Steelhead Report and Restoration Card Program

Supplemental Proposal Solicitation Notice

Fiscal Year 2015-2016

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Proposal Submission Period:
October 19th, 2015 to November 13th, 2015.




Contents

1: INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Steelhead Report and Restoration Card Program (Report Card) is soliciting proposals for projects that restore, enhance, monitor, or protect steelhead habitat, or projects that lead to restoration, enhancement, or protection of steelhead habitat. Proposed projects must comply with the focus outlined in Part 2.

The intent of this Proposal Solicitation Notice (PSN) is to solicit and fund project that address the primary objectives of the Report Card program, which are to:

- Restore watershed processes and functions, modify or remove barriers to migration, protect and restore steelhead instream habitat, as well as to increase long-term effectiveness of restoration efforts by monitoring and maintaining projects.
- Encourage local government and community based partnerships through the support of watershed organizations and cooperative efforts.
- Identify watershed priorities and restoration projects through evaluation and planning.

Proposals will be accepted from October 19th, 2015 to November 13th, 2015.

The Report Card program will accept proposal applications for the types of projects listed in the focus below. Because revenue for projects is generated through the sale of SHRRCs, proposed projects must have a direct or indirect benefit to the angler, be within anadromous waters, and be within a location code delineated by the SHRRC. The applicant must identify the primary project type that best describes the proposed project.

If you have any questions about the PSN, please contact Farhat Bajjaliya, Report Card Coordinator, at 916-327-8855, farhat.bajjaliya@wildlife.ca.gov or Kevin Shaffer, Program Manager of Anadromous Management and Conservation, at 916-327-8841, kevin.shaffer@wildlife.ca.gov.

2: FOCUS

2.1 Funding Prospects for Fiscal Year 2015/2016

In Fiscal Year 2015/2016 (FY 15/16), an additional amount of $473,000 is available for award through this supplemental solicitation to fund Report Card projects benefiting steelhead and steelhead habitat. Funding for proposals submitted under this supplemental PSN are subject to availability of funds and approval of the Budget Act for FY 15/16.

2.2 Project Types

The applicant will identify the restoration project type that best describes the proposed project. CDFW has developed a two-letter coding system for project types. A list of these codes is shown below and described in detail in Appendix A.

PL-Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning

PD- Project Design

FP-Fish Passage at Stream Crossings

HB-Instream Barrier Modification for Fish Passage

HI-Instream Habitat Restoration

HR-Riparian Restoration

HS-Instream Bank Stabilization

MD-Monitoring Status and Trends (limited to baseline monitoring only)

MO-Monitoring Watershed Restoration

EF-Enforcement and Protection Projects

3: PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

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

3.1 General Grant Provisions

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

3.2 Eligible Applicants

Entities eligible to apply for grants from the Report Card program are limited to public agencies, Recognized Tribes, and Qualified Nonprofit Organizations. Grant proposals from private individuals or for-profit enterprises cannot be accepted. Private individuals and for-profit enterprises interested in submitting restoration proposals are encouraged to work with a public agency, qualified nonprofit organization, or recognized tribe.

No project that is a required mitigation or used for mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Endangered Species Act (CESA), Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Forest Practices Act (FPA) or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) will be considered for funding.

3.3 Water Conservation and Efficiency Program

Pursuant to Governor Brown's April 2014 Executive Order, recipients of funding for future projects **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. Applicants may submit Water Conservation and efficiency programs as a supplemental document.

3.4 Climate Change

Current scientific evidence supports the necessity to address climate change impacts. Climate change is expected to alter the behavior and distribution of ocean and coastal species as air and water temperatures rise and natural ecosystems are altered. The *2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy* (California Natural Resources Agency) includes as a guiding principal to "Give priority to adaptation strategies that initiate, foster, and enhance existing efforts that improve economic and social well-being, public safety and security, public health and environmental justice, species and habitat protection, and ecological function." As a near-term action, the Strategy states that for Habitat Protection, "State agencies should identify key habitats that may require more protections as a result of climate change impacts and should plan additional buffer areas where necessary to allow for climate change phenomena…" Projects funded by the CDFW Report Card program have enhanced anadromous salmonid species' adaptation potential by restoring and preserving habitat. The realization of climate change places a great urgency on CDFW and its partners to accelerate and continue restoring and preserving habitat that will be resilient to current and future impacts.

3.5 Aquatic Invasive Species

Restoration projects should not be vectors for invasive species, such as New Zealand mud snail. Personal field gear and heavy equipment working in the stream must be properly decontaminated before moving to a new location even within the same watershed. For general information, see CDFW's Invasive Species Program web site at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/Invasives/. For field guidance and decontamination protocols, see https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=43333. **For all implementation projects, applicants must include, as part of supplemental information, a brief document summarizing the CDFW approved protocols they will use and their compliance with those protocols to prevent the spread of invasive species.**

3.6 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- CDFW Proposition 1 Proposal Solicitation Notice FY 2015/2016 11 2015 6276.48.

3.7 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.

3.8 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

3.9 Labor Code Compliance

Projects awarded through the Report Card program 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.

3.10 Environmental Compliance

All funded proposals must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, and California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Projects that have not been designed to meet all requirements of the California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual, 4th Edition (California Department of Fish and Game) (“Manual”) will have the responsibility of developing the appropriate documentation for CEQA, ESA, and CESA compliance, including financial assurances under CESA. An approved or certified CEQA document will be required in order to execute the project, and CDFW will act as a responsible agency under CEQA.

Projects that are designed to be consistent with the Manual, and for which no CEQA documentation has yet been prepared, will be included within the environmental document prepared by CDFW as a lead agency for CEQA. These projects may also obtain ESA coverage as needed through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ programmatic Section 7 consultation on its regional general permit to the Fisheries Restoration Grant Program (FRGP). If necessary, CESA permitting will be handled [on a project-by-project basis.]

The project description should include sufficient information for the CDFW to complete the CEQA documents. Pursuant to the Guidelines for the CEQA in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.4, the Report Card program must determine the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission of projects it funds, permits, or implements to assess the impacts on the environment. The majority of the GHG emissions are presumed to come from fuel consumption; therefore, the Report Card program will calculate the GHG emissions based on the amount of fuel (diesel and gasoline) consumption per project it funds, permits, or implements and will provide the results in the CEQA document. Therefore, the applicant must provide in the application an estimate of the amount of fuel that will be consumed during the implementation of the entire project.

3.11 Permits

Proposals that conduct fishery habitat restoration activities using methods described in the California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual (California Department of Fish and Game) may be covered by the FRGP's programmatic permits. The two FRGP's programmatic permits are the Section 404 and 401 permits of the Clean Water Act (CWA). If projects do not comply with the implementation methods described in the California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual 4th Edition, then the applicant is responsible for obtaining their own coverage of Section 404 and 401 permits. The applicant is encouraged to work with CDFW Regional staff to determine if the project is eligible for the FRGP programmatic permit coverage.

Other permits that may be required to implement the restoration project must be obtained by the applicant. Furthermore, it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure all the required permits are obtained prior to project implementation. Examples of other permits that may be required are the Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement(s) (http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/1600/) and fish collecting/handling permits (http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/cesa/incidental/incid_perm_proced.html) from CDFW. The Construction General Storm Water permit (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml) from the Regional Water Resource Control Boards (which may include provisions for dewatering), coastal development permit(s) from the California Coastal Commission (http://www.coastal.ca.gov/cdp/cdp-forms.html), and other permits from local/state governments or municipalities may also be required.

3.12 Fish Collecting/Handling Permits

Monitoring or research projects which involve fish collecting/handling must possess a current CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit (SCP) before any fish sampling may be initiated. If the project may result in either a direct or incidental take of fish listed under the CESA, an MOU enacted between CDFW and the applicant authorizing a limited level of take for scientific purposes (pursuant to Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 2081(a)) must also be in effect before any fish sampling may be initiated; contact the local CDFW District Biologist with regards to establishing an MOU. Applicants will be required to demonstrate current ESA take coverage in order to obtain a CESA MOU. Applicants submitting proposals for MD projects involving fish collection should incorporate a sufficient time frame in their proposed project to allow securing a CDFW SCP and CESA MOU, as well as applicable ESA permits. Applicants may include the fee cost as a line item in the proposed project budget and should include any costs they may require to comply with permit reporting requirements in their project budget as well.

