Proposition 1

Watershed Restoration & Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Programs





Proposal Solicitation Notice Fiscal Year 2015-2016

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Proposal Deadline: September 16, 2015

August 5, 2015









California Department of Fish and Wildlife



Table of Contents

1	_	KGROUND	
	1.1	Specific Funding Requirements	2
2	FOC	US	1
_	2.1	Priorities Eligible for Funding	
	2.2	Proposal Categories	
		Tropodar Gatogorios	
3	PRO	POSAL REQUIREMENTS	.10
	3.1	Eligible Applicants	.10
	3.2	Confidentiality	.10
	3.3	Conflict of Interest	
	3.4	California Conservation Corps	
	3.5	Indirect Costs	
	3.6	Labor Code Compliance	
	3.7	Environmental Compliance and Permitting	
	3.8	General Grant Provisions	
	3.9	Licensed Professional Engineers or Geologists	
	3.10	Performance Evaluation	
	3.11 3.12	Adaptive Management and Durability of InvestmentLand Tenure/Site Control	
	3.12	Signage	
	3.13	Multiple Benefits	
	3.14	Subcontractors	
	3.16	Water Conservation and Efficiency Program	
	3.17	Water Law	
4		ER CONSIDERATIONS	
	4.1	Consistency with and Implementation of other Plans	
	4.2	Disadvantaged Community	
	4.3	Partnership Projects	.21
5	SHR	MISSION PROCEDURES FOR ALL PROPOSALS	22
J	5.1	Submittal Deadline	
	5.2	Electronic Submittal	
	5.3	Application Attachments	
	0.0		0
6	PRO	POSAL REVIEW PROCEDURE	.25
	6.1	Administrative Review	.25
	6.2	Technical Review	.25
	6.3	Selection Panel Review	
	6.4	Director of CDFW Review and Action	.26
_	4 D.D.	TIONAL INFORMATION IF FUNDED	20
7		TIONAL INFORMATION IF FUNDEDAwards	
	7.1 7.2	Grant Agreement	
	1.2	Grant Agreement	.აყ
8	DFFI	NITIONS AND LINKS	.42
,	8.1	Definitions	
	8.2	Links	

Tables

Table 1: Administrative Review Evaluation Criteria	27
Table 2: Overview of Technical Review Criteria, Weighting Factors, and Maximum	
Criterion Scores	28
Table 3: Technical Review Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Standards	29
Appendices	
Appendix A: California Conservation Corps and Certified Community Conservation	1
Corps	A-1
Corps Consultation Process	A-1
Corps Consultation Review Document	A-3
Appendix B: Proposal Application Form and Instructions	D 1
General Information Tab	
Project Budget Tab	
Funding Tab	
Project Management Tab	
Legislative Information Tab	
Questionnaire Tab	
Section 1: Summary Information	
Section 2: Project Integration Information	
Section 3: Project Location Information	
Section 4: Conflict of Interest	
Section 5: Qualifications and Experience of Applicant and Professionals	B-9
Section 6: Community Support and Collaboration	
Section 7: Project Statement	.B-11
Section 8: Schedule and List of Deliverables	
Section 9: Plans, Permits, Landowner Access, and Environmental Compliance	.B-15
Section 10: Project Budget	
Attachment 1 – Performance Measures Table	
Attachment 2 – Schedule and List of Deliverables	
Attachment 3 – Environmental Compliance Checklist	
Attachment 4 – Applicant Budget	
Attachment 5 – Subcontract Budget	
Attachment 6 – Fund Sources and Cost Share	.B-25

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BIOS Biogeographic Information and Observation System CALCC California Association of Local Conservation Corps

CARI California Aquatic Resources Inventory

CCC California Conservation Corps

CDFW California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CEDEN California Environmental Data Exchange Network

CEQA California Environmental Quality Act
CESA California Endangered Species Act

CLC California Labor Code

CRAM California Rapid Assessment Method
CVPIA Central Valley Project Improvement Act

CWA Clean Water Act

CWAP California Water Action Plan

CWC California Water Code

Delta Reform Act Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009

DIR Department of Industrial Relations

DPIIC Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee

ESA Federal Endangered Species Act

FGC Fish and Game Code

FGDC Federal Geographic Data Committee

GAMA Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act
NMFS National Marine Fisheries Service

NOAA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposal Application

Solicitation Proposal Solicitation Notice

SWAMP Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program

SWRCB State Water Resources Control Board

USGS United States Geological Survey

WRAMP Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program



This page is intentionally left blank

1 BACKGROUND

The Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (<u>Proposition 1</u>), which California voters passed in November 2014, provides funding to implement the three broad objectives of the California Water Action Plan: more reliable water supplies, the restoration of important species and habitat, and a more resilient, sustainably managed water resources system (e.g., water supply, water quality, flood protection, environment) that can better withstand inevitable and unforeseen pressures in the coming decades.

According to the California Water Action Plan (<u>CWAP</u>) over 80 percent of the Central Valley's historical floodplain, riparian and seasonal wetland habitats have been lost in the last 150 years. This loss affects the physical and ecological processes of the Central Valley and beyond, contributes to the decline of salmon and steelhead, restricts habitat for waterfowl and other species, and impacts water supply, flood protection and sediment control. In watersheds around the State, fish and wildlife no longer have access to habitat or enough cold, clean water at key times of the year. In response to these losses and ecological challenges, as well as in anticipation of the effects of climate change on the timing, volume and temperature of water flows, activities to protect and restore the resiliency of ecosystems will help support fish and wildlife populations, improve water quality, and restore natural system functions.

Proposition 1 amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add, among other articles, Sections 79737 and 79738, authorizing the Legislature to appropriate \$372,500,000 to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to fund multi-benefit ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects. CDFW will distribute these funds on a competitive basis through two grant programs, collectively referred to as the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs. The Watershed Restoration Grant Program (\$285,000,000) will focus on watershed restoration and protection projects of statewide importance outside of the Delta. The Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program (\$87,500,000) will focus on water quality, ecosystem restoration and fish protection facilities that benefit the Delta. CDFW finalized its Project Solicitation and Evaluation Guidelines for the Proposition 1 Watershed Restoration & Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Programs in June 2015 (CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines).

Over the next five years, California will pursue more than 30,000 acres of critical Delta restoration under the <u>California EcoRestore</u> program. Proposition 1 funds are available for public benefit projects that achieve the restoration objective and are unassociated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities.

1.1 Specific Funding Requirements

Proposition 1 includes a number of provisions that govern how CDFW may allocate funds authorized by CWC Sections 79737 and 79738, including those identified below:

Watershed Restoration Grant Program

- These funds are available for water quality, river, and watershed protection and restoration projects of statewide importance outside of the Delta (CWC §79737[d]).
- Funding shall only be used for projects that will provide fisheries or ecosystem benefits or improvements that are greater than required applicable environmental mitigation measures or compliance obligations, except for any water transfers for the benefit of subsection (d) of Section 3406 of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) (Title 34 of Public Law 102-575) (CWC §79737[f]).
- Funds shall not be expended to pay the costs of the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of Delta conveyance facilities (CWC §79737[e]).
- Funds expended for the acquisition of a permanent dedication of water shall be in accordance with Section 1707 of the CWC, where the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) specifies that the water is in addition to water that is required for regulatory requirements as provided in subdivision (c) of Section 1707 (CWC §79709[a]). The acquisition of long-term transfers of water shall be completed in accordance with Water Code sections 1735, 1736 and 1737.
- Funds shall not be used to acquire land via eminent domain (CWC §79711[g]).

Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program

- Funding will be available for projects that will provide fisheries or ecosystem benefits or improvements that are greater than required applicable environmental mitigation measures or compliance obligations (CWC §79732[b]).
- Funds shall not be used to acquire land via eminent domain (CWC §79738[e]).
- Funds shall not be expended to pay the costs of the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of Delta conveyance facilities (CWC §79738[f]).
- Funds expended for the acquisition of a permanent dedication of water shall be in accordance with Section 1707 of the Water Code, where the SWRCB specifies that

the water is in addition to water that is required for regulatory requirements as provided in subdivision (c) of Section 1707 (CWC §79709[a]). The acquisition of long-term transfers of water shall be completed in accordance with Water Code sections 1735, 1736 and 1737 (CWC §79709[b]).

2 FOCUS

In Fiscal Year 2015/2016 (FY 15/16), up to \$31.4 million of Proposition 1 funding is available for award through this Solicitation to fund the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs. CDFW anticipates allocating up to \$24 million for the Watershed Restoration Grant Program and up to \$7 million for the Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program; however these amounts could change based on proposals received under each Program. The priorities for this Solicitation are described below.

Section 2.3 of the CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines provides information regarding eligible project types as established through Proposition 1. All Proposition 1 grants funded by CDFW under this Solicitation must fall within the list of priorities described below. An applicant must demonstrate that its proposed project is consistent with the eligibility requirements, priorities, proposal categories, CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines, and Proposition 1. CDFW is seeking a diversity of projects that encompass the priorities for this Solicitation. In selecting project awards, CDFW will consider proposal review scores and comments, amount of funds available, and distribution of funding among priorities considered in the Solicitation. CDFW may reduce grant amounts from that requested.

2.1 Priorities Eligible for Funding

Watershed Restoration Grant Program

The Watershed Restoration Grant Program will fund projects of statewide importance outside of the Delta within the five priorities identified below. Proposals that address the CWAP actions under this broad focus of Proposition 1 will receive additional points in the proposal review.

Manage Headwaters for Multiple Benefits (CWAP Action)

Projects that manage headwaters for multiple benefits by:

- Restoring forest health through ecologically sound forest management.
- Protecting and restoring degraded stream and meadow ecosystems to assist in natural water management and improved habitat.
- Protecting lands within watersheds to ensure that conversion of these lands does not have a negative impact on water resources.

Restore Coastal Watersheds (CWAP Action)

Projects that restore coastal watersheds including off-channel storage projects, projects to modernize stream crossings, and large-scale habitat projects in strategic coastal estuaries to restore ecological health and natural system connectivity, which will benefit local water systems and help defend against sea level rise.

Enhance Fish Migration (CWAP Action)

Projects that address fish migration including:

- Installation or repair of priority unscreened diversions in the Central Valley area as prioritized by CDFW and the CVPIA Anadromous Fish Screen Program. See CDFW's Priority Unscreened Diversion List for the Central Valley.
- Completing culvert and bridge improvements and small dam removal projects to provide anadromous fish species access to historic spawning and rearing habitats.

Restore Mountain Meadow Habitat (CWAP Action)

Projects that restore mountain meadow habitat in the Sierra Nevada and Cascade mountain ranges that provide potential benefits such as increased groundwater storage, reduced and delayed peak flows on streams that flow through meadow systems, improved water quality, protection of climate refugia, and restored and expanded habitat for native species.

Habitat Restoration, Conservation, and Enhancement

Projects to protect, restore, or enhance water dependent habitats (e.g., streams, rivers, lakes and wetlands) for fish and wildlife.

Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program

The Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program will fund projects that benefit the Delta within the three priorities identified below.

Improve Water Quality or Contribute to the Improvement of Water Quality

Projects that improve water quality or that contribute to the improvement of water quality in the Delta to improve ecosystem condition and functions, including projects in Delta counties that provide multiple public benefits and improve drinking and agricultural water quality or water supplies.

<u>Habitat Restoration, Conservation, and Enhancement (CWAP Action or California EcoRestore¹)</u>

Projects that improve the condition of special-status, at risk, endangered, or threatened species in the Delta and Delta counties, including but not limited to, projects to protect, restore, or enhance habitats, to eradicate invasive species, and to support the beneficial reuse of dredged material for habitat restoration and levee improvements. Habitat restoration projects must be carried out consistent with Section 1, part II (Habitats), of the Conservation Strategy for Restoration of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Sacramento Valley and San Joaquin Valley Regions (Conservation Strategy, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service 2014). Applicants should use the elevation map presented in the Conservation Strategy (refer to Figure 4 in the Conservation Strategy) as a guide for determining appropriate habitat restoration actions based on an area's elevation. If a proposed habitat restoration action is not consistent with the Conservation Strategy, the proposal shall provide rationale for the deviation based on best available science.

Scientific Studies and Assessments to Support Implementation of the Delta Science Plan (CWAP Action)

Scientific studies and assessments that address priority science needs that inform water and natural resource policy and management decisions and contribute to achieving the coequal goals for the Delta. Such actions will be consistent with and facilitate implementation of the Delta Science Plan. This Solicitation is seeking proposals that address the following high-impact science actions endorsed by the Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee (DPIIC).

