOCAL BENEFITS	ANNUAL QUANTITY	UNIT OF MEASUREMENT	ANNUAL MONETARY BENEFITS (Thousands \$/yr)
(a) Avoided Water Supply Costs (Current or Future Sources)			Not Ascertainable
(b) Avoided Energy Costs			Not Ascertainable, but could be Significant if local area pumps ground water.
(c) Avoided Waste Water Treatment Costs			Does not apply
(d) Avoided Labor Costs			Not applicable
(e) Other (describe)			None
(f) Total [(a)+(b)+(c)+(d)+(e)]	NA	NA	Not Ascertainable

Table C-7: Project Local Monetary Benefits and Project Costs

(a) Total Annual Monetary Benefits (Table C-6, row (f))	\$ Not Ascertainable
(b) Total Annual Project Costs (Table C-3, Column 111)	\$ 1,585,000

Table C-8: Applicant’s Cost Share and Description

Applicant’s cost share (%): (from Table C-1, row o, column V)	-0-
--	------------

**Attachments 1 -Disadvantaged Community Status
Of Urban Areas in Program Region**

City	Population	Median Household Income In \$	Single-Family Owner Occupied Homes	% of California Median Income of \$ 47,493	Less Than 80%
Redding	80865	34194	15583	71.9	X
Red Bluff	13147	27029	2074	56.9	X
Chico	59954	29359	8300	61.8	X
Yuba City	36758	32858	5627	69.2	X
Sacramento	407018	37049	71108	78.0	X
Davis	60308	42454	9184	89.3	
Galt	19472	45052	4235	94.9	
Lodi	56999	39570	10316	83.3	
Stockton	243771	35453	37698	74.6	X
Manteca	49258	46677	9360	98.3	
Tracy	56929	67464	11973	142.0	
Oakdale	15503	39338	3066	82.8	
Modesto	188856	40394	35140	85.0	
Turlock	55810	39050	9198	82.2	
Merced	63893	30429	8528	64.0	X
Los Banos	25869	43690	4953	91.9	
Chowchilla	11127	30729	1353	64.7	X
Madera	43027	31033	5815	65.3	X
Fresno	427652	32236	64982	67.8	X
Clovis	68468	50859	13281	107.0	
Selma	19444	36510	2963	76.9	X
Kingsburg	9199	44737	1940	94.2	
Visalia	91565	41349	17651	87.1	
Tulare	43994	36935	7341	77.8	X
Hanford	41686	41395	7747	87.2	
Lemoore	19712	40314	3163	84.9	
Lindsay	10297	24305	1269	51.2	X
Porterville	39615	32046	6125	67.5	X
Exeter	9168	33738	1658	71.0	X
Delano	38824	28143	4474	59.3	X
Bakersfield	247057	45556	45925	95.9	
Taft	6400	42468	1305	89.4	
Coalinga	11668	41208	1764	86.8	
Total	2,573,313		435,099		
Disadvantaged	1,548,554		244,898		
Not disadvantaged	1,024,759		190,201		
Total	2,573,313		435,099		

Source: US Census Bureau
Fact Sheet on 2000 Census
<http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html>

Attachments 2 - Project Plan/Work Schedule/Deliverables/Task Budget

Tasks	Work Schedule	Deliverables	Cost/Dollars
1. Develop cohesive relationship w/organizations			247,500
a. Develop guideline for organization participation	1/2006-1/2006	Sample of guideline	
b. Introduce program concept to organization	2/2006-4/2006	List of invited organizations, sample letter, responses noted	
c. Meet with interested parties	3/2006-6/2006	Meeting minutes with attendance, define locals' commitments	
d. Establish working committees on Tasks #2 thru8	6/2006-7/2006	Committee member list	
2. Develop a combined information campaign			30,000
a. Develop name and logo	7/2006-9/2006	Name and logo	
b. Decide types of communication to be used	7/2006-9/2006	Guideline sample	
c. Establish program's process	7/2006-10/2006	Guidelines	
3. Regrant funds Botanic Garden			265,000
a. Establish regranting guideline and set evaluation criteria	7/2006-9/2006	Sample guideline and criteria	
b. Proposal call to botanical gardens	10/2006-12/2006	Sample of call	
c. Evaluate proposals and make funding decision	1/2007-2/2007	Scoring of applications, list of funded projects	
d. Negotiate contracts	3/2007-6/2007	Contracts	
e. Monitor contracts	6/2007-10/2008	Quarterly status report from botanical gardens, pictures of completed projects	