Information on collecting and research take permits is available online at:

https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting

3.13 Lake and Streambed Alteration Permits (1602)

Fish and Game Code Section 1609 authorizes the CDFW to recover the total cost it incurs to administer and enforce its Lake and Streambed Alteration Program. The permit information and fee schedule are available at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/1600/forms.html. **Applicants may include the fee cost as a line item in the proposed project budget.**

3.14 Fish Passage and Screen Criteria and Testing Requirements

Fish passage and screening projects that are constructed with Report Card funding must meet criteria as outlined in the following documents:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *Fish Screening Criteria*
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2002. *Culvert Criteria for Fish Passage.* (This document is also included in Part IX Appendix A of the CA Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual.)
- National Marine Fisheries Service – Southwest Region. 1997. *Fish Screening Criteria for Anadromous Salmonids*
- National Marine Fisheries Service – Southwest Region. 2001. *Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings.* (This document is also included in Part IX Appendix B of the CA Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual.)

A project must be tested at a flow within the range of design flows prior to the end of the grant funding. Performance of a project throughout its design life is the responsibility of the grantee.

3.15 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.

Projects that may require the services of a licensed professional engineer or geologist include:

PL-Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning

PD-Project Design

FP-Fish Passage at Stream Crossings

HB-Instream Barrier Modification for Fish Passage

HI-Instream Habitat Restoration

HR-Riparian Restoration

HS-Instream Bank Stabilization

Project review and approval by CDFW and/or NOAA Fisheries engineering staff does not imply Department or NOAA Fisheries responsibility or liability for the performance of this aspect or any other aspect of the project. Such liabilities and assurances of performance are the responsibility of the applicant and/or their engineering contractor.

3.16 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.

3.17 Project Location Topographic Map

The location map submitted with the proposal to indicate the project location should only have the current proposal project location and must follow the specifications listed below. **Specific requirements for how to define and map project sites for each project type are listed in Appendix A under each project type.** Please do not include past or alternate funded projects on the location map for your proposal. You may submit a separate map with this information.

SITE: A project site is defined as a point, line (reach), or polygon that spatially describes a work area where specific restoration activities take place. Many projects employ multiple treatment types within a given work site. With multiple treatment types (point, line, or polygon) a project may need to be divided into more than one site. For example - a project that includes instream restoration and riparian treatments in a contiguous area would require two sites: a line for the instream activities and a polygon for the riparian plantings. Another example - a reach of stream may have several treatments, such as, instream habitat structures, stream bank stabilization structures, and a log jam barrier removal, but still be considered as one linear site, provided the distance between any two individual features is less than 1/2 mile. Similarly, the area of riparian habitat where Himalayan blackberry are to be removed and conifer trees planted would be considered one polygon site.

FEATURE: A feature is a distinct physical implementation at a location within a project work site intended to interact with the environment to improve anadromous salmonid habitat. Features consist of one or more restoration treatments. Within one project site there can be numerous features. For implementation monitoring, features are divided by treatment type and location. However, functional groups of structures or treatments can be grouped as one feature. For example, a group of tightly spaced willow baffles should be considered one feature. It is impractical to separate each baffle because they interact and work together as a group for the same objective at the same location. A string of closely spaced grade control weirs is another example of a group of structures of the same type functioning together. However, willow baffles and riprap bank stabilization at the same location would need to be separated into different features because they have different objectives.

POINT SITES describe work that occurs at one or more discrete locations that are more than ½ mile from each other.

LINE (LENGTH) SITES are a continuous line along which associated treatments are implemented. Lines must either follow the path of a stream or a road where work is taking place.

AREA SITES are described by the outline of a polygon on the landscape. These areas may be relatively small, such as the planting area for a riparian project, or relatively large, such as a watershed in which a planning project is taking place.

The project should be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows each location where work is being done. **Aerial photos do not satisfy this requirement.** All maps must be labeled with project title, grantee name, USGS quad name and stream name, and be positioned so that relevant map information such as stream names, towns, main roads, water bodies, etc. are not obscured.

All proposals for habitat restoration (which includes upslope restoration) must also include a detailed plan-view diagram with scale depicting all pertinent features of the project site. The diagram will show the stream channel or other area of work, structure locations, revegetation areas, and distance to each project structure from a reference point, and other significant project and existing features. Applicants may use “typical” drawings if multiple similar physical improvements are proposed.

After a proposal is approved for funding, project work sites may require modification for a variety of reasons. Site modification must be approved in writing by the assigned CDFW grant manager. The project proponent will be required to provide final site descriptions and latitude/longitude coordinates to be incorporated into an agreement before it may be executed.

3.18 Provisional Landowner Access Agreement

For proposed projects that require landowner permission to enter and work on the property, provisional landowner access agreements, with the landowners’ or authorized land managers’ signatures must be submitted with the proposal. If the applicant is the landowner, a provisional landowner access agreement is not required (the landowner should be indicated in the proposal application). For projects that require obtaining multiple landowner access agreements such as status and trend monitoring, at least one major landowner access agreement and a description of how access will be obtained for the entire project is required. A sample Provisional Landowner Access Agreement can be found on the FRGP PSN website. Provisional Landowner Access Agreements must include:

- Statement that landowner(s) or land manager(s) are aware of the proposed project;
- Landowner or land manager gives consent for pre-project evaluation by CDFW and NOAA fisheries staff;
- Landowner or land manager gives provisional consent for the grantee to complete the proposed project with CDFW oversight and visitation;

- Landowner name(s) or land manager(s) contact information; and
- Signature of landowner(s) or land manager(s).

3.19 Quality Assurance/ Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan

Requirements for Monitoring (MD and MO) Project Proposals. Establishing quality assurance and quality control procedures for a monitoring project helps ensure acceptable levels of accuracy and precision for the data collected and analytical procedures applied. Quality Assurance (QA) encompasses the broad plan for maintaining quality in all aspects of the project, and should include a description of how the project will be undertaken, study design, proper documentation and instructions for sampling protocols, training of personnel, data management and analysis, and specific quality control measures. Quality Control (QC) consists of the steps you will take to determine the validity of specific sampling and analytical results. A quality assessment of the overall precision and accuracy of the project data should be included with interim and final project reports. Additional information on QA/QC can be found on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website: http://www.epa.gov/volunteer/stream/132.html.

Proposals for monitoring projects must include a brief (one to two pages) description of the project QA/QC plan. If funding is awarded, a complete QA/QC plan must be submitted before the Grant can be executed. The QA/QC description should include, but is not limited to, the following elements (please provide some detail and not just a copy of the outline below):

- Project goal, objectives, and application
- Project setting
- Scope of work and time frame required
- Study design
- List of sampling protocols
- Personnel requirements and roles
- Schedule of primary activities, including QA/QC
- Training that addresses:
  1) safety practices for field sampling activities
  2) identification of fish species likely to be encountered,
  3) proper handling of fish and
  4) proper use of sampling gear and instruments
- Data collection control that addresses:
  1) independent sampling of a percentage of previously sampled units
  2) independent observers participating in electrofishing
- Data management that addresses:
  1) metadata description
  2) data entry and storage
  3) independent data verification of a percentage of the original entries
  4) data analysis
  5) chain of custody for data

3.20 Public Information

Under Fish and Game Code, Section 1501.5 and Public Resources Code, Section 6217.1, the CDFW is authorized to collect information from grant applicants in order to process, track, and ensure completion of funded projects. All information requested on this application is mandatory unless otherwise indicated. An applicant's name and address may be provided to the public, if requested. Other personal information submitted on this application 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.

3.21 Signage

Successful applicants must include signage, to the extent practicable, informing the public that the project received funds through CDFW from the Steelhead Report and Restoration Card program.

4: SUBMISSION PROCEDURES FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

4.1 Submittal Deadline

Proposals will be accepted from October 19th, 2015 to November 13th, 2015. Both Technical and peer review will occur November 16th through December 18th. Due to time constrains, technical review will be limited to desk reviews and field visits will not be conducted with applicants. Please provide supplementary photos of the project area if necessary. Following the proposal review period, CDFW anticipates awarding grants in late 2015, with grant execution approximately six months from award.

Projects under this PSN will start no later than June 1 of 2016, and end no later than March 1, 2018. Proposal timeframes must occur within this period.

4.2 Paper Application Proposal Package

Applications must be submitted by mail. Mail is the only way to submit proposals to the Report Card program at this time.

The application template can be found on the Steelhead Report and Restoration Card website or by following the link below:

http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/Fishing/Monitoring/SHRC/

A complete paper proposal package includes:

a. Applicants must provide 5 complete paper copies of each proposal package submitted, with the appropriate Proposal Application Form in front and supplemental information attached.

b. All maps, diagrams, tables, etc. should be legible and complete.
c. Entire proposals, including the budget, should be 12 point standard font (such as Arial) on plain white paper.

d. Each page of the proposal should be numbered in sequential order. Double-sided pages are encouraged. CDFW requests that proposals not be bound.

e. While preparing a proposal, please pay attention to the requirements listed in this PSN. Proposals that do not meet the requirements will be ineligible for funding consideration.