<u>Topic 1. Assessing drought-related effects on the Delta.</u> There is a need for enhanced understanding concerning the full-range of drought effects on the Delta system, including projects that provide the following:

 Investigate effects of drought-induced flow changes on native fish survival and migration patterns.

_

¹ Proposition 1 funds cannot be used to meet the existing obligations for habitat restoration established through the biological opinions for the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project operations (USFWS 2008, NMFS 2009), and the CDFW Longfin Smelt Incidental Take Permit for SWP Delta operations.

 Advance models that assess effects of changes in flow, entrainment, water quality, food web dynamics, and contaminants on juvenile fish using recent data from drought-related projects.

<u>Topic 2. Effectiveness and implications of habitat restoration actions.</u> In light of ongoing and proposed landscape-scale restoration projects to begin in the near-term, there is a need for pre-restoration data and synthesis of the efficacy of past projects to guide current restoration activities. There is a need for projects that provide the following:

- Enhance current and implement additional monitoring efforts in the Delta and Suisun Marsh to gather and synthesize pre-restoration data.
- Understand the effectiveness of wetland habitat restoration of subsided Delta islands on subsidence reversal, carbon sequestration, mercury methylation, flood protection, and levee stability.
- Develop decision-support tools to explore alternative Delta habitat restoration designs and potential regional effects of multi-project implementation on water quality, contaminants, flow, and species population dynamics.

Topic 3. Science support for management of estuarine and migratory species. This issue encompasses several priority topics including native fish distribution, food web dynamics, and flow effects on native species. Projects addressing this issue will identify key informational needs for management of estuarine and migratory species management. There is a need for projects that provide the following:

- Support new innovations such as real-time tracking devices and adjustments to monitoring and survey designs to aid in determining temporal and spatial distribution of fish at a finer scale than is currently achieved.
- Conduct research to improve understanding of food web dynamics and productivity and how they can be improved for native species.
- Improve understanding of flow effects on native species, for example conduct research to examine the direct and indirect effects of flows and other drivers on essential fish production processes and vital rates.

2.2 Proposal Categories

CDFW will award a variety of grants under the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs for projects that may include Planning, Implementation, Acquisition, and Scientific Studies, Monitoring and Assessments, to achieve the grant program purposes. Typical grant terms

will be three years with a possibility for extending up to five years, if justified. Project proposals should be written assuming a three-year grant term.

Planning

Planning grants provide funding for planning efforts that will lead to the successful design of implementation projects. These efforts may include project development, implementation strategy development, watershed assessments, and project-specific activities such as design, baseline data collection, permitting, and environmental review. Planning grants are intended to support the development of projects that are likely to qualify for future implementation funding. If the proposal seeks funding for permitting, a complete description of the permits needed and a timeline for obtaining them must be included in the application.

Implementation

Implementation grants are the primary focus of the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs. These grants fund construction of restoration and enhancement projects and new or enhanced facilities. They are intended to support high priority, "shovel ready" projects that have advanced to the stage where planning, land tenure, and engineering have been completed. Provided that CEQA has been completed, implementation proposals may include final design and permitting as lesser components. If permits are to be obtained for a proposed project, a complete description of the permits needed and a timeline for obtaining them must be included in the application.

Acquisition

Acquisition grants fund purchases of land or interests in land or water to support the CWAP and the goals of the Delta Stewardship Council's <u>Delta Plan</u>. Interests in land include perpetual conservation easements. Water acquisitions include permanent and long-term dedications (not less than 20 years). Acquisitions must be from willing sellers and at fair market value, as confirmed by an appraisal approved by the Department of General Services Real Property Services Section. Properties acquired by an eligible entity with Proposition 1 funds can be transferred to a federal, state, or nonprofit entity to ultimately own, manage, and steward.

Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment

Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment grants fund projects to assess the condition of natural resources, inform policy and management decisions, or assess the

effectiveness of grant projects and programs. These grants will only be awarded under the Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program. The Watershed Restoration Grant Program may fund Planning, Implementation, and Acquisition projects that include scientific studies, monitoring, and assessment activities as a part of the proposal's performance evaluation plan (i.e., as a lesser component).

3 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Submitted proposals must be in full compliance with all stated requirements of this Solicitation.

3.1 Eligible Applicants

Eligible entities are limited to public agencies (state agencies or departments, special districts, joint powers authorities, counties, cities, or other political subdivisions of the state), nonprofit organizations, public utilities, federally recognized Indian tribes, state Indian tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's California Tribal Consultation List, and mutual water companies (CWC §79712[a]). In addition, to be eligible for funding:

- A project proposed by a public utility that is regulated by the Public Utilities
 Commission or a mutual water company shall have a clear and definite public
 purpose and shall benefit the customers of the water system and not the investors
 (CWC §79712[b][1]).
- An urban water supplier shall adopt and submit an urban water management plan in accordance with the Urban Water Management Planning Act (Part 2.6 [commencing with §10610] of Division 6 of the CWC) (CWC §79712[b][2]).
- An agricultural water supplier shall adopt and submit an agricultural water management plan in accordance with the Agricultural Water Management Planning Act (Part 2.8 [commencing with §10800] of Division 6 of the CWC) (CWC §79712[b][3]).
- In accordance with CWC Section 10608.56, an agricultural water supplier or an urban water supplier is ineligible for funding unless it complies with the requirements of Part 2.55 (commencing with Section10608) of the CWC) of Division 6 of the Water Code (CWC §79712[b][4]).

Proposals from federal agencies, private individuals or for-profit enterprises will not be accepted.

3.2 Confidentiality

Once proposals have been submitted to CDFW, any privacy rights, as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the proposal will be waived. Unsealed proposals are public records under California Government Code Sections 6250-

6276.48.

3.3 Conflict of Interest

All applicants and individuals who participate in the review of submitted proposals are subject to state and federal conflict of interest laws. Any individual who has participated in planning or setting priorities for a specific solicitation or who will participate in any part of the project development and negotiation process on behalf of the public is ineligible to receive funds or personally benefit from funds awarded through that solicitation. Applicants should also be aware that certain state agencies may submit proposals that will compete for funding. Employees of state agencies may participate in the review process as scientific/technical reviewers but are subject to the same state conflict of interest laws.

Failure to comply with the conflict of interest laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the proposal being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal actions may also be taken. Applicable statutes include, but are not limited to, California Government Code Section 1090 and Public Contract Code Sections 10365.5, 10410, and 10411.

3.4 California Conservation Corps

All applicants for restoration and ecosystem protection projects shall consult with the California Conservation Corps and a certified local conservation corps as to the feasibility of using their services as defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code to implement projects (CWC §79734). Appendix A includes guidance on the steps necessary to ensure compliance. Applicants that fail to engage in such consultation will not be eligible to receive CDFW Proposition 1 funding.

3.5 Indirect Costs

Indirect cost (administrative overhead) rates are limited to 20 percent. Any amount over 20 percent will not be funded but may be used as cost share. Indirect costs include but are not limited to workers compensation insurance, utilities, office space rental, phone, and copying which is directly related to completion of the proposed project. Costs for subcontractors and purchase of equipment cannot be included in the calculation of indirect costs. The applicant must explain the methodology used to determine the rate and provide detailed calculations in support of the indirect cost rate.

3.6 Labor Code Compliance

Projects awarded through the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs may be subject to prevailing wage provisions of Part 7 of Division 2 of the California Labor Code (CLC), commencing with Section 1720. Typically, the types of projects that are subject to the prevailing wage requirements are public works projects. Existing law defines "public works" as, among other things, construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work done under contract and paid for in whole or in part out of public funds. Successful applicants shall pay prevailing wage to all persons employed in the performance of any part of the project if required by law to do so. Any questions of interpretation regarding the CLC should be directed to the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), the state department having jurisdiction in these matters. For more details, please refer to the DIR website.

3.7 Environmental Compliance and Permitting

Activities funded under the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs must be in compliance with applicable state and federal environmental laws and regulations, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Delta Reform Act, and other environmental permitting requirements. Several local, state, and federal agencies may have permitting or other approval authority over projects that are eligible for grant funding. The applicant is responsible for obtaining all permits necessary to carry out the proposed work. A list of common permit types is provided in the proposal application (Appendix B).

Proposals for Planning grants may include in their budgets the funding necessary for environmental review and permitting related tasks. Provided CEQA/NEPA compliance has been completed, proposals for Implementation grants may include in their budgets the funding necessary to complete permitting related tasks and final design. As part of any proposal, applicants must identify the project's expected permitting requirements, state what permits have been obtained or the process through which the permits will be obtained, and describe the anticipated timeframe for obtaining each permit. Projects that are undertaken to meet mitigation obligations, or projects that are under an enforcement action by a regulatory agency, will not be considered for funding.

When applicable, projects must be consistent with the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Plan. For grant proposals that include an action that is likely to be deemed a covered

action pursuant to CWC Section 85057.5, the applicant is responsible for ensuring and documenting consistency with the Delta Plan policies. In such instances, the proposal shall include a brief description of the project's consistency with the Delta Plan.

Proposals for projects that are subject to CEQA and NEPA must identify the state and federal lead agencies and provide documentation that the agency or agencies have accepted the role. The applicant must coordinate with CDFW if it anticipates CDFW acting as CEQA lead agency for the project. CDFW will not award implementation grants until the lead agency has completed CEQA/NEPA compliance for the project.

3.8 General Grant Provisions

The applicant must agree to the CDFW <u>General Grant Provisions</u>. CDFW General Grant Provisions include information regarding audits, amendments, liability insurance and rights in data.

3.9 Licensed Professional Engineers or Geologists

Some projects may require a licensed professional engineer or licensed professional geologist to comply with the requirements of the Business and Professions Code, section 6700 et seq. (Professional Engineers Act) and section 7800 et seq., (Geologists and Geophysicists Act). If a project requires the services of licensed professionals, these individuals and their affiliations should be identified in the proposal.

3.10 Performance Evaluation

Proposals are required to include a performance evaluation plan that describes how the success of the project will be determined. This evaluation will assess whether the project is: 1) being implemented consistently with the terms of the grant agreement (compliance monitoring), and 2) achieving or making progress toward the stated objectives and desired outcomes (effectiveness monitoring). As described below, the plan must include a description of project-specific performance measures and the approach through which monitoring, assessment, data management, and reporting will be accomplished. The scope and nature of the plan should be commensurate with the objectives, type, scale, level of uncertainty, and complexity of the project. It is recognized that the approach to performance evaluation may vary across, as well as within, proposal categories.

Performance Measures

Performance measures are indicators used to evaluate the degree to which project

objectives are achieved. Performance measures must be clearly linked to project objectives, quantifiable where feasible, easily understood, and repeatable. Applicants are required to define project-specific performance measures that best fit the needs of their project and associated activities, using the guidance below.

Project Objective(s)	Identify the project objective(s). Objectives are specific, often quantitative, statements of the desired outcomes that the project is expected to achieve. Where feasible, the objectives should be measurable and quantifiable.				
Project Output Performance Measures	Identify project output performance measures for each objective. Output performance measures evaluate factors that may be influencing outcomes and include tracking project implementation (e.g., activities, products, deliverables, acres of habitat restored, etc.). Identify the targets or benchmarks against which project success will be measured.				
Project Outcome Performance Measures	Identify project outcome performance measures for each objective. Outcome performance measures evaluate ecosystem responses to the project activities (e.g., improvement in environmental conditions). Identify the targets or benchmarks against which project success will be measured, at least some of which must be feasible to meet during the term of the grant (e.g., can be met within one to two years post-construction).				
Measurement Tools and Methods	List methods of measurement or tools that will be used to document project performance, using standard approaches/protocols, as applicable. This will be expanded upon in the monitoring plan described below.				

Monitoring and Assessment

Each proposal must include a plan to measure, track, and report on project performance (compliance and effectiveness) that is consistent with the project's objectives and performance measures. Applicants should incorporate standardized approaches, where applicable, into their monitoring plans and evaluate opportunities to coordinate with

existing monitoring efforts (e.g., California Coastal Monitoring Program, Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program [SWAMP]) or produce information that can readily be integrated into such efforts.