4. Establish 35-40 Passive Display Gardens			545,000
a. develop guideline for application and site criteria	7/2006-9/2006	Guideline and site criteria	
b. Project call for sites	10/2006-3/2007	Sample of call	
c. Evaluate site requests	4/2007-5/2007	Scoring of applications, list of contracts to be let	
d. Negotiate contracts	6/2007-7/2007	Contracts	
e. Design individual gardens	7/2007-12/2007	Copy of designs	
f. Install gardens	8/2007-10/2008	Observe site development, tracking spread sheet, pictures of completed gardens.	
g. Maintain installed gardens	9/2007-12/2008	Monthly report of activities	
5. Develop literature and signage			275,000
a. Collect and assess local organization literature	7/2006-9/2006	List of literature received	
b. Develop program literature	10/2007-3/2008	Rough drafts	
c. Print literature	12/2007-6/2008	Sample literature	
d. Develop garden signage and literature racks	10/2007-1/2008	Rough drafts	
e. Have signage made	1/2008-2/2008	Pictures of signs	
6. Develop curriculum and present classes			275,000
a. Determine if professional classes are for credit, if so establish methodology	7/2006-9/2006	Statement of decision, if decision is for credit include guidelines	
b. Develop guidelines on breadth of topics, venues, frequency, etc.	7/2006-12/2006	Sample of guidelines	
c. Recommend and solicit local specialist presenters	1/2007-3/2007	List of suggested presenters	
d. Develop calendar of classes	1/2007-3/2007	Anticipated calendar	

e. Develop class evaluation forms to be used for program assessment	3/2007-6/2007	Sample evaluation form	
f. Present classes	6/2007-12/2008	Class agendas, class attendance,	
g. Tabulate evaluation forms	7/2007-12/2008	Recap of results	
7. Develop and maintain program website			54,000
a. Develop criteria on materials to be placed on site	7/2006-9/2006	Guidelines	
b. Develop methodology of programs management of website	9/2006-12/2006	Guidelines	
c. Establish and maintain website	1/2007-12/2008	Web site address	
d. Establish stand alone web site	10/2008-12/2008	Web site address	
8. Develop vehicle by which program will be sustained			7,500
a. Define how program should be handled after initial funding period	6.2007-6/2008	Guideline of organization's structure	
b. Obtain future funding	6/2007-12/2008	Proof of funding	

NOTE: work schedule dates are to read as---starting at the beginning of the first month and finishing as the end of the last month;
Example 2/2006-5/2006 represents 4 months.

Attachments 3 - 3-Year Budget by Task

Task	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
# 1 Consensus Building				
Salaries & Ben.	50,000	50,000	50,000	150,000
Consultant	65,000	10,000	10,000	85,000
Travel	5,000			5,000
Phone & Off Sup	7,500			7,500
Sub Total	127,500	60,000	60,000	247,500
#8 Future Organization Structure		3,750	3,750	7,500
Sub Total	-0-	3,750	3,750	7,500
#2 Combined Information Campaign	30,000			30,000
Sub Total	30,000	-0-	-0-	30,000
# 5 Literature				
Printing	20,000	65,000	65,000	150,000
Travel		2,500	2,500	5,000
Consultant		7,500	7,500	15,000
Sub Total	20,000	75,000	75,000	170,000
# 7 Web Site				
Web Master	18,000	18,000	18,000	54,000
Sub Total	18,000	18,000	18,000	54,000
# 4 Display Gardens				
Materials and Installation	25,000	175,000	200,000	400,000
Repairs & Maintenance		10,000	20,000	30,000
Irrigation Design		20,000	20,000	40,000
Consultant		32,500	32,500	65,000
Travel		5,000	5,000	10,000
Signs	15,000	35,000	35,000	85,000
Sub Total	40,000	277,500	312,500	630,000
# 6 Classes				
Facility Rental		18,000	18,000	36,000
Travel		2,500	2,500	5,000
Consultant		7,500	7,500	15,000
Sub Total	-0-	28,000	28,000	56,000

# 3 Botanical Garden /Regranting				
Regranting		125,000	125,000	250,000
Signs		10,000	10,000	20,000
Consultant		7,500	7,500	15,000
Sub Total	-0-	142,500	142,500	285,000
Monitoring, Assessment, & Report Preparation	35,000	35,000	35,000	105,000
Total Budget	270,500	639,750	674,750	1,585,000

The budget tasks are arranged in the order of importance, allowing for efficient decision making if the project is not funded in its entirety. Developing a cohesive program will require consensus building, future program organization structure, and a combined information campaign. The tasks of literature, website, display gardens, classes, and botanical gardens are listed in the anticipated order of largest audience to smallest audience, allowing for reaching the largest audience possible with available funds.