Proposals submitted by mail must arrive by November 13st, 2015, by 5 PM. ***Proposals received after November 13st, 2015 will not be accepted regardless of U.S. Postal Service postmark.***

Proposals should be addressed to:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Steelhead Report and Restoration Card Program
Attention: Farhat Bajjaliya
830 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

For required provisions of all proposal applications please see Appendix B

5: Proposal Review Procedure

5.1 Administrative Review

Report Card staff will conduct an administrative review on all hard copy proposals submitted to 830 S Street. The administrative review will determine if the proposal package is complete and meets all the requirements for submission in the 2015 PSN. If the proposal does not pass the administrative review, the proposal will not be considered further for funding this year.

5.2 Technical Review

Appendix B provides an overview of the technical review criteria for each project type. 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]).

5.3 Peer Review

A Steelhead Subcommittee comprised of members of the California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout will review all proposals that pass both Administrative and Technical review. Technical and Peer review scores will be averaged for a final score.

5.4 Cost Analysis Evaluation

Cost analysis evaluation will consider project logistics (e.g. site remoteness, accessibility, coordination required with multiple land holdings), review of production rates/labor requirements in the regional area, and benefit to the recovery of steelhead.

Evaluation of project cost analysis will include the following:

- Comparison of wages, equipment rates, material costs, and other project costs for similar completed and proposed project work within similar geographic regions.

- Review of labor costs identified by Department of Industrial Relations General Prevailing Wage Determinations (http://www.dir.ca.gov/dlse/dlseWagesAndHours.html), Davis-Bacon labor rates (http://www.access.gpo.gov/davisbacon/), and recent California Employment Development Department wage data (http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/).

- Review of regional equipment rental cost information (including the most current version of California Department of Transportation's (CalTrans), *Labor Surcharge and Equipment Rental Rates* publication (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/equipmnt.html).

- Restoration costs, labor requirements, and production rates identified in Appendix I of the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon,* DFG 2004 http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/documents/SAL_SH/SAL_Coho_Recovery/ReportToCommission_2004/22.I_CostAndSocioeconomicImpacts.pdf

6: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF FUNDED

6.1 Awards

The coordinator of the Report Card program 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.

6.2 Grant Agreement

Development of grant agreements will begin as soon as projects are approved by the coordinator of the Report Card program. 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)

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 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.

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

- 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 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.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Project Type Descriptions

A.1 General Information

The Report Card program will accept proposal applications for the types of projects listed below. Funding is limited to watersheds delineated by a Report Card location codes and projects must be within anadromous waters. CDFW has developed a two-letter coding system for project types. A list of these codes is shown and described below. The applicant will identify the primary project type that best describes the proposed project.

PL-Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning

PD- Project Design

FP*-Fish Passage at Stream Crossings

HB*-Instream Barrier Modification for Fish Passage

HI*-Instream Habitat Restoration

HR*-Riparian Restoration

HS*-Instream Bank Stabilization

MD-Monitoring Status and Trends (limited to baseline monitoring only)

MO-Monitoring Watershed Restoration

EF-Enforcement and Projection

*These types of projects may require the services of 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 proposed project requires the services of licensed professionals, these individuals and their affiliations must be identified in the proposal application.

A.2 Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning (PL)

1. Eligible watershed planning projects are for developing watershed plans, ranch implementation plans, conducting watershed assessment, instream flow studies, and databases, which benefit or coordinate information about salmonids and/or restoration and management of their habitat. A watershed is all land enclosed by a continuous drainage basin that drains to, or contributes to a stream, lake, or other body of water (e.g. ocean, etc.). Watersheds can vary in scale to include multiple sub-watersheds or may be as small as a headwater or first order stream. It is a common area that *flows to a larger stream or into the ocean inhabited now or in the past, individually or by any combination of coho salmon or steelhead trout.*

Planning work in sub-watersheds within a hydrologic basin that are not contiguous may be submitted under a single watershed restoration planning project proposal if restoration of these non-contiguous sub-watersheds will, in conjunction with other restoration being undertaken in the hydrologic basin, or on its own, correct the major problems affecting the entire hydrologic basin.

Develop Watershed Plan: Proposals in this category must describe a complete and detailed process of watershed evaluation and assessment that culminates into an integrated and comprehensive plan. The plan should contain site-specific and prioritized recommendations that will address key limiting factors in the watershed that, when implemented, will lead to restoration of salmon and anadromous trout habitat. If the total landowner access secured does not support the proposed area to be evaluated or assessed for the plan, the project budget will be modified to reflect the reduced effort. If landowner access fails to support at least 50% of the intended scope of the project, then FRGP will determine whether or not the project is worth completing. Both social and landscape elements associated with restoration of the watershed must be addressed.

Develop Ranch Implementation Plan: Proposals to develop ranch implementation plans that will identify opportunities to increase anadromous salmonid populations may be included under watershed planning. These plans will cover specific ownerships or portions of a watershed that lend themselves to property specific planning.

Conducting Watershed Assessment: Proposals for partial watershed assessment and evaluation, such as road erosion surveys and stream surveys, should be based on an already completed watershed planning document that is acceptable to CDFW.

Instream Flow Studies: The identification of acceptable instream flows in particular waters includes technical considerations, involving physical opportunities and/or constraints as well as biological processes and needs. These considerations vary significantly between different waters and in different locations, depending upon the degree and complexity of prior water resource development and upon the complexity of the affected ecosystems. The proposed project must demonstrate outreach to the State Water Resources Control Board relative to water rights considerations, and to CDFW Water Branch instream flow study staff if the project stream is subject to PRC 10,000 and/or FGC 5937 code considerations. The key elements of the study plan that CDFW would have to support include, but are not limited to, 1) site selection and representation strategy, 2) selection of target flows for assessment, and 3) selection and/or development of habitat suitability criteria.

Database Support: Proposals for database support include the creation or management of data systems that compile information regarding salmonids, salmonid habitat, and habitat management/restoration. Data systems should contribute to the assessment of existing salmonid populations and habitat and/or the prioritization of future restoration and recovery actions.

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows;

   a. Miles assessed that contain anadromous salmonids;
   b. Miles assessed that are in need of restoration;
   c. Miles assessed to establish regulations or protective measures for salmonids;
   d. Acres assessed that are in need of restoration;
   e. Number of potential fish passage barriers assessed;
   f. Number of barriers to fish passage identified; and
   g. Number of plan assessments completed.
   h. If the proposal is for Database Support, the final report must include either the completed dataset or a link to a publicly accessible website where the data are available.
   i. For Watershed Plans, a final Watershed Plan must be submitted with the final report.

3a. Each proposal must describe in detail the following information in the project description;

   a. Acres of land area affected by the planning/assessment activity;
   b. If the project involves restoration planning or coordination:
      i. Type(s) of planning activities conducted, select from: coordination on implementation of a recovery plan; coordination of watershed conservation and restoration; watershed council support; support to local entities or agencies involved in salmonid restoration planning and coordination; conducting habitat restoration scoping and feasibility studies; evaluation/prioritization of restoration plans and projects; designing and maintaining restoration data systems; engineering/design work for restoration projects; or developing restoration/action plans;
      ii. Name of the plan developed by the project, in the format Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
      iii. Describe extent, purpose and application of the plan;
   c. If the project involves stream surveys or assessments:
      i. Type(s) of assessment activities conducted, select from: salmonid presence/absence survey; instream habitat condition assessment; habitat use by salmonids; instream flow study, or fish passage barrier inventory;
      ii. Name of the assessment document developed by the project, in the format Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
      iii. Acres of habitat assessed to determine habitat conditions affecting salmonids;
      iv. Miles of stream assessed;
      v. Miles of road assessed;
   d. If the project involves watershed habitat surveys or assessments:
      i. Type(s) of assessment activities conducted, select from: riparian condition; road condition/inventory; wetlands; estuarine habitat conditions; LiDAR or other remote mapping; landscape mapping; invasive species; floodplain mapping; overall watershed condition assessment or mapping; stream typing; or instream flow studies;
      ii. Name of the assessment document developed by the project, in the format Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
      iii. Acres of habitat assessed to determine habitat conditions affecting salmonids;
      iv. Miles of stream assessed; and
      v. Miles of road assessed.

3b. In addition to the above required information each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description;

Watershed Plan proposals must include the following:

a. Describe the area of the watershed and estimate the percentage of the area relative to the size of the watershed to be included in the evaluation and assessment for plan development;
b. If the proposed project is intended to complete a watershed plan or augment a reach-level plan, provide the title and date of completion of the existing document and estimate the percentage of the watershed the work proposed will include that is in addition to the previously completed effort (if evaluation and assessment work has already been completed to CDFW satisfaction, the plan may include, or reference, already completed work to satisfy this element);
c. Identify types of surveys to be completed and a reference to the survey methodology used to assess the physical characteristics of the watershed.