For example, wetland and riparian restoration projects shall collect and report project and monitoring data in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program (WRAMP) framework and tools administered by the California Wetlands Working Group of the California Water Quality Monitoring Council. The framework can be used to decide on the kinds of data to collect based on how they will be used. The tools include the California Aquatic Resources Inventory (CARI) for classifying the distribution and abundance of wetlands throughout the state; rapid assessment tools, such as the California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM), for assessing the overall condition of wetlands; and EcoAtlas for tracking project information and aggregating and visualizing data from multiple sources. For information on improvements to these tools and new tools being developed, contact the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup.

If an applicant determines that the use of standardized approaches is not appropriate, the proposal must provide a clear justification and description of the proposed approach. As the maturity of a restoration project is often beyond the timescale of an individual grant agreement (typically three to five years), applicants pursuing Implementation projects or Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment projects should identify opportunities to extend the monitoring beyond the grant term (e.g., by using standardized, readily replicated monitoring and evaluation processes; leveraging on-going monitoring programs; and building partnerships capable of attracting funding from multiple sources over time).

The monitoring plan shall include the following elements:

- What will be monitored
- Monitoring objectives (why the monitoring is needed)
- Clearly stated assessment questions
- The specific metrics that will be measured and the methods/protocol(s) that will be used
- Linkages to relevant conceptual model(s)
- The timeframe and frequency of monitoring, including pre- and post-project monitoring
- The spatial scope of the monitoring effort

- Quality assurance/quality control procedures
- Compliance with all permit requirements for monitoring activities (e.g., Scientific Collecting Permits)
- Description of relationships to existing monitoring efforts
- How the resulting data will be analyzed, interpreted and reported

Data Management

Each proposal will describe how data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, and shared. Projects must include data management activities that support incorporation of project data into statewide data systems (e.g., California Environmental Data Exchange Network [CEDEN]), where applicable. Environmental data and information collected under these grant programs must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users in a timely manner, except where limited by law, regulation, policy or security requirements.

Unless otherwise stipulated, all data collected and created is a required deliverable and will become the property of CDFW. A condition of final payment shall include the delivery of all related data. Spatial data should be delivered in an ESRI-useable format where applicable and documented with metadata in accordance with minimum Biogeographic Information and following Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) metadata standards.

Water Quality Data

If the project includes water quality monitoring data collection, it shall be collected and reported to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in a manner that is compatible and consistent with surface water monitoring or groundwater data systems administered by the SWRCB (e.g., CEDEN for surface water data) (CWC §79704). The grantee shall be responsible for uploading the data and providing a receipt of successful data submission, generated by CEDEN, to the grant manager prior to submitting a final invoice. Guidance for submitting data, including minimum data elements, data formats, and contact information for the Regional Data Centers, is available on the CEDEN website.

Wetland and Riparian Restoration Data

Wetland and riparian restoration project data shall be uploaded to <u>EcoAtlas</u>. For the purpose of this requirement, examples of project data include project proponent, project

name, location (e.g., latitude/longitude, project boundary), pertinent dates (e.g., site construction), activity type (e.g., restoration), and habitat type and amount. For additional information, refer to the "Project Uploader" online tool on the EcoAtlas website. Monitoring data shall be uploaded to statewide data systems, as applicable, in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the WRAMP framework.

Reporting

All grantees will be required to provide periodic progress reports during implementation of the project and a final report prior to project completion. Specific reporting requirements will be included in the grant agreement. Among other requirements, all such reports will include an evaluation of project performance that links to the project's performance measures. The final report will include, among other things, a discussion of findings, conclusions, or recommendations for follow-up, ongoing, or future activities.

Final reporting for Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment projects will include a synthesis of all findings and provide conclusions on hypotheses tested, as well as recommendations for resource management and further investigations related to the research subject area. The deliverables will include a draft manuscript in a format suitable for publication in a scientific peer-reviewed journal.

3.11 Adaptive Management and Durability of Investment

Each proposal shall describe the project's adaptive management strategies. An adaptive management approach provides a structured process that allows for taking action under uncertain conditions based on the best available science, establishing an explicit objective, monitoring and evaluating outcomes, and re-evaluating and adjusting decisions as more information is learned. This discussion shall identify what actions will be implemented if the monitoring data indicates that project objectives are not being met, the party responsible for implementing remedial measures and the source(s) of funding to complete necessary actions.

To facilitate project success, applicants proposing Implementation or Acquisition projects shall provide a long-term management and maintenance plan as part of their grant proposal. Specific terms and conditions appropriate to the scope of the project may be negotiated prior to grant execution. CDFW shall have access to the project site at least once every 12 months from the start date of the grant for 25 years, or an appropriate term negotiated prior to grant execution. CDFW shall provide advance notice to landowners

prior to accessing the project site.

3.12 Land Tenure/Site Control

Applicants for projects conducting on-the-ground work must submit documentation showing that they have adequate tenure to, and site control of, the properties to be improved or restored for at least 25 years. Proof of adequate land tenure includes, but is not necessarily limited to:

- Fee title ownership.
- An easement or license agreement.
- Other agreement between the applicant and the fee title owner, or the owner of an easement in the property, sufficient to give the applicant adequate site control for the purposes of the project and long-term management.
- For projects involving multiple landowners, all landowners or an appointed designee must provide written permission to complete the project.

When an applicant does not have tenure at the time of proposal submission, but intends to establish tenure via an agreement that will be signed prior to grant execution, the applicant must submit a template copy of the proposed agreement, memorandum of understanding (MOU), or permission form at the time of proposal submission. Once a project has been awarded, the applicant must submit documentation of land tenure before a complete grant agreement can be executed.

3.13 Signage

Successful applicants must include signage, to the extent practicable, informing the public that the project received funds through CDFW from the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (CWC §79707[g]).

3.14 Multiple Benefits

An intent of Proposition 1 is to fund multi-benefit ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects in accordance with statewide priorities (CWC §79730). In addition, the CWAP acknowledges the value of projects with multiple benefits, such as restoring a mountain meadow that can simultaneously improve groundwater storage, water quality, and provide suitable habitat for native species. Applicants must describe how the proposed project will achieve additional benefits beyond the primary benefit. The scale of the benefits may differ depending on the project.

3.15 Subcontractors

It is the responsibility of the applicant to comply with all applicable laws and regulations for their projects, including the applicant's institutional requirements for selection of subcontractors.

3.16 Water Conservation and Efficiency Program

Pursuant to Governor Brown's <u>April 2014 Executive Order</u>, recipients of funding for future projects that impact water resources, including groundwater resources must have appropriate water conservation and efficiency programs in place in response to persistent drought conditions. CDFW is interpreting this to include all of the eligible project types that could be funded through this Solicitation. The water conservation and efficiency program is specific to the organization, not the proposed project. The Executive Order did not provide specific guidance concerning format or content of the programs. As such, each entity can develop a program that is appropriate for the type and scale of their organization. Proposals must verify the applicant's organization has a water conservation and efficiency program in place; however, it does not need to be submitted with the proposal.

3.17 Water Law

Proposals that address stream flows and water use shall comply with the CWC, as well as any applicable federal, state, or local laws or regulations. Any proposal that would require a change to water rights, including, but not limited to, bypass flows, point of diversion, location of use, purpose of use, or off-stream storage shall demonstrate an understanding of the SWRCB processes, timelines, and costs necessary for project approvals by SWRCB and the ability to meet those timelines within the term of a grant. In addition, any proposal that involves modification of water rights for an adjudicated stream shall identify the required legal process for the change as well as associated legal costs. Prior to its completion, any water right acquisition must be supported by a water rights appraisal approved by the Department of General Services Real Property Services Section.

All applicants must demonstrate to CDFW that they have a legal right to divert water and sufficient documentation regarding actual water availability and use. For post-1914 water rights, the applicant must submit a copy of a water right permit or license on file with the SWRCB. Applicants who divert water based on a riparian or pre-1914 water right must submit written evidence of the right to divert water and the priority in the watershed of that diversion right with their proposal. All applicants must include past water diversion and

use information reported to the SWRCB, required by CWC Section 5101. Such reports include Progress Reports of Permittee and Reports of Licensee for post-1914 rights, and Supplemental Statements of Water Diversion and Use for riparian and pre-1914 water rights. All water rights must be accompanied by any operational conditions, agreements or court orders associated with the right, as well as any SWRCB orders affecting the water right. Projects involving activities described in Fish and Game Code Section 1602 may require a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement.

4 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 Consistency with and Implementation of other Plans

Applicants are encouraged to provide information on how the proposed project is consistent with other local, state, and federal management plans. Proposed projects which show a nexus to other plans may be considered more competitive and beneficial than projects that do not.

4.2 Disadvantaged Community

Points will be awarded to proposals that are located within, or provide benefits to a disadvantaged community as defined in CWC Section 79505.5.

4.3 Partnership Projects

In watersheds with multiple projects, partners and landowners may work together to submit a single proposal for a combined project to provide greater ecosystem benefits. The proposal must be submitted and managed by a single eligible entity. During the proposal review and selection process, the evaluation will be based on the merit of the entire proposal as a whole versus the merit of any individual components. However, each individual component must be identified and described in sufficient detail to support an evaluation of the merit of the proposal. A proposal containing multiple actions would need to be considered as one project under CEQA, and evaluated as such.

5 SUBMISSION PROCEDURES FOR ALL PROPOSALS

5.1 Submittal Deadline

Proposals will be accepted from August 5, 2015 to September 16, 2015. Following the proposal review period, CDFW anticipates awarding grants in late 2015, with grant execution approximately six months from award.

Online submittal of proposals must be received before 4:00pm, PST on September 16, 2015.

Applications will not be accepted after 4:00 p.m., and thus will not be reviewed or considered for funding. Failure to submit any required attachment or complete all required application components will make the application incomplete. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed or considered for funding. The complete application must be submitted electronically through SWRCB's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST).

All information requested in this Solicitation is mandatory unless otherwise indicated. An applicant's name and address may be provided to the public, if requested. Other personal information submitted in this proposal may be released to governmental entities involved with the funding of the project, to law enforcement agencies pursuant to a court order, or for official natural resources management purposes. Proposals are subject to Public Records Act requests.

5.2 Electronic Submittal

Applicants must submit a complete application on-line using the FAAST. The online FAAST application is currently available for use and can be found at: https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov.

The name of this Solicitation in FAAST is "Proposition 1, Watershed Restoration & Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Programs." To access this Solicitation, if they have not already done so, applicants must register and have an account in FAAST. Applicants are encouraged to watch the "How to Create a FAAST Account" video. The FAAST Help Desk is staffed Monday – Friday (8:00am – 5:00pm). Questions regarding

the FAAST website should be directed to 1-866-434-1083 or FAAST_ADMIN@waterboards.ca.gov. If there are any questions regarding the Solicitation or proposal application process, please email WatershedGrants@wildlife.ca.gov.

The application in FAAST consists of eight sections or "tabs". Within FAAST, pull down menus, text boxes, multiple-choice selections, or uploaded attachments will be used to receive answers to the questions. FAAST will allow applicants to type text or cut and paste information from other documents directly into a submittal screen. The proposal application is provided as Appendix B in rich text format for applicants to prepare responses and cut and paste information into the online application; however, the application must be submitted online using FAAST. Hardcopy or email submissions of the application will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

5.3 Application Attachments

When uploading an attachment in FAAST, the following attachment title naming convention must be used:

Att#_2015CDFWP1_#ofTotal#

Where:

- a. "Att#" is the attachment number or name
- b. "2015CDFWP1" is the code of this Solicitation
- c. "#ofTotal#" identifies the number of files that make up an attachment, where "#" is the number of a file and "Total#" is the total number of files submitted in the attachment.

For example, if the Attachment - Project Maps consists of three files, the second file in the set would be named "AttProjectMaps 2015CDFWP1 2of3".

File size for each attachment submitted via FAAST is limited to 25 megabytes (MB). Breaking documents into logical components so that files are less than 25 MB will aid in uploading files. There is no limit to the number of files that can be uploaded.

Acceptable file formats are: MS Word, MS Excel, or PDF. PDF files should be generated, if possible, from the original application file rather than scanned hard copy. All portions of

the application must be submitted by the application deadline. When possible all attachments should use a minimum 10-point font size with a 1 inch border. Certain page restrictions may apply and will be described in the FAAST application questions.

6 PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

6.1 Administrative Review

An administrative review will determine if the proposal is complete and meets all the requirements for technical review. This review will use a "Pass/Fail" scoring method, based on the criteria presented in Table 1. Those proposals which receive a "Fail" for one or more of the Table 1 criteria will be considered incomplete and will not be considered for funding under this Solicitation.