The California Environmental Quality Act

Appendix G

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: _____ Central Valley Landscape Water Education Display Garden

2. Lead agency name and address:
Local Agency

456 Any Street

Central Valley Town, CA

3. Contact person and phone number: local agency staff person

4. Project location: 123 Main Street, Central Valley Town, CA

5. Project sponsor's name and address: Great Valley Center

201 Needham Street

Modesto, CA

6. General plan designation: per local agency _____ 7. Zoning: per local agency _____
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
Retrofit an existing landscaped area into a water conserving display garden by installing a well designed irrigation system, planting drought tolerant plants, and use of efficient irrigation scheduling with informative signage.

-
-
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:
The site is situated adjacent to a sidewalk with high volume of foot traffic between a parking lot and the Central Valley Town county library.
-
-

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)
Permits to be determined when site determined.

Contract agreement between Great Valley Center and land owner or local agency.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

- _____ Signature	- _____ Date
- _____ Printed Name	- _____ For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the

incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from ~~Section XVII~~, "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues: All of the following questions would be answered by indicating NO IMPACT

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> <u>Incorporation</u>	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

buildings within a state scenic highway?

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California

Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that

results in substantial safety risks?

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually



limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).

| [CERES](#) | [CEQA Home](#) | [CEQA Guidelines](#) | [Environmental Law](#) | [Wetlands](#) | [LUPIN](#) |

This file last modified on: Tuesday, February 6, 2001.

Document URL: http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/Appendix_G.html

Copyright © 1998-2003 California Resources Agency. All rights reserved.

Attachments 5 - Detail of Table C-1

Brief detail of project costs by line items of Table C-1:

Administrative salaries			
Program manager	150,000		
Web Master	<u>54,000</u>		
Total salaries and wages		204,000	
Office supplies, telephone, postage, etc.		10,000	
Consulting services			
Consensus building	85,000		
Literature development	15,000		
Display garden design and installation over sight	65,000		
Class curriculum oversight	15,000		
Botanical garden regranting	<u>15,000</u>		
		195,000	
Travel-primarily consultant to cover 450 mile range of projects		<u>25,000</u>	434,000
Planning/Design			
Logo, campaign		30,000	
Garden irrigation design		<u>40,000</u>	70,000
Materials/ Installation			
40 display gardens @ \$ 10,000 each		400,000	
landscape maintenance		30,000	
Informational signs at display & botanical gardens		<u>105,000</u>	435,000

Attachments 6 - Carolyn E. (Ratto) Lott Resume

Project Position: Project Manager

NAME Carolyn E. (Ratto) Lott	CURRENT POSITION TITLE/ INSTITUTION Program Manager/ Great Valley Center
--	--

EDUCATION/TRAINING

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE (if applicable)	YEAR(s)	FIELD OF STUDY
Holy Names University, Oakland, CA	BA	1972	English
Holy Names University - Lifetime Teaching Credential	Credential	1973	Education

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND

Carolyn Lott is Manager of New Valley Connexions, a program department of the Great Valley Center that focuses on strengthening and diversifying the regional economy through new technologies and positioning it to be more competitive.

Prior to her current position, Mrs. Lott was the Coordinator of Operation Clean Air. She was responsible for crafting the Governance Plan and organizing and facilitating all meetings of the Steering Committee (leaders from 13 industry sectors) and Sector Working Groups. She coordinated a 9-county effort to organize sectors of the San Joaquin Valley to help improve air quality. She successfully guided the development of fourteen sectors, developed working groups, drafted an Air Quality Improvement Plan, coordinated an inaugural Summit with more than 400 attendees, and secured Congressional assistance through endorsement and funding commitments.

Mrs. Lott also works with the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) in Sacramento, California. CCP is a joint program of the California State University, Sacramento and McGeorge School of Law and offers facilitation for public policy development. Mrs. Lott has completed the third year of contract services providing facilitation to the Department of Water Resources for San Joaquin County. During her tenure, the County and a joint powers authority have moved from a stalemate position to recipients of state funding for water supply projects and are currently developing Management Objectives to help restore the depleted underground aquifer. Also with CCP, Mrs. Lott was both Project Manager and Facilitator for the Smart Growth Local Elected Officials Roundtables, a joint project of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, the California State Association of Counties, the Local Government Commission, and the League of California Cities.