Ranch Implementation Plan proposals must include the following:

a. Describe the area of the ranch and estimate the percentage of the area relative to the size of the ranch to be included in the evaluation and assessment of plan development;
b. If the proposed project has been identified in a completed document, provide the title and date of completion of the existing document and estimate the percentage of the work proposed that is in addition to the previously completed effort (if evaluation and assessment work has already been completed to CDFW satisfaction, the plan may include, or reference, already completed work to satisfy this element);
c. Identify types of surveys to be completed and a reference to the survey methodology used to assess the physical characteristics of the stream.

Assessments proposals must include the following:

a. Reference to a documented plan calling for the assessment and evaluation work, additional project proposal elements that will result in a complete watershed restoration plan;
b. Types of surveys to be completed and a reference to the survey methodology used.

Instream Flow Study Proposals must include at least the following:

a. Hydrology and geology: A description of historical (i.e., unaltered) hydrological conditions;
b. Description of surface flow via a water budget, including reach-by-reach gains and losses;
c. Fluvial geomorphologic description of stream system;
d. Biology: Reasonably comprehensive species inventory and distribution information (all taxonomic levels);
e. Life-history understanding for all species identified as present;
f. Macro and micro-habitat characterization for aquatic species;
g. Assessment (and monitoring) of fish condition;
h. Study/modeling, uses, and limitations;
i. Water quality protection and pertinent standards (e.g., Basin Plan standards, Total Maximum Daily Loads, etc.).
j. Study goals, the method(s) to be employed, study/modeling, uses, and limitations;
k. A description of existing/planned outreach to the State Water Resources Control Board relative to water rights considerations, and to CDFW Water Branch instream flow study staff if the project stream is subject to PRC 10,000 considerations.

Database Support Proposals: Describe the data standards used in developing the database, and how data will be managed and stored once the FRGP grant ends.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

   a. Project Location Topographic Map: The project location must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows an outline of the area in which the work is being conducted. Planning proposals where sample locations are subject to a random selection scheme must provide an appropriately scaled map depicting the sample frame region. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted.
   b. **Or** a Watershed Map or County Map: The project must be shown on a scaled map that shows the watershed, county, or other appropriate boundary. **Aerial photos do not satisfy this requirement.**
   c. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement: If part of proposal is to gain landowner access, describe how this will be done.

A.3 Project Design (PD)

1. Eligible design proposals for developing project designs for restoration activities are those that would improve, protect, or enhance habitat for salmonids (e.g. fish barrier modification or removal, bank stabilization, habitat restoration, fish screens, etc.). A PD proposal can be a feasibility study or for project design development. A project design development proposal must include an options analysis, a basis of design report, 30%, 65%, 90%, and 100% design as project deliverables.

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows;

   a. Number of restoration projects proposed as a result of this project;
   b. Name(s) of restoration project(s) proposed as a result of this project;
   c. Description(s) of restoration project(s) proposed as a result of this project;
   d. Type(s) of treatments applied, indicate the FRGP Proposal Project Type(s);
   e. Acres of salmonid habitat protected/restored;
   f. Number of watersheds protected/restored; and
   g. Dollar value of habitat treatments applied.

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description:

a. A detailed description of the project and how it resolves a limiting factor(s) for coho salmon or steelhead.
b. Identify all necessary surveys (e.g. longitudinal profiles, water surface profiles, soils, hydrology, geomorphology, scour analysis) required to complete the design;
c. Identify all county, state, and federal permits needed for the project;
d. Identify qualified specialists (e.g. in fish passage, hydrology, geology) already consulted or to be

consulted in the development of the plan;
e. Number of restoration projects proposed as a result of this project;
f. Acres of habitat proposed for protection/restoration as a result of this project;
g. Provide the name of the plan/assessment in which the need for the project is identified in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, source address; and
h. Scope of plan, including extent, purpose, and application.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

   a. Existing Condition Sketch: For design of structure(s) include documentation and sketch of existing conditions. If known, include proposed treatments and alternatives. Photographs do not satisfy this requirement.
   b. Project Location Topographic Map: The project location must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows an outline of the area in which the work is being conducted. Planning proposals where sample locations are subject to a random selection scheme must provide an appropriately scaled map depicting the sample frame region. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted.
   c. Watershed Map.
   d. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement.
   e. Water Right Verification: If a water right is involved with the project, written verification of the right to divert, use, store, sell, or transfer the water is required for a project that addresses issues related to the diversion, use, storage, or purchase of water.
   f. Photographs of the proposed project site.

A.4 Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP)

1. Eligible fish passage projects are those that are specifically limited to barriers to immigration or emigration. The FP category includes any human-made crossing over or through a stream channel such as paved roads, unpaved roads, railroads, trails and paths, fair-weather Arizona crossings, bridges, and box, pipe, or concrete culverts and baffles. This project type does not include the construction of new fish ladders or upgrading/maintenance of existing fish ladders. Baffles are a series of flow obstructions placed in a culvert or flume to improve fish passage by increasing water depth at lower flows and/or decreasing water velocity at higher flows. Dams are not included in this project type, they are included in HB. For road crossings or modification proposals, the proponent must (a) provide evidence of the extent to which the crossing is a barrier to adult and/or juvenile salmonids and (b) test the project post construction at two life stage design flows (e.g. fall/winter flows for adult salmonids and summer flows for juveniles).

   This project type does not include pre-project planning or design. It is strictly for constructing implementation projects. Proposals must, at a minimum, include completed intermediate plans (i.e., design plans at ~65% level of development). Proposals for pre-project planning and development should be submitted under Project Design (PD). Implementation projects not subject to an earlier review through the planning process must be reviewed and accepted by CDFW/NOAA Fisheries engineering staff prior to funding consideration. Regardless of whether pre-project planning is done through a PD project or outside of the Report Card program, project

applicants are encouraged to engage in discussion with CDFW or NOAA technical staff prior to development of 30 percent plans. Project design review and approval by CDFW/NOAA Fisheries engineering staff does not imply CDFW or NOAA responsibility or liability for the performance of this aspect or any other aspect of the project. Such liabilities and assurances of performance are the responsibility of the applicant and/or their engineering contractor.

If the proposal is funded, Final Plans (100% plans) accepted by CDFW/NOAA Fisheries technical/engineering staff will be required before implementation of the project.

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows;

   a. Post longitudinal profile for projects where channel grade is to be restored or otherwise modified by the project;
   b. If the project includes dewatering and fish exclusion/relocation, a CDFW incidental take permit must be submitted to the CDFW grant manager before each fish relocation activity.

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description;

   a. Miles of stream treated (include only the actual length of stream *treated* by the project, not the length of stream *affected* by the project);
   b. Total number of stream crossings/culverts treated to improve fish passage;
   c. Type(s) of crossings treated, select from: culvert; bridge; or ford;
   d. Miles of stream made more accessible by treating stream crossings (accessible to next barrier or to upstream end of anadromy);
   e. Number of culverts replaced/improved;
   f. Number of bridges installed/improved;
   g. Number of rocked fords placed;
   h. Number of road crossings removed;
   i. Indicate type of required listed species surveys which will be done and type of protocols to be used;
   j. If the project is identified in an assessment or recovery plan, provide the name of the plan/assessment, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
   k. Indicate if fish relocation is needed. Refer to “Stream Dewatering and Fish Exclusion / Relocation” definition in Part V.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

   a. Intermediate Plan. If a design element within the intermediate plan is thought to be unnecessary, provide the rationale for not including it.
   b. Project Location Topographic Map: The project must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows each location where work is being done. Lines for in stream work must be labeled with a label plus an arrow marked "U" pointing at the upstream end of the site and an arrow marked "D" pointing

at the downstream end. The stream where work is being done needs to be labeled on every map submitted. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Locations on each side of the bank need to be differentiated. Project should be represented as point(s) or line(s) along streams, according to the following guidelines:

i. Features that are more than ½ mile apart will be shown as separate points on the map.
ii. Features less than ½ mile apart should be combined into one line on the stream where work is being performed.
iii. If the features are closer than ½ mile apart BUT are on different drainages, the project should be represented as multiple sites, by stream/drainage.

c. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement;
d. Water Right Verification: If a water right is involved with the project, written verification of the right to divert, use, store, sell, or transfer the water is required for a project that addresses issues related to the diversion, use, storage, or purchase of water; and
e. Photographs of proposed project site.

A.5 Instream Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)

1. Eligible instream barrier projects are limited to work in the stream channel (bankfull) and along the stream bank. Instream barriers include grade control structures (weirs), flashboard dams, dams, debris basins, water diversion structures, and log debris accumulations. This project type does not include the construction of new fish ladders or upgraded/maintenance of existing fish ladders. It is recommended proposals under this category include the baseline data discussed in Parts II and III, of the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual, 4th edition (California Department of Fish and Game).* For barrier modification and removal proposals, the proponent must (a) provide evidence of the extent to which the structure is a barrier to adult and/or juvenile salmonids and (b) test the project post construction at two life stage design flows (e.g. fall/winter flows for adult salmonids and summer flows for juveniles).