6.2 Technical Review

Table 2 provides an overview of the technical review criteria, as well as the weighting factors, maximum criterion scores, and percent of total maximum score. All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers in accordance with the scoring criteria documented in Table 3. Technical reviewers will make narrative comments as shown in Table 3. The technical reviewers assigned to each proposal will include representatives from CDFW. CDFW may request reviewers from other agencies or other outside experts to participate in the review. The review process may encompass an independent scientific review. Individuals selected to serve as technical reviewers will be professionals in fields relevant to the proposed project (CWC §79707[f]).

Each criterion will be scored by technical reviewers and assigned a point value between zero and five. Each criterion's point value will then be multiplied by the applicable weighting factor to calculate the criterion score. A total score for the proposal will be generated by summing the criterion scores. Where standard scoring criteria are applied, points will be assigned as follows:

- A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.
- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is less than fully addressed and is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed or the documentation or rationale is incomplete or insufficient.

- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed or no documentation or rationale is presented.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

6.3 Selection Panel Review

Following completion of the technical reviews of all complete and eligible proposals, CDFW will convene a Selection Panel to review the scores and comments.

Representatives from other agencies and organizations may be invited to participate on the Selection Panel. The Selection Panel will generate a preliminary ranking list of the proposals and make the initial funding recommendations. When developing the ranking list, the Selection Panel will consider the following items:

- Proposal review scores and comments
- Amount of funds available
- Program purposes
- Distribution of funding among priorities identified in the Solicitation
- For Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program proposals, results of coordination and consultation with the Delta city or Delta county in which a grant is proposed to be expended or an interest in real property is proposed to be acquired (CWC §79738[b])

The Selection Panel may recommend modifications, including reducing grant amounts from that requested, in order to meet current and any potential future program priorities, funding targets and available funding limitations.

6.4 Director of CDFW Review and Action

The Director of CDFW will review the Selection Panel recommendations and associated materials and make the final funding decision.

Table 1: Administrative Review Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Score
All proposal components have been completed in the required formats, including all proposal forms and associated documents.	Pass/Fail
Applicant contact information, including person authorized to sign grant agreement, is included.	Pass/Fail
Applicant is an eligible entity.	Pass/Fail
Proposal was received by the deadline.	Pass/Fail
Budget is included.	Pass/Fail
Proposal is responsive to the Solicitation's priorities and represents an eligible project type.	Pass/Fail
Proposed project is not required mitigation or to be used for mitigation under CEQA, NEPA, CESA, ESA, CWA, Porter-Cologne, other pertinent laws and regulations, or a permit issued by any local, state, or federal agency.	Pass/Fail
The applicant has included a consultation form from the California Conservation Corps AND California Association of Local Conservation Corps (collectively, "the Corps") to determine the feasibility of the Corps participation, consistent with the guidance stipulated in Appendix A of the Solicitation.	Pass/Fail

Table 2: Overview of Technical Review Criteria, Weighting Factors, and Maximum Criterion Scores

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Criterion Score	Percent of Total Maximum Score			
Organizational Capacity						
Project Team Qualifications / Ability to Accomplish Project	2.0	10	10%			
Project Benefits / State Priorities						
2. Project Description – Purpose	0.5	2.5				
Implement Actions of the California Water Action Plan	2.0	10				
Consistency with and Implementation of Other Plans	1.0	5	32.5%			
5. Project Outcomes – Diversity and Significance of the Benefits	1.0	5	32.576			
Project Outcomes – Durability of Investment	1.0	5				
7. Climate Change Considerations	1.0	5				
Readiness / Feasibility						
Project Description - Implementation	1.0	5				
9. Schedule and Deliverables	0.5	2.5	20%			
10. Project Readiness (Implementation Projects Only)	1.5	7.5	2070			
11. Budget	1.0	5				
Leveraged Funding						
12. Leverages Other State Funds	0.5	2.5	7.5%			
13. Non-State Cost Share Funds	1.0	5	7.5%			
Community / Stakeholder Suppor	rt					
14. Community Support and Collaboration	1.5	7.5	10%			
15. Disadvantaged Communities	0.5	2.5				
Scientific Merit						
16. Scientific Merit – Scientific Basis	1.0	5				
17. Scientific Merit – Enhance Scientific Understanding	0.5	2.5	20%			
18. Monitoring and Assessment	2.0	10				
19. Data Management and Access	0.5	2.5				
Total Possible Score		100	100%			
TOTAL POSSIBLE SCORE		100	100%			

Table 3: Technical Review Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Standards

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
Organizational Capacity				
I. Project Team Qualifications / Ability to Accomplish Project The proposal clearly demonstrates that the project eam has the qualifications, experience, and capacity o perform the proposed tasks.	2.0	0-5	0-10	Proposals that demonstrate an appropriate level of expertise and, where applicable, successful completion of previously funded grants will receive 4 to 5 points
				Proposals in which the project team lacks some expertise, has had some problems with successful completion of previously funded grants, or named subcontractors are not appropriate for work will receive 2 to 3 points
				Proposals in which the project team lacks a lot of expertise and/or has had many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects will receive 1 point
				Proposals in which the project team is unqualified, problematic subcontractors are identified, persistent problems with completing previously funded grants, and/or uncooperative will receive a score of zero
Project Benefits / State Priorities				
2. Project Description – Purpose The proposal includes a detailed project description, including sufficient rationale to justify project needs, and a description of the objectives. Proposed project location and boundaries are clearly delineated.	0.5	0-5	0-2.5	See Standard Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
3. Implement Actions of the California Water Action Plan The proposed project implements one or more actions from the California Water Action Plan that are	2.0	0-5	0-10	Proposals that implement multiple California Water Action Plan actions identified as priorities for this Solicitation, as well as one or more other actions identified in the California Water Action Plan will receive 5 points
ntified as priorities in this Solicitation.				Proposals that implement one of the California Water Action Plan actions identified as a priority for this Solicitation and one or more other actions identified in the California Water Action Plan will receive 3-4 points
				Proposals that implement one of the California Water Action Plan actions identified as a priority for this Solicitation, but do not implement other actions identified in the California Water Action Plan will receive 2 points
				Proposals that do not implement any of the California Water Action Plan actions identified as a priority for this Solicitation, but do implement one or more other actions identified in the California Water Action Plan will receive 1 point
				Proposals that do not implement the actions identified in the California Water Action Plan will receive a score of zero
4. Consistency with and Implementation of Other Plans The proposed project implements one or more actions within existing conservation, restoration, recovery plans, or other relevant local, state, or federal plans or policies.	1.0	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
Project Outcomes – Diversity and Significance of the Benefits The proposed project provides multiple benefits and	1.0	0-5	0-5	Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant and is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation will receive 5 points
the proposal provides sufficient analysis and documentation to demonstrate significance and a high likelihood that the benefits will be realized.				Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking will receive 4 points
 Examples of potential multiple benefits include: Climate change response actions Drought preparedness Integrated flood management 				Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance and is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation will receive 3 points
 Protection or improvement of water quality Use and reuse water more efficiently Expand environmental stewardship 				Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking will receive 2 points
 Increase habitat for threatened and endangered species 				Proposals that are likely to provide a low level of multiple benefits will receive 1 point
Reduce species survival stressors				Proposals that do not provide multiple benefits will receive a score of zero
6. Project Outcomes – Durability of Investment The proposed project will deliver sustainable outcomes in the long-term. Planning and Scientific Studies, Monitoring and Assessment proposals should describe how the proposed project will result in or inform future implementation projects and how it will address long term sustainability of future implementation.	1.0	0-5	0-5	Implementation/Acquisition: Proposals that provide a well- defined long-term management and maintenance plan for a minimum of 25 years will receive 5 points Planning/Scientific Studies, Monitoring and Assessment: Proposals that provide a well-defined description of how the proposed project will result in or inform future implementation projects and how it will address long term sustainability of future implementation will receive 5 points
				Implementation/Acquisition: Proposals that provide an adequate long-term management and maintenance plan for a minimum of 25 years will receive 3 to 4 points Planning/Scientific Studies, Monitoring and Assessment:

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
	rusio	value	000.0	Proposals that provide an adequate description of how the proposed project will result in or inform future implementation projects and how it will address long term sustainability of future implementation will receive 3 to 4 points
				Implementation/Acquisition: Proposals that provide an adequate long-term management and maintenance plan for less than 25 years will receive 1 to 2 points
				Planning/Scientific Studies, Monitoring and Assessment: Proposals that marginally address how the proposed project will result in or inform future implementation projects and how it will address long term sustainability of future implementation will receive 1 to 2 points
				Implementation/Acquisition: Proposals that provide an inadequate long-term management and maintenance plan will receive a score of zero
				Planning/Scientific Studies, Monitoring and Assessment: Proposals that do not provide a description of how the proposed project will result in or inform future implementation projects and how it will address long term sustainability of future implementation will receive a score of zero
7. Climate Change Considerations The proposal adequately takes into account climate change considerations and projections (applicant has considered how future climate conditions might affect the project's long-term impacts or benefits).	1.0	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
Readiness / Feasibility		1		
 8. Project Description – Implementation The proposed project is technically feasible and the project description is sufficiently detailed to serve as a statement of work for a grant agreement. The means by which each element of the project will be implemented (e.g., methods/techniques used, materials and equipment used, etc.) are adequately described. The project applies methods and technologies that are understood and well proven. 	1.0	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
 If not, does the proposal provide an adequate basis for the use of new or innovative technology or practices? 				
9. Schedule and Deliverables The proposed schedule demonstrates the sequence and timing of project tasks, reasonable milestones, and deliverables. The tasks in the schedule align with the tasks in the project description and budget.	0.5	0-5	0-2.5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
10. Project Readiness (Implementation Projects Only) The proposal demonstrates the anticipated duration	1.5	0-5	0-7.5	Proposals that demonstrate a readiness to begin construction no later than three months after the projected date of an executed agreement will receive 5 points
between the projected execution date of a grant agreement and the start of project construction.				Proposals that demonstrate a readiness to begin construction no later than six months after the projected date of an executed agreement will receive 4 points
				Proposals that demonstrate a readiness to begin construction no later than nine months after the projected date of an executed agreement will receive 3 points
				Proposals that demonstrate a readiness to begin

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards construction 12 months (2pts) to 18 months (1pt) after the projected date of an executed agreement will receive 1 to 2 points Proposals that demonstrate a readiness to begin construction more than 18 months after the projected date of an executed agreement, and proposals that are not for implementation, will receive a score of zero
The proposed budget and justification are appropriate to the work proposed, cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. The tasks shown in the budget justification are consistent with the tasks shown in the project description and schedule.	1.0	0-5	0-5	Proposals for which the budget is detailed, accurate, and considered reasonable will receive 5 points Proposals for which the budget appears reasonable, contains moderate detail, inaccuracies or unspecified lump sums of up to 20 percent of the total budget will receive 3 to 4 points Proposals for which the budget lacks sufficient detail, includes; many inaccuracies, unspecified lump sums of 20 to 50 percent of the total budget, or inappropriate costs will receive 1 to 2 points Proposals for which the budget lacks sufficient detail, is inaccurate, contains unspecified lump sums exceeding 50 percent of the total budget, or is not cost effective will receive a score of zero
Leveraged Funding 12. Leverages Other State Funds To what extent does the proposal leverage other state funds (cash or in-kind services)?	0.5	0-5	0-2.5	Proposals in which >40% of the budget is funded by leveraging other state funds will receive 5 points Proposals in which 31-40% of the budget is funded by leveraging other state funds will receive 4 points Proposals in which 21-30% of the budget is funded by leveraging other state funds will receive 3 points

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards Proposals in which 11-20% of the budget is funded by leveraging other state funds will receive 2 points Proposals in which 1-10% of the budget is funded by leveraging other state funds will receive 1 point Proposals that do not leverage other state funds (0%) will
13. Non-State Cost Share Funds	1.0	0-5	0-5	receive a score of zero Non-state cost share of >40% will receive 5 points
To what extent does the proposal provide private, federal, or local cost share? Cost share includes cash and in-kind services.				Non-state cost share of 31-40% will receive 4 points Non-state cost share of 21-30% will receive 3 points
				Non-state cost share of 11-20% will receive 2 points Non-state cost share of 1-10% will receive 1 point Non-state cost share of 0% will receive a score of zero
Community / Stakeholder Support				
 14. Community Support and Collaboration Does the project have broad-based public and institutional support, at the local, regional, or larger scale? Does the applicant demonstrate that the community is engaged in the project by providing funds, in-kind contributions (i.e., administrative/technical services, labor, materials, equipment, etc.), partnerships, or other evidence of support? 	1.5	0-5	0-7.5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
 Does the applicant describe efforts to include stakeholders in project planning, design, outreach/education, implementation, monitoring, maintenance, etc.? 				