Mrs. (Ratto) Lott was also a Council Member for the City of Turlock, CA. During this time she was actively involved in numerous policy development activities through both the League of California Cities (LCC) and the National League of Cities. She played a leadership role as President of the LCC, Board member for both organizations, and Chair of numerous committees, including chairing the National League of Cities Leadership Training Council. She has also chaired the California Cities, Counties, and Schools State Partnership and still serves on their Board of Directors, and served as Governor’s Appointee on the Commission for Local Governance in the 21st Century. Mrs. Lott has completed a decade of service on the Turlock Chamber of Commerce Leadership Steering Committee and has spent more that half a decade as an Advisory Board Member for California State University, Stanislaus. She has also completed three terms as a Board Member for Emanuel Medical Center in Turlock.

One of Mrs. Lott’s strengths noted both by the City of Turlock management while on City Council and by leadership within the League of CA Cities, is her ability to build consensus. In facilitating conflict resolution, she works to understand individual interests versus positions;

thereby underscoring common desired outcomes. This would be an important skill to utilize within the context of the proposed project.

Recently awarded a U.S. Economic Development Administration grant, Mrs. Lott will coordinate the business plan development for the University of California, Merced Agri-Food Research Institute.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2003- Manager, Great Valley Center, New Valley Connexions, Modesto, CA
2001- Senior Mediator- Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento
Focus on facilitation of water management policy
2002-2003 Coordinator/Facilitator-Operation Clean Air, a 9-county, 13 industry sector, collaborative to address air quality issues (Under contract with Great Valley Center)
1993-2001 Office Manager- Dr. Michael P. Ratto
1996-1998 Teacher, Julien Elementary School, Turlock
1973-1975 Teacher-St. Brendan's Elementary School, San Francisco

HONORS AND AWARDS

1973 Cum Laude
1999 Paul Harris Award, Rotary International
1999 Turlock Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year Award
1998 Soroptomist Lifetime Honorary Membership
1998 Stanislaus County Minority Network Woman of the Year
1988 Nominee PTA Teacher of the Year

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

2001 Mediation and facilitation training - Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento, CA
1996-2000 Basic, Advanced, and Leadership in Action Certificates, League of California Cities Mayors and Council Members Leadership Academy

CREDENTIAL

1973 Lifetime Elementary

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES/COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

1998- Board Member-California Cities, Counties, and Schools Partnership
1998- Advisory Board Member- California State University Stanislaus
1990-2001 Council Member-City of Turlock
1998-1999 President: League of California Cities
1998-1990 Planning Commissioner-City of Turlock
1984-1988 Parks & Recreation Commissioner-City of Turlock
1994-1996 Board of Directors, National League of Cities
1996-2001 Advisory Board-National League of Cities
1996 Chair-National League of Cities Leadership Council
1998 Chair-California Cities, Counties, Schools Partnership

1997-1999
Century
1999
Committee

Commissioner-Governor's State Commission on Governance in the 21st
Member-CA State Vocational and Technical Education Plan Field Review

Attachments 7 - Marilyn Creel Resume

Marilyn Creel

2818 E. Los Altos Avenue
Fresno, CA 93710
(559) 298-8201

Projects:

Friant Water Education Garden at Friant Dam for the Bureau of Reclamation; plant choice and placement in demonstration garden; development of educational curriculum for interpreters
Garden of the Sun, Fresno County Master Gardener Program Demonstration Garden; design of specific garden rooms and structures; coordination of the installation of entire the garden; development of initial course topics
Habitat of Humanity Homes, Klamath Falls, Oregon for the Bureau of Reclamation; design of four drought tolerant residential landscapes
Bureau of Reclamation Regional office, Klamath Falls, Oregon; design of drought tolerant demonstration garden at regional office
Private residential designs

Employment Background:

Marilyn Creel, Landscape Designer and Consultant, Self-employed, 2004
California State University, Fresno for the Center for Irrigation Technology and California Water Institute, 1995 to 2004; Business Manager and Program Specialist
Tree Fresno, regional non-profit tree advocacy organization, 1992-1999; Bookkeeper

Volunteer:

Master Gardener Program for Fresno County-past member of the board of directors and current active volunteer-15 years
Discovery Center- past member of the board of directors
Clovis Botanical Garden- past member of the board of directors

Education:

Bachelor of Science, Accounting, CSU Fresno, 1965
Master Gardener Certificate, UCCE Fresno County, 1989
Course Studies in Horticulture, Landscape Design, and Architecture, California State Center Community Colleges, intermittent 1988 thru 2004