   This project type is for implementation only and does not include funding for pre-project planning or design. Proposals for pre-project planning and development should be submitted under Project Design (PD). If the proposal is for the implementation phase of a project previously funded by an Report Card Project Design grant, which includes 100% plan development as a project deliverable, then funding for final design plans will not be allowed. Proposals developed through other funding sources must, at a minimum, include completed intermediate plans (i.e., design plans at ~65% level of development) with the proposal submittal.

   If the proposal is funded, Final Plans (100% plans) accepted by CDFW/NOAA Fisheries technical/engineering staff will be required before implementation of the project.

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows;

   a. Post longitudinal profile for projects where channel grade is to be restored or otherwise modified by the project.

b. If project includes the removal of a diversion dam, flashboard dam, wood or concrete dam: design documents, final costs, and final plans will be entered in the Clearinghouse for Dam Removal Information (CDRI) at http://library.ucr.edu/wrca/collections/cdri/.

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description;

a. Miles of stream treated (include only the actual length of stream *treated* by the project, not the length of stream *affected* by the project);
b. Number of barriers treated for fish passage;
c. Type(s) of barriers treated, select from: diversion dam; push-up dam; wood or concrete dam; grade control structures (weirs); logs; or debris;
d. Each project element (pertinent natural features and specific work areas) shall be assigned a unique station number that reflects its measured distance from the project start location. For example, a logjam proposed for modification 250 feet downstream from a bridge designated as the project starting point would have a "station number" of 250. A scaled map with all pertinent features and work site station shall be included as part of the proposal.
e. Miles of stream made more accessible by removing barriers (accessible to next barrier or to upstream end of anadromy);
f. Number of fishway chutes/pools installed;
g. If the project is identified in an assessment or recovery plan, provide the name of the plan/assessment, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
h. Indicate type of required listed species surveys which will be done and type of protocols to be used; and
i. Indicate if fish relocation is needed. Refer to "Stream Dewatering and Fish Exclusion / Relocation" definition in Part V.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information;

a. Intermediate Plan. If a design element within the intermediate plan is thought to be unnecessary, provide the rationale for not including it.
b. Conceptual Plan: If an intermediate plan is determined to be unnecessary, provide a conceptual plan. Projects where channel grade is to be restored or otherwise modified by the proposed project must also include a longitudinal profile, scaled plan, and elevation view diagrams showing the proposed work.
c. Project Location Topographic Map: The project must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows each location where work is being done. Lines for in stream work must be labeled with a label plus an arrow marked "U" pointing at the upstream end of the site and an arrow marked "D" pointing at the downstream end. The stream where work is being done needs to be labeled on every map submitted. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Locations on each side of the bank need to be differentiated. If there are multiple sites along a stream length, make sure that the individual sites are numbered or labeled. If this makes the map too busy to easily read, then multiple maps will be necessary. Project should be represented as point(s) or line(s) along streams, according to the following guidelines:
   i. Features that are more than ½ mile apart will be shown as separate points on the map.
   ii. Features less than ½ mile apart should be combined into one line on the stream where

work is being performed.
   iii. If the features are closer than ½ mile apart BUT are on different drainages, the project should be represented as multiple sites, by stream/drainage.
d. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement.
e. Water Right Verification: If a water right is involved with the project, written verification of the right to divert, use, store, sell, or transfer the water is required for a project that addresses issues related to the diversion, use, storage, or purchase of water.
f. Photographs of proposed project site.

A.6 Instream Habitat Restoration (HI)

1. Eligible instream habitat restoration projects are limited to work in the stream channel (bankfull) and along the stream bank. Instream habitat restoration includes installation of instream structures such as boulder clusters, weirs, log and root wad structures, and off-channel projects. It is recommended that proposals under this category include the baseline data discussed in Parts II and III, of the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual, 4th edition (California Department of Fish and Game).*

   If the applicant is seeking funds to monitor an instream habitat restoration project (HI) as a component of this proposal, they must also **include all the required information for a monitoring watershed restoration project (MO)**. The funding requested for the monitoring task of the proposal must also be clearly identified and detailed in the budget.

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows;

   a. Post longitudinal profile for projects where channel grade is to be restored or otherwise modified by the project.

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description. Instream structure proposals must specifically define the number and types (complexity) of proposed structures, and the materials and labor needed for completing the structure.

   a. Total miles of instream habitat treated, count stream reach only once, even if it has multiple treatments;
   b. If the project is for channel reconfiguration and connectivity:
      i. Type of channel reconfiguration and connectivity, select from: creation/connection to off-channel habitat, creation of instream pools, channel bed restored, or meanders added;
      ii. Miles of stream treated for channel reconfiguration and connectivity;
      iii. Miles of off-channel stream created;
      iv. Number of instream pools created for channel reconfiguration;
   c. If the project is for channel structure placement:
      i. Type of materials used for channel structure placement, select from: individual logs (unanchored), individual logs (anchored), logs fastened together (logjam),

rocks/boulders (unanchored), rocks/boulders (fastened or anchored), stumps with roots attached (root wads), weirs, deflectors/barbs, or other engineered structures;
   ii. Miles of stream treated with channel structure placement;
   iii. Number of instream pools created by structure placement;
   iv. Number of structures placed in channel;

d. If the project is for spawning gravel placement:
   i. Miles of stream treated with spawning gravel placement;
   ii. Cubic yards of spawning gravel placed;

e. If the project is for removal of aquatic non-native invasive plants:
   i. Miles of stream treated for removal of aquatic non-native invasive plants;
   ii. Species scientific name(s) of plants removed;

f. Each project element (pertinent natural features and specific work areas) shall be assigned a unique station number that reflects its measured distance from the project start location. For example, a logjam proposed for installation 250 feet downstream from a bridge designated as the project starting point would have a “station number” of 250. A scaled map with all pertinent features and work site station shall be included as part of the proposal,

g. Indicate type of required listed species surveys which will be done and type of protocols to be used; and

h. If the project is identified in an assessment or recovery plan, provide the name of the plan/assessment, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, and source address.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information;

. Intermediate Plan. If a design element within the intermediate plan is thought to be unnecessary, provide the rationale for not including it.

a. Conceptual Plan: If an intermediate plan is determined to be unnecessary, provide a conceptual plan. Projects where channel grade is to be restored or otherwise modified by the proposed project must also include a longitudinal profile, scaled plan, and elevation view diagrams showing the proposed work.

b. Project Location Topographic Map: The project must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows each location where work is being done. Lines for in stream work must be labeled with a label plus an arrow marked "U" pointing at the upstream end of the site and an arrow marked "D" pointing at the downstream end. The stream where work is being done needs to be labeled on every map submitted. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Locations on each side of the bank need to be differentiated. If there are multiple sites along a stream length, make sure that the individual sites are numbered or labeled. If this makes the map too busy to easily read, then multiple maps will be necessary. Project should be represented as point(s) or line(s) along streams, according to the following guidelines:
   i. Features that are more than ½ mile apart will be shown as separate points on the map.
   ii. Features less than ½ mile apart should be combined into one line on the stream where work is being performed.
   iii. If the features are closer than ½ mile apart BUT are on different drainages, the project should be represented as multiple sites, by stream/drainage.

c. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement.

d. Photographs representative of proposed project site.

A.7 Riparian Restoration (HR)

1. Eligible riparian restoration projects are for riparian restoration of bare or partially denuded banks adjacent to the stream and within the riparian corridor. Also included is eradication of non-native, invasive vegetation species and revegetation with native endemic riparian species. This project type does not allow funding for developing a riparian restoration plan. See the project type Watershed Assessment Evaluation and Planning (PL) if a plan needs to be developed for a future riparian restoration project. The riparian area shall be defined as the area between a stream and the adjacent upland identified by soil characteristics and distinctive vegetation. It includes wetlands and those portions of floodplains and valley bottoms that support riparian vegetation.

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows;

    a. An agreement that the landowner or proponent will maintain the livestock exclusion fence(s) for a period of 10 years and totally exclude livestock from the riparian zone. Maintenance will include repair of fences to a level that will effectively exclude livestock from the livestock exclusion project area. Maintenance will not include damage that exceeds 50 percent of the fence due to natural disaster.