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
15. Disadvantaged Communities Is the proposed project located within and/or provides benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities?	0.5	0-5	0-2.5	Proposed projects that are located within and provide benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities will receive 5 points
(http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_dac.c_fm)				Proposed projects that are either located within but do not provide benefits to a disadvantaged community, or are not located within a disadvantaged community but provide benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities will receive 3 points
				Proposed projects that are not located within a disadvantaged community and do not provide benefits to a disadvantaged community will receive a score of zero
Scientific Merit				
16. Scientific Merit - Scientific Basis	1.0	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
 The scientific basis of the proposed project is clearly described (i.e., provided a clearly articulated conceptual model, if applicable) and based on the best available science². The proposed methods, approaches, and technology are appropriate for the project. Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment Projects – Is the idea timely and important? Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? 				

² Refer to Appendix C of the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013) for guidelines and criteria for defining and assessing best available science. Available: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan-0

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
17. Scientific Merit – Enhance Scientific Understanding	0.5	0-5	0-2.5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
The proposed project will address key scientific uncertainties and fill important information gaps. Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodologies, or approaches?				
18. Monitoring and Assessment	2.0	0-5	0-10	See Standard Scoring Criteria
The proposed approach to monitoring and assessment should be evaluated in a context of the objectives, type, scale, level of uncertainty, and complexity of the proposed project.				
 The project proposal demonstrates a clear and reasonable approach for monitoring, assessing, and reporting the compliance and effectiveness of the project that is consistent with the project's objectives 				
 The performance measures are appropriate and adequately demonstrate the projects outcomes. 				
 Does the proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts or produce data that can be readily integrated with such efforts, where applicable/feasible? 				
 Does the proposal contain a description of baseline monitoring that would be or has already been conducted, in order to support future effectiveness monitoring and does it appear to be reasonable? 				
19. Data Management and Access	0.5	0-5	0-2.5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
 The project proposal demonstrates the means by which data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, and made publicly 				

Criteria	Weight Factor	Point Value	Criteria Score	Scoring Standards
available.				
 Does the proposal identify which databases the project data will be included in and discuss how data will be managed and made compatible with existing databases to support statewide data needs? 				
 If applicable, does the proposal discuss integration of data into the State Water Resources Control Board's California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) or Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program? 				
Total Possible Maximum Score – Technical Review		100		

How well does the Proposal support the overall intent of the program as outlined in this Solicitation? (Reviewer Comments):

Overall Evaluation: Please provide an overall assessment of the Proposal (scale 0-5), identifying key strengths and deficiencies, likelihood of success (technical and financial feasibility), opportunities to strengthen the proposal, and other relevant information. Please be clear and concise.

7 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF FUNDED

7.1 Awards

The Director of CDFW will make all final funding decisions. Successful applicants will receive an award letter officially notifying them of their proposal selection and grant amount. Successful applicants will work with an assigned CDFW grant manager to develop the grant agreement.

7.2 Grant Agreement

Development of grant agreements will begin as soon as projects are approved by the Director of CDFW. The applicant must submit additional forms before an agreement is prepared and executed. The applicable forms described in this section are for informational purposes only. **Do not submit these forms with your proposal.** Applicants are required to complete, sign, and return the forms when projects are approved for funding. These additional forms include:

- Payee Data Record form (STD. 204)
- Federal Taxpayer ID Number
- Drug-Free Workplace Certification (STD. 21)

Grant agreements are not executed until signed by both the authorized representative of the grant recipient and CDFW. Work performed prior to an executed grant agreement will not be reimbursed.

Responsibility of the Grantee

Successful applicants will be responsible for carrying out the work agreed to and for managing finances, including but not limited to, invoicing, payments to subcontractors, accounting and financial auditing, and other project management duties including reporting requirements. All eligible costs must be supported by appropriate documentation. State auditing requirements are described in the CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines (refer to CWC §79708[b-c]).

Invoicing and Payments

Grant agreements, with the exception of Acquisition grants, will be structured to provide for payment in arrears of work being performed. Funds cannot be disbursed until there is an executed grant agreement between CDFW and the project applicant. Payments will be

made on a reimbursement basis (i.e., the grantee pays for services, products or supplies, submits an invoice that must be approved by the CDFW grant manager, and is then reimbursed by CDFW). Funds for construction will not be disbursed until all of the required environmental compliance and permitting documents have been received by CDFW.

Performance Retention

CDFW may retain from the grantee's reimbursements for each period for which payment is made, an amount equal to 10 percent of the invoiced amount, pending satisfactory completion of the task or grant. Retention withholding will be modified in the following circumstances:

- When the grantee or subcontractor is a public entity contracting for construction of any public work of improvement, CDFW may retain from the grantee's earnings, for each period for which payment is made, an amount equal to five percent of such earnings, pending satisfactory completion of the task or grant (Public Contract Code §7201(b)(1).
- CDFW will not withhold performance retention from payments for conservation easement acquisition or fee-title land acquisition.

Loss of Funding

Work performed under the grant agreement is subject to availability of funds through the State's normal budget process. If funding for the grant agreement is reduced, deleted, or delayed by the Budget Act or through other budget control actions, CDFW shall have the option to either cancel the grant agreement, offer to the grantee a grant agreement amendment reflecting the reduced amount, or to suspend work. In the event of cancellation or suspension of work, CDFW shall provide written notice to the grantee and be liable for payment for any work completed pursuant to the agreement up to the date of the written notice and shall have no liability for payment for work undertaken after such date. In the event of a suspension of work, CDFW may remove the suspension of work through written notice to the grantee. CDFW shall be liable for payment for work completed from the date of written notice of the removal of the suspension of work forward, consistent with other terms of the grant agreement. In no event shall CDFW be liable to the grantee for any costs or damages associated with any period of suspension invoked pursuant to this provision, nor shall CDFW be liable for any costs in the event that, after a suspension, no funds are available and the grant agreement is then cancelled based on budget contingencies.

Actions of the State that may lead to suspension or cancellation include, but are not limited to:

- Lack of appropriated funds.
- Executive order directing suspension or cancellation of grant agreements.
- Departmental or California Natural Resources Agency directive requiring suspension or cancellation of grant agreements.

Actions of the grantee that may lead to suspension or cancellation of the grant agreement include, but are not limited to:

- Failing to execute an agreement with CDFW within six months of the award announcement. In such situations, the applicant may apply to a future solicitation;
- Withdrawing from the grant program.
- Failing to acquire land at an approved fair market value.
- Losing willing seller(s).
- Failing to submit required documentation within the time periods specified in the grant agreement.
- Failing to submit evidence of environmental or permit compliance as specified by the grant agreement.
- Changing project scope without prior approval from CDFW.
- Failing to complete the project.
- Failing to demonstrate sufficient progress.
- Failing to comply with pertinent laws.

8 DEFINITIONS AND LINKS

8.1 Definitions

Acquisition

Acquisition means obtaining a fee interest or any other interest in real property, including, easements, leases, water, water rights, or interest in water obtained for the purposes of instream flows and development rights (CWC §79702[a]).

Coastal Wetland

Coastal wetlands include saltwater and freshwater wetlands located within coastal watersheds – specifically USGS 8-digit hydrologic unit watersheds which drain into the Pacific (US EPA).

Delta

Delta means the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as defined in CWC §12220 and the Suisun Marsh as defined in Public Resources Code §29101 (CWC §79702[e]).

Disadvantaged Community

Disadvantaged community means a community with an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income (CWC §79505.5).

Eligible Entities

Eligible entities are public agencies, nonprofit organizations, public utilities, federally recognized Indian tribes, state Indian tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's California Tribal Consultation List, and mutual water companies (CWC §79712[a]).

Federally Recognized Indian Tribe

Federally recognized tribes are those Indian tribes that are recognized by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs and listed annually in the Federal Register.

Mountain Meadows

For the purposes of this Solicitation, mountain meadows include wet meadow, fresh emergent wetland, riverine, lacustrine, aspen, and montane riparian as described in

California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR, Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988).

Mutual Water Companies

Mutual water companies are any private corporation or association organized for the purposes of delivering water to its stockholders and members at cost, including use of works for conserving, treating and reclaiming water. Mutual water companies are organized under California Corporations Code Section 14300. To be eligible for funding, proposals must have a clear and definite public purpose and benefit the customers of the water system and not the investors.

Nonprofit Organization

Nonprofit organization means an organization qualified to do business in California and qualified under §501(c)(3) of Title 26 of the United States Code (CWC §79702[p]).

Performance Measure

A performance measure is a quantitative measure used to track progress toward a project objective/desired outcome.

Public Agency

Public agency means a state agency or department, special district, joint powers authority, county, city, city or county, or other political subdivision of the state (CWC §79702[s]).

Public Utilities

Public utilities are privately owned electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies that are regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. To be eligible for funding, proposals must have a clear and definite public purpose and benefit the customers of the water system and not the investors.

State Indian Tribe

State Indian tribes are those Indian tribes that are listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's California Tribal Consultation List.

Wetlands

Wetlands are lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface or the land is covered by shallow water. For purposes of this classification, wetlands must have one or more of the following three

attributes: (1) at least periodically, the land supports predominantly hydrophytes; (2) the substrate is predominantly undrained hydric soil; and (3) the substrate is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by shallow water at some time during the growing season of each year (Cowardin et al. 1979).

8.2 Links

State Departments and Programs:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Homepage: <u>www.wildlife.ca.gov/</u>

Grant Opportunities: www.wildlife.ca.gov/Explore/Grant-Opportunities

Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs:

https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Watersheds/Restoration-Grants

ERP Conservation Strategy: www.dfg.ca.gov/erp/reports_docs.asp

State Wildlife Action Plan: www.dfg.ca.gov/swap/

California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR): https://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cwhr/

Coho Salmon Habitat Enhancement Leading to Preservation Act (Coho HELP Act, AB
 1961, Huffman): http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/Resources/Coho/HELP/

Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Act of 2014 (AB 2193, Gordon):

https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Environmental-Review/HRE-Act

Priority Unscreened Diversion List for the Central Valley:

https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=103960

California Conservation Corps

Homepage: http://www.ccc.ca.gov/Pages/default.aspx

Proposition 1: http://www.ccc.ca.gov/work/programs/prop1/Pages/default.aspx

California Natural Resources Agency

Homepage: http://resources.ca.gov/

Bond Accountability: http://bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov/p1.aspx

California EcoRestore: http://resources.ca.gov/ecorestore/

Delta Stewardship Council / Delta Science Program

Homepage: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/

Delta Plan: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan-0

Delta Plan Covered Actions: www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/covered-actions

California Department of Conservation

Homepage: www.conservation.ca.gov/Index/Pages/Index.aspx

Watershed Program: www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wp/Pages/Index.aspx

California Department of Industrial Relations

Homepage: <u>www.dir.ca.gov/</u>

California Department of Water Resources

Homepage: <u>www.water.ca.gov</u>

Integrated Regional Water Management: http://water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/

State Water Resources Control Board

Homepage: www.swrcb.ca.gov/

California Environmental Data Exchange Center: http://ceden.org/

Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST):

https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/

Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program:

www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/

Other Relevant Resources:

California Aquatic Resources Inventory

Homepage: http://www.sfei.org/it/gis/cari

California Rapid Assessment Method

Homepage: http://www.cramwetlands.org/

California Water Action Plan

Homepage: http://resources.ca.gov/california_water_action_plan/

California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup

Homepage:

http://www.mywaterquality.ca.gov/monitoring_council/wetland_workgroup/

CEQA Information

- Summary: <u>www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/CEQA/Purpose</u>
- California State Clearinghouse Handbook:

http://opr.ca.gov/docs/SCH_Handbook_2012.pdf

Climate Change Information

CDFW's Climate Science Program:

www.dfg.ca.gov/Climate and Energy/Climate Change/

• Safeguarding California: Reducing Climate Risk:

http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/Final_Safeguarding_CA_Plan_July_31_2014.pdf

National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy:

www.wildlifeadaptationstrategy.gov/pdf/NFWPCAS-Final.pdf

Coastal Wetlands Information

United States Environmental Protection Agency:

http://water.epa.gov/type/wetlands/cwt.cfm#what_def

Disadvantaged Community Information

Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool:

http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_dac.cfm

EcoAtlas

Homepage: http://www.ecoatlas.org/

Enabling Legislation

• Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1):

Proposition 1

Metadata Information

Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS):

http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/bios/metadata.asp

Federal Geographic Data Committee:

http://www.fgdc.gov/metadata/documents/workbook 0501 bmk.pdf

Mutual Water Companies

California Corporations Code §14300:

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=corp&group=14001-15000&file=14300-14307

National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration

Homepage: www.noaa.gov/

NEPA Information

United States Environmental Protection Agency:

www.epa.gov/compliance/basics/nepa.html

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta

Map of Legal Delta:

www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_207JLMap1_1.pdf

Statutory Definition of Legal Delta (CWC §12220):

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=WAT&division=6.&title=&part=4.5.&chapter=2.&article

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

Homepage: <u>www.fws.gov/</u>

United States Forest Service

Homepage: www.fs.fed.us/

Water Conservation and Efficiency Plans

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: www.epa.gov/WaterSense/pubs/guide.html
- Alliance for Water Efficiency:

www.allianceforwaterefficiency.org/Water_Conservation_Planning_Introduction.aspx

Appendix A: California Conservation Corps and Certified Community Conservation Corps

Proposition 1 - Water Bond Guidelines - Chapter 6

Corps Consultation Process

June 2015

This process has been developed to ensure compliance with Division 26.7 of the Water Code, Chapter 6, Section 79734 that specifies the involvement of the CCC and the certified community conservation corps (as represented by the California Association of Local Conservation Corps-CALCC).

Section 79734 states "For restoration and ecosystem protection projects funded pursuant to this chapter, the services of the California Conservation Corps or a local conservation corps certified by the California Conservation Corps <u>shall</u> be used whenever feasible."

Applicants for funds to complete restoration and ecosystem protection projects shall consult with representatives of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) AND the California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC), the entity representing the certified community conservation corps, to determine the feasibility of the Corps participation. Unless otherwise exempted (see notes below), applicants that fail to engage in such consultation should not be eligible to receive Chapter 6 funds. CCC and CALCC have developed the following consultation process for inclusion in Prop 1 – Chapter 6 project and/or grant program guidelines:

Step 1:	Prior to submittal of an application or project plan to the Funder, Applicant prepares the following information for submission to both the California Conservation Corps (CCC) and CALCC (who represents the certified community conservation corps): Project Title Project Description (identifying key project activities and deliverables) Project Map (showing project location) Project Implementation estimated start and end dates
Step 2:	Applicant submits the forgoing information via email concurrently to the CCC and CALCC representatives: <u>California Conservation Corps representative</u> : Name: CCC Prop 1 Coordinator Email: <u>Prop1@ccc.ca.gov</u> Phone: (916) 341-3100
	California Association of Local Conservation Corps representative Name: Crystal Muhlenkamp Email: inquiry@prop1communitycorps.org
	Phone: 916-426-9170 ext. 0

- Step 3: Within five (5) business days of receiving the project information, the CCC and CALCC representatives will review the submitted information, contact the applicant if necessary, and respond to the applicant with a Corps Consultation Review Document (template attached) informing them:
 - It is NOT feasible for CCC and/or certified community conservation corps services to be used on the project; or
 - (2) It is feasible for the CCC and/or certified community conservation corps services to be used on the project and identifying the aspects of the project that can be accomplished with Corps services.

Note: While the Corps will take up to 5 days to review projects, applicants are encouraged to contact the CCC/CALCC representatives to discuss feasibility early in the project development process.

The Corps cannot guarantee a compliant review process for applicants who submit project information fewer than 5 business days before a deadline.

- Step 4: Applicant submits application to Funder that includes Corps Consultation Review Document.
- Step 5: Funder reviews applications. Applications that do not include documentation demonstrating that the Corps have been consulted will be deemed "noncompliant" and will not be considered for funding.

NOTES:

- 1. The Corps already have determined that it is not feasible to use their services on restoration and ecosystem protection projects that <u>solely</u> involve either planning or acquisition. Therefore, applicants seeking funds for such projects are exempt from the consultation requirement and should check the appropriate box on the Consultation Review Document.
- 2. An applicant that has been awarded funds to undertake a project where it has been determined that Corps services can be used must thereafter work with either the CCC or CALCC to develop a scope of work and enter into a contract with the appropriate Corps. Unless otherwise excused, failure to utilize a Corps on such a project will result in Funding Entities assessing a scoring penalty on the applicant's future applications for Chapter 6 Funds.

California Conservation Corps and Certified Community Conservation Corps

Proposition 1 - Water Bond

Corps Consultation Review Document

June 2015

Unless an exempted project, this Corps Consultation Review Document must be completed by California Conservation Corps and Community Conservation Corps staff and accompany applications for projects or grants seeking funds through Proposition 1, Chapter 6, Protecting Rivers, Lakes, Streams, Coastal Waters and Watersheds. Non-exempt applications that do not include this document demonstrating that the Corps have been consulted will be deemed "noncompliant" and will not be considered for funding.

•	pplications that do not include this document demo n consulted will be deemed "noncompliant" and will	•
1. Name	of Applicant:	Project Title:
Departme	ent/Conservancy to which you are applying for fund	ing:
	mpleted by Applicant: plication solely for planning or acquisition? Yes (application is exempt from the requirement to No (proceed to #2)	o consult with the Corps)
This Cons	mpleted by Corps: sultation Review Document is being prepared by: e California Conservation Corps (CCC) lifornia Association of Local Conservation Corps (C	CALCC)
	ant has submitted the required information by emaintion Corps (CCC) and California Association of Loc :	
	Yes (applicant has submitted all necessary information)	ation to CCC and CALCC)
	No (applicant has not submitted all information or to both Corps – application is deemed non-compliant.)	
3. After of following:	consulting with the project applicant, the CCC and C	CALCC has determined the
	It is NOT feasible for CCC and/or certified commuservices to be used on the project (deemed complete)	•
	It is feasible for the CCC and/or certified commun services to be used on the project and the following be accomplished with Corps services (deemed co	g aspects of the project car

CCC AND CALCC REPRESENTATIVES WILL RETURN THIS FORM AS DOCUMENTION OF CONSULTATION BY EMAIL TO APPLICANT WITHIN FIVE (5) BUSINESS OF RECEIPT AS VERIFICATION OF CONSULTATION. APPLICANT WILL INCLUDE COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT AS PART OF THE PROJECT APPLICATION.

Appendix B: Proposal Application Form and Instructions

FY 2015/16 PROPOSITION 1 RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAMS

Note to Applicants: All applications must be submitted online at: https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/. Appendix B is provided to allow applicants to fill out the application and cut and paste information into the online application.

All fields of the proposal application form are required to be completed, except where noted. Any supplementary information must be uploaded with the proposal application, where requested.

General Information Tab

Project Title:	Provide a brief, descriptive project title:
Applicant Name:	Name of the applicant (the applicant is solely responsible to ensure all grant provisions are met):
Project Description:	Provide a brief description of the project:

Project Budget Tab

Funds Requested:	Provide project amount requested from CDFW. The amount must match what is in the budget detail: \$
Local Cost Match:	Provide total cost share amount included in Attachment 6 - Fund Sources and Cost Share. Note that non-local cost share may be included in this field: \$
Total Budget:	Provide total project cost, including any cost share. The amount must match the total provided in Attachment 6 Fund Sources and Cost Share: \$
Applicant Federal Tax ID Number:	Provide applicant's Federal Tax ID Number:

Funding Tab

Grant Program:	Will the project occur within, or provide a benefit to, the Delta? If so, check the Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration box, if not, check the Watershed Restoration box. Check only one box:
	 ☐ Watershed Restoration ☐ Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration

Project Management Tab

Project Director (Signatory):	Provide name and title of person authorized to legally sign the grant agreement (Project Director):
Telephone, Fax Number, and Email Address of Project Director:	Provide Project Director's primary telephone and fax number (including area code) and email address: Telephone: Fax Number: Email Address:
Project Manager (Contact Person):	Provide name of Project Manager (This person will be contacted regarding any technical and administrative questions for the project):
Telephone, Fax Number, and Email Address of Project Manager:	Provide primary telephone and fax number (including area code) and email address for Project Manager: Telephone: Fax Number: Email Address:

Legislative Information Tab

California State Senate District Number:	Provide California State Senate District Number(s) (http://www.legislature.ca.gov/legislators and districts/districts/senatedistricts.html):
California State Assembly District	Provide California State Assembly District Number(s) (http://www.legislature.ca.gov/legislators_and_districts/districts/assemblydistricts.
Number:	<u>html</u>):
U.S.	Provide U.S Congressional District Number(s)
Congressional District	(http://www.house.gov/):

Questionnaire Tab

Section 1: Summary Information

1.1 Mailing Address of Project Director:	Provide street address, city, state and zip code (or P.O. Box) of the Project Director, who will serve as the signatory. If project is funded, agreement will be sent to this address:
1.2 Mailing Address of Project Manager:	Provide street address, city, state and zip code (or P.O. Box) for mailing address of Project Manager, who will serve as the point of contact for the project:
1.3 Organization Type:	Check box for which organizational type the applicant falls under. If applicant does not fall under a listed category, the applicant is not an eligible entity: Public Agency
1.4 Nonprofit Organization:	Check box if applicant is qualified to do business California and qualified under Section 501(c)(3). If yes, provide 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization number: Yes No 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization number:
1.5 Additional Information for Water Suppliers:	Check box where appropriate: Urban Water Management Plan (if Urban Water Supplier) Agricultural Water Management Plan (if Agricultural Water Supplier) Not Applicable
1.6 Mitigation:	Is the proposed project required mitigation or is it to be used for mitigation under laws such as CEQA, NEPA, CESA, ESA, CWA, or other pertinent laws and regulations, or a permit issued by any local, state or federal agency. If yes, project is ineligible: Yes No

Section 2: Project Integration Information

2.1 Implement Actions of the California Water	Check whether the project implements actions in the CWAP, and if yes, identify those actions:
Action Plan:	Yes. If yes, identify actions:
	□ No.
2.2 Applicable Solicitation Priority(ies):	Check all appropriate boxes that apply to project. If project occurs within the Delta or will provide a direct benefit to the Delta, only check boxes under the Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration section: Watershed Restoration Grant Program: Manage Headwaters for Multiple Benefits (CWAP Action) Restore Coastal Watersheds (CWAP Action) Enhance Fish Migration (CWAP Action) Restore Mountain Meadow Habitat (CWAP Action) Habitat Restoration, Conservation, and Enhancement (non-CWAP Action)
	 Improve Water Quality or Contribute to the Improvement of Water Quality (non-CWAP Action) Habitat Restoration, Conservation, and Enhancement (CWAP Action or California EcoRestore) Scientific Studies and Assessments to Support Implementation of the Delta Science Plan (CWAP Action)
2.3 Proposal	Check box which describes proposal category:
Category:	☐ Planning ☐ Implementation
	Acquisition
	Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment (only applicable
2.4 Project	to Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program) Anticipated start and end dates of project/construction:
Readiness:	Project/construction start and end dates:
2.5 Consistency with and Implementation of other Plans:	Check box if project has consistency with and implementation of other plans (e.g., existing conservation, restoration, recovery plans, or other relevant local, state, or federal plans or policies). Copies of the plan(s) must be available upon request: Yes No If yes, identify the plan(s) (use the following format: author, year, title, organization, city, state.) and associated action(s):

2.6 Project Area Covered by Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWM):	Check box if the project area is covered by an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan: Yes No If yes, identify Plan and relevant project
2.7 Coordination with the California Conservation Corps and Certified Local Corps:	Has consultation occurred with the California Conservation Corps and Certified Local Corps. Unless otherwise exempted (i.e., projects that only involve only planning or acquisition), applicants that fail to consult with the CCC will not be eligible to receive CDFW Proposition 1 funding: Yes No Upload Completed Corps Consultation Review Document on Attachments Tab.
2.8 Application to Other Grant Programs:	Check box if a proposal has been submitted to another grant program for this project (i.e., that would fund the same project components applied for in this application.) If yes, identify program name(s):