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description;

    a. Each proposal must also demonstrate how the project would be instrumental in restoring the natural function of the riparian corridor using appropriate successional stage native species.
    b. For projects that include fencing, the applicant must construct a wildlife friendly fence (consult with local CDFW staff for guidance). Fencing shall have a minimum set back of 35 feet from the edge of the stream bank.
    c. Miles of stream treated overall, count stream reach only once, even if it has multiple treatments.
    d. Miles of riparian stream bank treated, measure both sides of the bank if appropriate.
    e. Total acres of riparian area treated.
    f. If the project involves riparian planting:
        i. Number of plants;
        ii. Provisions made for annual survival monitoring and replanting/reseeding;
        iii. Provisions for watering;
        iv. Acres of riparian area planted;
        v. Species scientific names of plants planted.
    g. If the project involves livestock exclusion:
        i. Miles of fence installed/repaired;
        ii. Type of fencing material proposed;
        iii. Acres of riparian area protected by fencing;
        iv. Number of water gap installations.
    h. If the project involves plant removal/control:
        i. Acres of riparian area treated for removal of non-native invasive plants;
        ii. Species scientific names of plants removed.

i. Indicate type of required listed species surveys which will be done and type of protocols to be used; and
j. If the project is identified in an assessment or recovery plan, provide the name of the plan/assessment, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, and source address.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

a. Riparian Restoration Plan.
b. Project Location Topographic Map: The project must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows the location being acquired. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Show the extent of the riparian work being conducted, using an outline of the area. All contiguous work areas should be included in a single outline. Non-contiguous work areas should be shown as separate outlines (ex: right and left bank planting exercises should be separated into two sites).
c. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement
d. Fence Maintenance Plan: Maintenance will include repair of fences to a level that will effectively exclude livestock from the livestock exclusion project area for a period of 10 years. Include a maintenance schedule and indicate who will be responsible for the fence maintenance.
e. Photographs representative of project site.

A.8 Bank Stabilization (HS)

1. Eligible bank stabilization projects include stabilization of eroding, collapsing, or otherwise de-stabilized banks. It is recommended that proposals under this category include the baseline data discussed in Parts II and III, of the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual, 4th edition (California Department of Fish and Game).*

2. All supplemental information required (see #4 below) is to be submitted with the proposal. There is no additional information required after funding.

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description.
a. Miles of stream treated overall; count stream reach only once, even if it has multiple treatments;
b. Type of materials used for stream bank stabilization, select from: logs; rocks/boulders; rock barbs; log barbs; revetments; or vegetation;
c. Miles of stream bank treated, measure both sides of the bank if appropriate;
d. Indicate type of required listed species surveys which will be done and type of protocols to be used;
e. If the project is identified in an assessment or recovery plan, provide the name of the plan/assessment, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, and source address.
f. If the project involves bioengineering, the proposal must identify and describe the type of treatment and define linear feet of bank stabilized and riparian species planted.
g. Indicate if fish relocation is needed. Refer to “Stream Dewatering and Fish Exclusion / Relocation” definition in Part V.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

   a. Intermediate Plan. If a design element within the intermediate plan is deemed unnecessary, then provide the rationale to support this determination.
   b. Conceptual Plan: If an intermediate plan is determined to be unnecessary, provide a conceptual plan and an explanation for why a conceptual level of plan development is appropriate. Projects where channel grade is to be restored or otherwise modified by the proposed project must also include a longitudinal profile, scaled plan, and elevation view diagrams showing the proposed work.
   c. Project Location Topographic Map: The project must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows each location where work is being done. Lines for in stream work must be labeled with a label plus an arrow marked "U" pointing at the upstream end of the site and an arrow marked "D" pointing at the downstream end. The stream where work is being done needs to be labeled on every map submitted. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Locations on each side of the bank need to be differentiated. If there are multiple sites along a stream length, make sure that the individual sites are numbered or labeled. If this makes the map too busy to easily read, then multiple maps will be necessary.
   d. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement.
   e. Photographs of project site.

   Project should be represented as point(s) or line(s) along streams, according to the following guidelines:

   a. Features that are more than ½ mile apart will be shown as separate points on the map.
   b. Features less than ½ mile apart should be combined into one line on the stream where work is being performed.
   c. If the features are closer than ½ mile apart BUT are on different drainages, the project should be represented as multiple sites, by stream/drainage.

A.9 Monitoring Projects (MD)

1. Eligible monitoring projects for consideration under this PSN are projects that monitor the status and trends of anadromous salmonid populations and/or their habitat (MD). This project type includes **only** baseline monitoring. Baseline monitoring is intended to measure existing conditions of salmonid habitat, watershed processes, and/or populations. Baseline data can be used to identify factors limiting species recovery and for restoration and recovery planning purposes. A wide array of indicators might be included in baseline sampling. Proposals for baseline monitoring must fully document compliance with the protocols described in Fish Bulletin 180, California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring: Strategy, Design, and Methods, DFG 2011.

   Monitoring or research projects that involve fish collections must possess a current CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit (SCP) before any fish sampling may be initiated. If the project may result in either a direct or incidental take of fish listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), an MOU enacted between CDFW and the applicant authorizing a limited level of take for scientific purposes (pursuant to Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 2081(a)) must also be in effect before any fish sampling may be initiated. Contact the local CDFW District Biologist with

regards to establishing an MOU. Applicants will be required to demonstrate current Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) take coverage in order to obtain a CESA MOU. Applicants submitting proposals for MD project types involving fish collections should incorporate sufficient time in their proposed project to allow securing a CDFW SCP and CESA MOU, as well as applicable ESA permits. Applicants should include in their project proposal an estimated project budget which includes costs they may require to obtain the permit and comply with permit reporting requirements. Information on collecting and research take permits is available online at https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting. The SCP application may be obtained at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/research_permit/scp/scp_aplic_procs.html

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. Failure to provide data, analyses, and scientific reporting will result in the grantee becoming ineligible for future funding consideration until the required products are delivered to CDFW. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The grantee will be required to submit information to the grant manager as follows:

   a. In addition to the final report, annual reports in scientific format (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Literature Cited) will be required;
   b. Final manuscript in scientific format suitable for publication in a scientific journal;
   c. Field sampling database, in Excel or Access;
   d. Data compilations and analytical products, in Excel or Access;
   e. Names of reports prepared, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
   f. All data collected and created is a required deliverable and will become the property of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and not of the grantee. 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 BIOS metadata standards (http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/metadata.asp) and FGDC metadata standards (http://www.fgdc.gov/metadata/documents/workbook_0501_bmk.pdf).

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description:

   a. Research or management questions and hypotheses addressed;
   b. Overall project goals, measurable project objectives, and specific tasks to meet the objectives;
   c. Spatial and temporal monitoring scales;
   d. Study design and the parameters to be monitored;
   e. Sampling scheme to be utilized;
   f. Sampling protocol to be utilized, including appropriate report or literature citation (for example, Fish Bulletin 180, California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring: Strategy, Design, and Methods, DFG 2011);
   g. Analyses to be employed;
   h. Miles of stream monitored;
   i. Acres of habitat monitored;

j. Type of monitoring conducted, select from: adult salmonid population monitoring, salmonid smolt or fry production monitoring, biological monitoring (other than salmon), redd counts, carcass counts, water quality monitoring, water quantity (flow) monitoring, or habitat condition monitoring;
k. Describe the comprehensive monitoring strategy/program of which the project is a part, if applicable;
l. Describe how the proposed status and trend monitoring addresses specific component(s) of the Coastal Monitoring Plan (as described in *Fish Bulletin 180, California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring: Strategy, Design, and Methods, DFG 2011)*. If proposed monitoring is not described in Fish Bulletin 180 explain how the work would meet a critical information gap necessary for population recovery;
m. Number of organizations cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy;
n. Name of each organization cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy;
o. Number of reports prepared on key management or restoration data, information and needs;
p. If the project is identified in an assessment or recovery plan, provide the name of the plan/assessment, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
q. Geospatial project reference sites and data sampling locations;
r. Photographs of data sampling locations, paper and electronic copies.
s. Describe the project's appropriateness for initial or continued grant support under the Report Card program;
t. Literature Cited section;
u. Indicate type of required listed species surveys which will be done and type of protocols to be used;

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

a. Project Location Topographic Map: The monitoring site location(s) must be shown on a USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map, using points, lines, or areas that best describes the work being done. Site location should be shown. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Monitoring proposals where sample locations are subject to a random selection scheme must provide an appropriately scaled map depicting the sample frame region.
b. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement.
c. Proposals for monitoring projects must include a brief (one to two pages) description of projects QA/QC plan. If funding is awarded a complete QA/QC plan must be submitted before the Grant will be executed;
d. If proposal is for ongoing monitoring - attach a copy or provide a link to last year's report including data summary and analysis;
e. If proposal is for new monitoring – attach an example or a link to applicant's work including sample data analysis that demonstrates applicant's ability to collect and analyze anadromous fisheries population data.

A.10 Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO)

1. Eligible watershed restoration monitoring projects are those which will address one or more of the following tasks: 1) assess grant compliance, implementation quality, and document the location and as-built condition of restoration features constructed (Implementation monitoring), 2)

determine if restoration treatments and features have produced the desired habitat conditions and/or watershed processes (effectiveness monitoring), 3) determine whether the hypothesized responses of habitat, watershed processes, and/or populations to restoration activities were correct (validation monitoring).