Section 3: Project Location Information

3.1 Project Location Information:	Provide exact project location, including the following: address, latitude/longitude (NAD 83, use multiple coordinates if necessary), USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle(s), Township, Range, and Section. For projects with multiple sites, provide this information for each site. Also provide a brief description of what the coordinates refer to, such as the downstream end of the project reach:
3.2 Project Maps:	Include both a location and project specific map. The project specific map should include clearly delineated project boundaries on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map. For watershed level planning proposals, provide a map scale that is appropriate. Aerial photos do not satisfy this requirement. All maps must be labeled with project title, applicant name, USGS quadrangle name, and be positioned so that relevant map information such as stream names, towns, main roads, water bodies, etc. are not obscured. Upload project map(s) on the Attachments tab.
3.3 Site Description:	Provide the physical description of terrain and land cover type(s):
3.4 County(ies):	Provide the county or counties in which the project will occur:
3.5 Driving Directions:	Provide driving directions from nearest freeway, city, town, or major land mark:

3.6 Waterbody and Watershed:	If applicable, provide the name of the waterbody where the project will occur, the tributary (any watercourse that flows into a body of water), and the watershed name (e.g., Sacramento River, etc.): Waterbody: Tributary To:
	Watershed Name:
3.7 Is Project Located in Close Proximity to an	Check box if the project is located in close proximity to an existing restoration project:
Existing	☐ Yes ☐ No
Restoration Project:	If yes, explain (include distance):
3.8 Project	Check box if land where project will occur (or will require access to enter) is
Area Ownership:	owned by a private entity, state, federal, or other. If yes on any box, provide name of land owner(s). For projects with multiple sites, identify landowners by site name. Check not applicable for watershed level planning proposals: Private Yes No If yes, name
	State
	Federal Tes No If yes, name
	Other
	Not Applicable (Watershed Level Planning Proposals only)

Section 4: Conflict of Interest

4.1	Applicant:	Identify members of the applicant's team who: wrote the proposal; will be performing the work listed in the proposal; or who will benefit financially if the proposal is funded:
4.2	Subcontractors:	Identify subcontractors who: will perform some work listed in the proposal; will benefit financially if the proposal is funded. Include name(s) and organization(s):
4.3	Others:	Identify other individuals that helped with proposal development, for example by reviewing drafts, or by providing critical suggestions or ideas contained within the proposal. These individuals may include agency staff. List the name(s) and organization(s) of any individuals who were consulted during proposal development:

Section 5: Qualifications and Experience of Applicant and Professionals

5.1 Project Team:	List project team's qualifications and experience that directly apply to the proposed tasks:
	Separate curriculum vitae/resumes for key personnel may be uploaded on the Attachment tab (two pages maximum per person)
5.2 Previous Projects:	List previous projects (funded by CDFW or others) and give examples of similar work:
5.3 Licensed Professional:	Is a licensed professional needed? If so, check appropriate box, provide license number, affiliation, and contact information (phone and email address):
	Yes No If yes provide:
	Name: License number:
	Affiliation:
	Contact information (phone/e-mail):
	If no, provide justification for that determination:
5.4 Licensed Professionals Qualifications and	List licensed professionals qualifications and experience. Please specify which licensed professionals(s) will be providing direct oversight on the project (if applicable):
Experience:	
5.5 Capacity:	Describe project team's capacity to perform the proposed tasks:

Section 6: Community Support and Collaboration

6.1 Evidence of Public and Institutional Support:	Briefly describe if the project has public and institutional support, at the local, regional, or larger scale. Briefly describe evidence of that support, for example have stakeholders provided funds, in-kind contributions (i.e., administrative/technical services, labor, materials, equipment, etc.), partnerships, etc.:
	Letters of support may also be uploaded on the Attachment tab.
6.2 Stakeholders:	Briefly describe efforts to include stakeholders in project planning, design, outreach/education, implementation, monitoring, maintenance, etc.:
6.3 Disadvantaged	Check box if project will occur in a Disadvantaged Community as defined in
Community:	CWC Section 79505.5(a): Yes No Check box if project will benefit a Disadvantaged Community
	☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, describe benefit(s)

Section 7: Project Statement

7.1 Introduction:

Briefly describe the history, background and overview of the project. This should include the following information:

- Describe the history of the project, including all phases completed to date (including funding sources), the current phase for which funding is being requested, and plans for future project phases.
- Include how the project will address the priorities of this Solicitation as well as other planning documents.

7.2 Project Description – Purpose and Implementation:

Include a detailed project description that can serve as a statement of work for a grant agreement. Include the rationale for project need, a description of the project objectives and how the proposed approach addresses those objectives. Describe how the project is technically feasible. Describe the means by which each element of the project will be implemented (e.g., methods/ techniques used, materials and equipment, etc.). If permits are to be obtained for a proposed project, a complete description of the permits needed and the application status must be included. If applicable provide the basis for the use of new or innovative technology or practices.

Upload Project Description on Attachments tab. The Project Description can be a maximum of ten pages.

7.3 Project Outcomes – Diversity and Significance of the Benefits:

Describe the project's multiple benefits and the objectives related to those multiple benefits. Where feasible, the objectives should be measureable and quantifiable. Provide analysis and documentation to demonstrate the likelihood that the multiple benefits will be realized and their significance (e.g., climate change response actions, drought preparedness, integrated flood management, protection or improvement of water quality, use and reuse water more efficiently, expand environmental stewardship, increase habitat for threatened and endangered species, reduce species survival stressors):

7.4 Project Organization and Management:

Describe how the project will be organized in terms of staffing levels, supervision, administration of tasks, project oversight, auditing, planning sessions, etc. Identify all applicant staff to be funded and their specific roles in the project. Also describe how the project will be fiscally managed, outline subcontracted work, and all personnel services included in the budget:

7.5 Project Deliverables:

Describe all project deliverables. Periodic progress reports and a final report must be included as deliverables. Project deliverables should correlate to the tasks described above and be identified in the Schedule and List of Deliverables in Section 8:

Final reporting for Scientific Studies, Monitoring and Assessment projects must include a synthesis of all findings and provide conclusions on hypotheses tested, as well as recommendations for resource management and further investigations related to the research subject area. The deliverables will include a draft manuscript in a format suitable for publication in a scientific peer-reviewed journal.

7.6 Scientific Merit – Scientific Basis and Enhance Scientific Understanding:

Describe background and scientific basis based on the best available science. Identify the proposed methods, approaches, and technology for the project. Explain how project is timely and important, and is justified relative to existing knowledge.

Identify key scientific uncertainties and how the project will fill important information gaps. Describe if the project will generate novel information, methodologies, or approaches:

Planning, Implementation, and Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment projects must include a conceptual model that clearly explains the underlying basis of the knowledge that will support the proposed work. Conceptual models can be presented either graphically or as narrative. The conceptual model should reference the pertinent scientific literature. Describe how the conceptual model will be integrated into the project design. The conceptual model must be revisited in the project's final report.

Upload Scientific Merit on Attachments tab.

7.7 Land Tenure/Site Control:

Applicants for projects conducting on-the-ground work must submit documentation showing that they have adequate tenure to, and site control of, the properties to be improved or restored for a minimum of 25 years. Proof of adequate land tenure includes, but is not necessarily limited to:

- Fee title ownership.
- An easement or license agreement.
- Other agreement between the applicant and the fee title owner, or the owner of an easement in the property, sufficient to give the applicant adequate site control for the purposes of the project and long-term management.
- For projects involving multiple landowners, all landowners or an appointed designee must provide written permission to complete the project.

When an applicant does not have tenure at the time of proposal submission, but intends to establish tenure via an agreement that will be signed prior to grant execution, the applicant must upload a template copy of the proposed agreement, memorandum of understanding (MOU), or permission form on the Attachments tab.

7.8 Durability of Investment:

Implementation and Acquisition projects should generally be maintained for a minimum of 25 years, unless CDFW permits otherwise. Using the attachments tab, upload a copy of the proposed long-term management and maintenance plan which includes the project's adaptive management strategies.

7.9 Climate Change Considerations:

Describe how climate change has been taken into account in the proposal.

Applicants should describe anticipated climatic changes and resulting impacts to the project area, and how the proposed actions will help the system to adapt or respond to these changes. Applicants should also address how future climate conditions might affect the benefits provided by the project in the long-term:

7.10 Performance Measures:

Identify specific performance measures designed to assess progress towards achieving the objectives using Attachment 1 - Performance Measures Table on the Attachments tab. The performance measures should be linked to the objectives defined above in Section 7.2 and 7.3. Differentiate between those results that are expected to occur within the term of the grant versus those that will require additional time.

7.11 Monitoring and Assessment:

Describe the approach for monitoring, assessing, and reporting the compliance and effectiveness of the project, which is consistent with the project's objectives. The monitoring design should directly link to the performance measures identified in Attachment 1 - Performance Measures Table.

The monitoring plan shall include the following elements:

- What will be monitored
- Monitoring objectives
- Clearly stated assessment questions
- The specific metrics that will be measured and the methods / protocol(s) that will be used
- Linkages to relevant conceptual model(s)
- The timeframe and frequency of monitoring, including pre- and postproject monitoring
- The spatial scope of the monitoring effort
- Quality assurance/quality control procedures
- Compliance with all permit requirements for monitoring activities (e.g., Scientific Collecting Permits)
- Description of relationships to existing monitoring efforts
- How the resulting data will be analyzed, interpreted and reported

Standardized approaches should be incorporated into the monitoring design, where applicable. Where feasible, describe approaches to leverage existing

	monitoring efforts or produce data that can be readily integrated with such efforts. Applicants pursuing Implementation or Scientific Studies, Monitoring, and Assessment projects should identify opportunities to extend the monitoring beyond the grant term (e.g., by using standardized, readily replicated monitoring and evaluation processes; leveraging on-going monitoring programs; and building partnerships capable of attracting funding from multiple sources over time).
	For planning grants – describe baseline monitoring that has been, or will be, conducted in order to support project evaluation during and following implementation. If not feasible based on characteristics of the proposed project, provide justification.
	Upload Monitoring and Assessment Plan on the Attachments tab.
7.12 Data Management and Access:	Describe how data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, and shared (i.e., disseminated to the public, participants, stakeholders, and the State). Where appropriate, describe data management activities that support incorporation of project data and information into statewide data systems. If applicable, discuss integration of data into the State Water Resources Control Board's California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) or Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program:
7.13 Literature Cited:	Include a list of literature referenced in the proposal. Upload Literature Cited on the Attachments tab.

Section 8: Schedule and List of Deliverables

Provide estimated completion dates for all Tasks and Deliverables identified in Section 7.2 (Project Description – Purpose and Implementation) and Section 7.5 (Project Deliverables) using Attachment 2 – Schedule and List of Deliverables. Upload completed document on Attachments tab. Grants will be executed approximately six months from award and typical grant terms will be three years. Schedules should include project management and identify quarterly submission of progress reports and invoices. If permits are to be obtained for a proposed project, a timeline for obtaining them must be included in the Schedule and List of Deliverables. Completion dates for tasks must allow for final reporting and cannot fall on last day of grant term.

Section 9: Plans, Permits, Landowner Access, and Environmental Compliance

9.1 Delta Stewardship Council – Delta Plan Consistency:	Check box yes or no based on whether your project would occur, in whole or in part, within the boundaries of the Delta or Suisun Marsh and meets the other necessary conditions in order to be deemed a covered action (CWC §85057.5) and therefore must demonstrate consistency with the Delta Plan: Yes (Required) If yes, describe approach to ensuring consistency with the applicable Delta Plan policies: No (Not Required)
9.2 Water	Pursuant to Governor Brown's April 2014 Executive Order, recipients of
Conservation and Efficiency Program:	funding for future projects that impact water resources, including groundwater resources must have appropriate water conservation and efficiency programs in place in response to persistent drought conditions (refer to Section 3.16 of the Solicitation). Applicants must verify that their organization has a water conservation and efficiency program in place; however, it does not need to be submitted with the proposal:
	Does the applicant's organization have a Water Conservation and Efficiency Program in Place? Yes No
9.3 Landowners	Provide Landowner information to show permission to access land on which project will occur, or permission to access will be needed:
Granting Access for Project:	Name:
•	Address:
	Phone Number:
9.4 Water Rights for Project:	If water will be diverted in any way, provide water rights and permit number associated with that right.
	☐ Pre-1914 ☐ Riparian Rights ☐ Post-1914 ☐ Not Applicable
	If Post-1914, provide Appropriative Water Rights permit number and upload a copy of the permit on the Attachments tab
9.5 Environmental	Identify all federal, state, and local permits for the project and their status using Attachment 3 – Environmental Compliance Checklist.
Compliance	Upload completed document on Attachments tab.

CEQA Information

Projects that receive funding shall comply with all applicable laws and regulations, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

9.6 CEQA Compliance:	If the project meets the definition of a "project" in Public Resources Code Section 21065 identify the Lead Agency, contact person, and the justification for why the lead agency was selected:
	Lead Agency:
	Contact Person:
	Address:
	Phone Number:
	Justification:
9.7 CEQA Documentation:	Check type of CEQA documentation to be prepared:
Documentation.	☐ Initial Study
	☐ Notice of Exemption
	☐ Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration
	☐ Environmental Impact Report
	☐ Not Applicable
9.8 CEQA Status:	Describe the status of the CEQA documents, expected date of completion, and Initial Study if applicable:
9.9 CEQA Document Name:	If the CEQA document has been completed, provide the name of the document and the State Clearinghouse number. Upload a copy of the documentation on the Attachments tab:
	Document Name:
	State Clearinghouse Number:
	☐ Not Applicable

Section 10: Project Budget

Line Item Budget

10.1 Line Item Budget:	Upload Attachment 4 - Applicant Budget and, if applicable, Attachment 5 - Subcontract Budget for each proposed subcontractor (do not upload additional sheets for subcontractor's subcontractors) on the Attachments tab:
10.2 Budget Justification:	Provide a budget break down by task. The tasks should be consistent with Section 7.2 (Project Description – Purpose and Implementation). Describe which line items will be included under each task, and how the line items will be utilized. Describe what is included in each line item that is not self-explanatory [e.g., materials, or equipment (as defined in the CDFW General Grant Provisions)]:
10.3 Construction Component Costs:	For construction projects only, provide a breakdown of construction costs by component of the project. For example, identify construction costs at each project site, or if there are distinctly separate components of the project provide costs of each separate component:
10.4 Indirect Charges Justification:	Explain the methodology used to determine indirect rate and provide detailed calculations in support of the indirect charge rate:

Cost Share

To be eligible, cost share must be applied directly to the project and spent during the grant term. Where applicable, cost share agreements or funding assurances will be required prior to grant execution.

10.5 Fund Sources and Cost Share:	Upload Attachment 6 - Fund Sources and Cost Share on the Attachments tab. To be considered eligible, cost share must be used to support the proposed project, must be spent during the proposed project term, and must be secured prior to grant award.
10.6 Cost Share Funding:	Describe how the cost share funding identified in Attachment 6 will be used in the project (i.e., which project components will the cost share support?):
10.7 Cost Share Funding-Secured:	Describe the degree to which the cost share funding identified in Attachment 6 is secured (i.e., proposal submitted, grant executed, grant awarded, etc.). In instances where cost share has not been secured, provide anticipated date by which funding will be secured:

Attachment 1 - Performance Measures Table

Using the Performance Measures Table, identify performance measures designed to assess progress towards achieving the project's objectives. The performance measures should be linked to the objectives defined in Section 7.2 and 7.3 of the application. Differentiate between those results that are expected to occur within the term of the grant versus those that will require additional time. At least some of the performance measures must be feasible to meet during the term of the grant (e.g., can be met within 1-2 years post-implementation). Applicants may need to complete multiple Performance Measures Tables depending on what types of objectives are proposed.

Project Objective(s)	Identify the project objective(s). Objectives are specific, often quantitative, statements of the desired outcomes that the project is expected to achieve. Where feasible, the objectives should be measurable and quantifiable.
Project Output Performance Measures	Identify project output performance measures for each objective. Output performance measures evaluate factors that may be influencing outcomes and include tracking project implementation (e.g., activities, products, deliverables, acres of habitat restored, etc.). These should include measurable targets or benchmarks against which project success can be measured.
Project Outcome Performance Measures	Identify project outcome performance measures for each objective. Outcome performance measures evaluate ecosystem responses to the project activities (e.g., improvement in environmental conditions). These should include measurable targets or benchmarks against which project success can be measured, at least some of which must be feasible to meet during the term of the grant (e.g., can be met within 1-2 years post-implementation).
Measurement Tools and Methods	List methods of measurement or tools that will be used to document project performance, using standard approaches/protocols, as applicable. This will be expanded upon in the monitoring plan described below.

Attachment 2 – Schedule and List of Deliverables

Provide estimated completion dates for all Tasks and Deliverables identified in Section 7.2 (Project Description – Purpose and Implementation) and Section 7.5 (Project Deliverables). Grants will be executed approximately six months from award and typical grant terms will be three years. Schedules should include project management and identify quarterly submission of progress reports and invoices. If permits are to be obtained for a proposed project, a timeline for obtaining them must be included in the Schedule and List of Deliverables. Completion dates for tasks must allow for final reporting and cannot fall on last day of grant term.

Task No.	Task Title	Deliverables and Key Project Milestones	Estimated Completion Dates
1	Project Management and Administration	 Invoices Subcontractor Selection and Scope of Work <insert additional="" deliverables=""></insert> 	<insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert><insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert><insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert>
2	Reports	 Progress Reports Annual Report Draft Final Report Final Report Close-Out Summary Report <insert additional="" deliverables=""></insert> 	 Due within thirty (30) days following each quarterly month following Agreement execution. Due annually Due sixty (60) days prior to end of grant term Due thirty (30) days prior to end of grant term Due thirty (30) days prior to end of grant term Due thirty (30) days prior to end of grant term <insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert>
3	<insert task="" title=""></insert>	<insert deliverables=""></insert>	<insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert>
4	<insert task="" title=""></insert>	<insert deliverables=""></insert>	<insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert>
5	<insert task="" title=""></insert>	<insert deliverables=""></insert>	<insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert>
6	<insert task="" title=""></insert>	<insert deliverables=""></insert>	<insert date="" due="" estimated=""></insert>

Attachment 3 – Environmental Compliance Checklist

Permitting Agency	Type of Requirements	Required	Applied	Acquired	Date Anticipated/ Received
	FEDER	AL AGENCI	ES:		
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit				
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403)				
U.S Fish and Wildlife Service	Biological Opinion (Section 7 Endangered Species Act)				
NOAA Fisheries	Biological Opinion (Section 7 Endangered Species Act)				
	STAT	E AGENCIE	S:		
CA. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (Section 1600)				
CA. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	Incidental Take Permit, or Consistency Determination (CESA)				
CA. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Act of 2014 (AB 2193)				
CA. Dept. of Transportation	Encroachment Permit				
CA. Coastal Commission	Letter of Consistency				

Permitting Agency	Type of Requirements	Required	Applied	Acquired	Date Anticipated/ Received
State Water Resources Control Board	401 General Water Quality Certification for Small Habitat Restoration Projects				
Regional Water Quality Control Board	401 Water Quality Certification of Waste Discharge Requirement				
State Water Resources Control Board	Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit				
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Permission to Encroach on Waterways within Designated Floodways				
	Local and Region	nal Plannin	g Agencie	es:	
City/County	Grading Permit				
City/County	Environmental Health Department				
City/County	Road Use Permits				
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Any Relevant Permit				
Local Resource Conservation District	Consultation				
Flood Control Districts	Floodway & Hydrological Analysis				
Other(s) (List):					

Attachment 4 – Applicant Budget

<< Insert Project Title >>					
A. PERSONNEL SERVICES					
Level of Staff	Hours	Rate	Tota Projec Cost	ct	
Classification Title	0.00	\$	\$	-	
Classification Title	0.00	\$	\$	-	
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert>	0.00	\$	\$	-	
Subtotal Personnel Services			\$	-	
Staff Benefits @ %		%	\$	-	
TOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICES	3		\$	-	
B. OPERATING EXPENSES: GENERAL					
Items (units)	Number of Units	I DOL	Tota Proje Cos	ect	
General Expenses	0.00	\$		\$	
Field Supplies	0.00			\$	
Permit Fees	0.00	· ·		\$	
Travel (break down by lodging, per diem, mileage)	0.00	\$		\$	
See General Grant Provisions for applicable travel reimbursement rates	0.00			•	
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert>	0.00) \$		<u>\$</u>	
Subtotal Operating Expenses: General C. OPERATING EXPENSES: SUBCONTRACTORS					
Subcontractor 1 Name			1	Ф.	
Subcontractor 2 Name				<u>\$</u>	
				\$	
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""> Subtental Operating Typespace Subsenting to the contractors</insert>					
Subtotal Operating Expenses: Subcontractors					
D. OPERATING EXPENSES: EQUIPMENT See General Grant Provisions for definitions of electronic and purchased ed	quipment def	initions.			
<pre><insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert></pre>				\$	
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert>				\$	
Subtotal Operating Expenses: Equipment				\$	
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE	S			\$	
E. SUBTOTALS & INDIRECT COSTS					
SUBTOTAL A + B (Personnel Services + Operating Expenses: General)				\$	
SUBTOTAL C (Operating Expenses: Subcontractors)				\$	
SUBTOTAL D (Operating Expenses: Equipment)				\$	
Requested Indirect Charge Rate (max.20%) @ % (Indirect Charges cannot be applied to subcontracts or equipment) 0.00%				\$	
TOTAL INDIRECT CHARGES				\$	
D. GRAND TOTAL				\$	

Attachment 5 – Subcontract Budget

<< Insert Project Title >>				
<< Insert Subcontractor Name >>	>			
A. PERSONNEL SERVICES				
Level of Staff	Hours	Rat	е	Total Project Cost
Classification Title	0.00	\$	-	\$
Classification Title	0.00	\$	-	\$
<pre><insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert></pre>	0.00	\$	-	\$
Subtotal Personnel Services				\$
Staff Benefits @ %		0.0	0%	\$
TOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICES	3	•		\$
B. OPERATING EXPENSES: GENERAL				
Items (units)	Number of Units	Cost Uni		Total Project Cost
General Expenses	0.00	\$	-	\$
Field Supplies	0.00	\$	-	\$
Permit Fees	0.00	\$	-	\$
Travel (break down by lodging, per diem, mileage)	0.00	\$	-	\$
See General Grant Provisions for applicable travel reimbursement rates				
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert>	0.00	\$	-	\$
Subtotal Operating Expenses: General				\$
C. OPERATING EXPENSES: SUBCONTRACTORS				
Subcontractor 1 Name				\$
Subcontractor 2 Name				\$
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert>				\$
Subtotal Operating Expenses: Subcontractors				\$
D. OPERATING EXPENSES: EQUIPMENT See General Grant Provisions for definitions of electronic and purchased equipme	nt definitions.			
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert>				\$
<insert as="" delete="" items="" line="" needed="" or=""></insert>				\$
Subtotal Operating Expenses: Equipment				\$
TOTAL OPERATING EXP	ENSES			\$
E. SUBTOTALS & INDIRECT COSTS				
SUBTOTAL A + B (Personnel Services + Operating Expenses: General)				\$
SUBTOTAL C (Operating Expenses: Subcontractors)				\$
SUBTOTAL D (Operating Expenses: Equipment)				\$
Requested Indirect Charge Rate (max.20%) @ % (Indirect Charges cannot subcontracts or equipment)	ot be applied	to	%	\$
TOTAL INDIR	ECT CHARG	SES		\$
D. GRAND TOTAL				\$

Note: A separate subcontract budget sheet must be included for each subcontractor.

Attachment 6 - Fund Sources and Cost Share

<< Insert Project Title >>					
Source of Funds	Cash	In-Kind (If Applicable)	Total		
CDFW Restoration Grant Program (see Project Budget)	\$	\$	\$		
Applicant	\$	\$	\$		
Other State Agency (insert additional rows as needed by Agency Name					
and funding source)	\$	\$	\$		
Federal (insert additional rows as needed by Agency Name and funding source)	\$	\$	\$		
Other(s) including partners (insert additional rows as needed by Entity Name and funding source)	\$	\$	\$		
Total Project Cost	\$	\$	\$		

Note: To be considered eligible, cost share must be used to support the proposed project, must be spent during the proposed project term, and must be secured prior to grant award.