Monitoring or research projects that involve fish collections must possess a current CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit (SCP) before any fish sampling may be initiated. If the project may result in either a direct or incidental take of fish listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), an MOU enacted between CDFW and the applicant authorizing a limited level of take for scientific purposes (pursuant to Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 2081(a)) must also be in effect before any fish sampling may be initiated. Contact the local CDFW District Biologist with regards to establishing an MOU. Applicants will be required to demonstrate current Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) take coverage in order to obtain a CESA MOU. Applicants submitting proposals for MO project types involving fish collections should incorporate sufficient time in their proposed project to allow securing a CDFW SCP and CESA MOU, as well as applicable ESA permits. Applicants should include in their project proposal an estimated project budget which includes costs they may require to obtain the permit and comply with permit reporting requirements. Information on collecting and research take permits is available online at https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting. The SCP application may be obtained at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/research_permit/scp/scp_aplic_procs.html

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows;

   a. Final manuscript suitable for publication in a scientific journal, in scientific format (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Discussion, Literature Cited);
   b. Field sampling database, in Excel or Access;
   c. Data compilations and analytical products, in Excel or Access;
   d. Names of reports prepared, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, source address;
   e. All data collected and created is a required deliverable and will become the property of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and not of the grantee. 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 BIOS metadata standards (http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/metadata.asp) and FGDC metadata standards (http://www.fgdc.gov/metadata/documents/workbook_0501_bmk.pdf).

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description;

   a. Research or management questions and hypotheses addressed;
   b. Overall project goals, measurable project objectives, and specific tasks to meet the objectives;
   c. Spatial and temporal monitoring scales;
   d. Study design and the parameters to be monitored;

e. Sampling scheme to be utilized;
f. Sampling protocol to be utilized, including appropriate report or literature citation (for example, Protocols for Monitoring the Response of Anadromous Salmon and Steelhead to Watershed Restoration in California, Duffy 2005);
g. Analyses to be employed;
h. Miles of stream monitored;
i. Acres of habitat monitored;
j. Type of monitoring conducted, select from: post-project implementation or design compliance monitoring, restoration effectiveness monitoring, or restoration validation monitoring;
k. Describe the comprehensive monitoring strategy/program of which the project is a part, if applicable;
l. Describe the component of the comprehensive monitoring strategy that the project addresses;
m. Number of organizations cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy;
n. Name(s) of each organization cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy;
o. Number of reports prepared on key management or restoration data, information and needs; and
p. If the project is identified in an assessment or recovery plan, provide the name of the plan/assessment, in the format: Author, date, title, name, source, and source address.
q. Literature Cited section;

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

a. Project Location Topographic Map: The project must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows each location where work is being done. Lines for in stream work must be labeled with a label plus an arrow marked "U" pointing at the upstream end of the site and an arrow marked "D" pointing at the downstream end. The stream where work is being done needs to be labeled on every map submitted. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Locations on each side of the bank need to be differentiated. Project should be represented as point(s) or line(s) along streams, according to the following guidelines:
   i. Features that are more than ½ mile apart will be shown as separate points on the map.
   ii. Features less than ½ mile apart should be combined into one line on the stream where work is being performed.
   iii. If the features are closer than ½ mile apart BUT are on different drainages, the project should be represented as multiple sites, by stream/drainage.
b. Watershed Map.
c. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement.
d. Proposals for monitoring projects must include a brief (one to two pages) description of projects QA/QC plan. If the proposal is funded, a complete QA/QC plan must be submitted before the Grant can be executed.
e. If proposal is for new monitoring, attach a brief description/example of applicant's previous work that demonstrates the ability to summarize and interpret data similar to the proposed project;
f. If proposal is for ongoing monitoring, attach a brief abstract of findings/progress to date with summary table or figure.

A.11 Enforcement and Protection Projects (EF)

1. Eligible Enforcement and Protection Projects will be accepted for projects that clearly offer benefits that will lead to enhanced abilities for the public, natural resource managers, public agencies, and counties to utilize important laws and regulations that protect salmon and steelhead and their habitat. Providing protection through enhanced enforcement training and related activities is a valuable tool in efforts to help restoration and recovery efforts. Protection efforts directly and indirectly serve as a conduit to the public, providing education, information, training, and accountability towards the goal of being good stewards of watersheds and fishery resources. Projects include these three categories:

   A. Training that enhances protection of individual fish or populations of threatened or endangered salmon and steelhead by providing an enhanced ability to prevent illegal take. This includes permit reviews and other activities intended to protect salmonid habitat.
   B. The protection of salmon and steelhead habitat by enhancing the ability of resource managers and responsible organizations to prevent pollution and habitat degradation. Including actions which would help with successful prosecution of illegal take and habitat destruction.
   C. Educational, outreach, and training programs which serve to prevent illegal destruction of salmon and steelhead habitat.

2. If the proposal is funded the following information will be required with the Final Report of the grant agreement. This information is provided so the applicant is able to budget for these deliverables in the proposal as necessary. The required information is as follows:
   a. Name of the plan that was developed/implemented (author, date, title, name, source, source address).
   b. Description and scope of the plan developed/implemented including extent, purpose, and application of the plan.
   c. Acres of land affected by plan.
   d. Number of plans/designs for restoration/conservation actions developed as a result of this project.
   e. Dollar amount of donations made to restoration/conservation actions.
   f. Number of volunteers committed to restoration/conservation actions.
   g. Number of restoration or protection projects proposed.
   h. Acres of habitat restored or protected.
   i. Number and list of watersheds restored or protected.
   j. Dollar value of treatments applied.
   k. Results and analysis of the evaluation plan.
   l. Number of students educated.
   m. Number of workshops/training event.
   n. Number of outreach/education documents completed and distributed.
   o. Number of schools and other institutions reached.
   p. Name of education/outreach document.

3. Each proposal must describe in detail the following additional specific information in the project description;

a. Submit a plan which outlines the reason for the request as it relates to salmon and steelhead protection.
b. Demonstrate that the funding requested is necessary to either augment or create a program that offers a reasonable goal of better protection of salmon and steelhead resources.
c. A cost/benefit discussion that demonstrates the need for funding.
d. An evaluation of the activity being proposed to ensure it meets current State enforcement requirements.

4. Applicants for this project type must include the following supplemental information:

a. Project Location Topographic Map: The project must be shown on an appropriately scaled, USGS (or equivalent) 7.5 minute contoured topographic quadrangle map that shows each location where work is being done. Lines for in stream work must be labeled with a label plus an arrow marked "U" pointing at the upstream end of the site and an arrow marked "D" pointing at the downstream end. The stream where work is being done needs to be labeled on every map submitted. USGS Quad names for all areas shown on the map need to be clearly labeled on every map submitted. Locations on each side of the bank need to be differentiated. Project should be represented as point(s) or line(s) along streams, according to the following guidelines:
   i. Features that are more than ½ mile apart will be shown as separate points on the map.
   ii. Features less than ½ mile apart should be combined into one line on the stream where work is being performed.
   iii. If the features are closer than ½ mile apart BUT are on different drainages, the project should be represented as multiple sites, by stream/drainage.
b. Watershed Map or County Map. **Aerial photos do not satisfy this requirement.**
c. Pre- and post-training evaluations.
d. Training curriculum.
e. Targeted organizations and parties that would benefit from implementation of training.
f. Description of species, geographic, or institutional protection issues needing training to achieve or improve protection of habitat or fisheries.

Appendix B: Required Provisions for All Proposal Applications

General Guidelines

This PSN is a legal document. Applicants are encouraged to work closely with local CDFW FRGP staff in the planning and development of proposals well in advance of the proposal deadline and before the submission window.

If the project is selected for funding, the project proponent shall comply with all applicable state laws, rules, regulations, and local ordinances specifically including but not limited to environmental, procurement, safety laws, rules, regulations, and ordinances. As may be necessary, the grantee shall be responsible for obtaining the services of appropriately licensed professionals to comply with the applicable requirements of the Business and Professions Code including but not limited to section 6700 et seq. (Professional Engineers Act) and/or section 7800 et seq. (Geologists and Geophysicists Act) with the applicable requirements of the Business and Professions Code.

If the project is selected for funding and the project proponent fails to perform in accordance with the provisions of the enacted grant agreement, the CDFW retains the right, at its sole discretion, to interrupt or suspend the work for which the monies are appropriated or to terminate the grant agreement.

Instructions for proposal submittal

Proposals must conform to the instructions below. All information requested must be included in the proposal application. All boxes on the application form must be filled in.

Section 1: Summary Information

1. Focus (Check only one)	**SHRRC** ☐
2. Project type:	*Two-letter project code as described under each Focus.*
3. Project title:	*Brief, descriptive title. 72 character maximum.*
4. Applicant/Organization name:	*Name of organization, tribe, or agency applying for grant.*
5. Applicant/Organization mailing address: Check if changed from previous applications ☐	*Street or P.O. Box for mail. This is where the grant agreement (if funded) will be sent.*
6. Applicant/Organization - city, state, zip:	
7. Applicant/Organization phone #	*Primary telephone number to reach person responcible for the proposal, including area code.*
8. Applicant/Organization - Fax #:	*Primary FAX number for person responcible for the proposal, including area code.*

9. Person authorized (PA) to sign grant agreement:	*Name and Title of person authorized to legally sign a grant agreement.*
10. PA - Email address:	*Primary Email address for person authorized to sign a grant agreement.*
11. Contact person (CP):	*Name and Title of person to be contacted regarding project if funded. Would also act as applicant grant manager.*
12. CP - Email address:	*Primary Email address for contact person.*
13. Organization type:	Public Agency ☐ Nonprofit Organization ☐ Native American Indian Tribe ☐
14. Mitigation:	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ *Is the work mitigation pursuant to CEQA or other authority or a result of an enforcement action? Check and explain if yes.*
15. Certified nonprofit organization:	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ *If yes, specify the 501(c) nonprofit organization number.*
16. Past grantee:	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐
17. Licensed Professional	*Is licensed professional needed?* **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ *If yes provide name, license number, affiliation, and contact information of licensed professional(s). If this information cannot be provided with the application, an explanation must be provided in the project description.*
18. Amount requested:	*Amount requested from FRGP, this must be the same requested amount shown in the budget.*
19. Total project cost:	*Sum of amount requested plus all cost share funds and services, this must be the same project total amount shown in the budget.*
20. Salmonid species benefited:	**Coho** ☐ **Steelhead** ☐ (Cutthroat ☐ Chinook ☐) *Check the focus species benefited. (If you are also benefiting cutthroat & Chinook please check the appropriate box.) For the SHRRC Focus only select "steelhead".*
21. Project objectives:	*Summarize specific measurable project objectives and expected results. Maximum of 255 characters.*
22. Recovery/ Restoration Plan:	*N/A*
23. Task number or reference: **(List one task only)**	*Angler benefit*
24. Time frame:	*Provide estimated timeframe (start and end dates) for the project from project start to completion. (Duration of projects cannot exceed two years.) This timeframe must include submission of final invoice and final report and allow for all required surveys, including engineer review. All deliverables must be submitted within the project timeframe.*

25. Stream:	*Name all streams and/or rivers which will be directly affected by the project.*
26. Tributary to:	*Name all streams and/or rivers directly downstream of the project stream.*
27. Focus Watershed system:	*Follow the instructions for the Criteria of each Focus to complete this box.*
28. County(ies):	*Name all counties in which the project work will take place.*
29. Coastal Zone:	**Yes ☐ No ☐** *Indicate if your project location is in the Coastal Zone. The Coastal Zone is a specific geographic area of varying width adjacent to the Pacific Ocean, set forth in the California Coastal Act, which is subject to the policies and regulations in the County's Local Program, including the Coastal Element of the General Plan and Coastal Zoning Code. A Coastal Development permit may be required, for further information on the Coastal Zone, visit the California Coastal Commission's website at http://www.coastal.ca.gov/cdp/cdp-forms.html.*

Section 2: Location Information

1. Latitude, Longitude (in decimal degrees, geographic, NAD83):	*Provide exact project location, using multiple coordinates if necessary. If the project is not tied to a specific on-the-ground location, provide the coordinates for the headquarters of the organization. Also provide a brief description of what the coordinates refer to, such as the downstream end of the project reach.*
2. USGS Quad Name and surrounding quads. Township, Range and Section	*This information is required for the 2015 PSN. Provide it as a supplemental document in the online system.*
3. Location description:	*Provide a general description of the project location and the nature of the work site in relation to known landmarks, with reference to attached drawings and maps. Include the number of miles upstream of the mouth of the creek/river (mainstem) and number of miles upstream of a confluence (tributary). Include the extent (physical linear or area measure) of the project site. Maximun 2,048 characters.*
4. Directions from nearest town or landmark:	*Provide driving directions to the project site. Indicate if advance permission is required from the landowner and if locked gates exist. Indicate if there are restrictions to road use. Maximum 2,048 characters.*

Section 3: Watershed Information

All questions in this Section refer to the watershed named in Number 1 below.

1. Watershed name:	*Name the watershed and/or subwatershed which best indentifies the habitat area benefited by the project.*
2. Watershed area:	*Watershed area in square miles within which the project is*

	located.
3. Watershed area directly affected by the proposed project:	*Percent of watershed affected by project.*
4. Land use statement:	*Describe current and anticipated future (next 10 years) land uses in the watershed. Maximum of 2,000 characters.*
5. Watershed ownership:	%Private_____ %State_____ %Federal_____ %Other _____ *Enter percentages by type of ownership for the entire watershed to equal 100%.*
6. Length of anadromous streams in watershed:	*Length of anadromous streams in the watershed, in miles.*
7. Watershed Plan(s):	*List any watershed plan(s) in which the proposed project is recommended. Use the following format: Author, year, title, organization, city, state. Copies of the plan(s) must be available upon request.*

8. Background information: *Provide backround information, referencing historical land use, past land use practices, local conditions, watershed plans, studies and other sources. Include the causes of the existing problem (at the appropriate scale) this project will correct. Reference attached figures, tables, maps and photos if necessary. Maximum of 3,000 characters.* ***Do Not describe the project here.***

Section 4: Recovery Task (Angler Benefit) and Limiting Factors

1. Describe how project accomplishes listed task: *Specifically identify how the proposal will successfully address the task identified in box 23 of Section 1. Include the title of the task in your explanation. Maximum of 2,000 characters. In order to track recovery actions from recovery plans, please list in this section any additional tasks that your project may address.*
2. Need for the project: *Concisely summarize the need for the project based on historic or existing conditions and/or limiting factors. Maximum of 8,000 characters.* ***Do Not describe the project here.***

3. Limiting factors to salmonids remediated by proposed project:	☐ Water quantity (lack of flow, diversions, runoff) ☐ Water quality (temperature, chemistry, turbidity) ☐ Riparian dysfunction (lack of shade, excessive nutrients, roughness elements) ☐ Excessive sediment yield (pool and gravel quality) ☐ Spawning requirements (gravel, resting areas-pools) ☐ Rearing requirements (velocity, lack of shelter, pools) ☐ Estuary/lagoon issues (closure during migration periods) ☐ Fish passage (emigration and immigration)
4. Limiting factor remediation: *Describe how the project addresses each of the selected limiting factors in #3 above. You will be required to give a separate explanation for each limiting factor you selected above. Be specific on how your project is addressing each limiting factor.*	

Section 5: Project Description

The Project Description must contain the following information broken out into subsections: 1) Introduction, 2) Objectives, 3) Project Set Up, 4) Materials 5) List of Tasks, 6) Deliverables, 7) Timeline, 8) Protocols, and 9) Expected Quantitative Results. The Project Description must include a complete description of the project, including what is being funded by cost share (cash and in-kind services). This section has no character limit. If there are any attachments or required supplemental information included with the proposal, they must be referenced in the project description.

Projects should treat causes and not just the symptoms of anadromous fish habitat degradation. Project proposal descriptions must have sufficient detail to be used in a grant agreement statement of work (if funded), to complete California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance, and necessary permits. A description, which only consists of a list of proposed activities, without descriptive narrative does not constitute sufficient detail.

1) <u>The Introduction</u> must include:

(a) An overview of the project which sums up the project in a few sentences;
(b) the purpose of the project;
(c) why the project is necessary;
(d) each restoration element being proposed and how each element will be implemented (e.g. methods/techniques used, materials and equipment used, dewatering, etc.),
(e) a clear understandable link of how the proposed project elements will address the current problem(s) at the appropriate scale,
(f) any specific information required for each Project Type as listed in Part VI of this PSN.

2) <u>The Objectives</u> must identify specific end goals(s) that will be accomplished by the project. Summarize measurable objectives in a few sentences which can be included in the grant agreement if the proposal is funded. The specifics for how, when, where and by whom these goals will be accomplished should be addressed in numbers 3 to 7 below. This should be the same information as entered in Section 1, Box 21 above. (In the online system, this will be entered on the Summary Information page.)

3) <u>The Project Set Up</u> must describe who will be implementing the project and who will be completing each task, include specifically named subcontractors if known, or types of subcontractors needed for the project (e.g. construction, revegetation, surveys). Personnel must be listed by their titles or classifications and a description of their responsibilities and tasks must be included. <u>Any personnel not discussed in this section cannot be included in the Personnel Services section of the budget.</u> If there will be more than one subcontractor, <u>clearly differentiate which tasks each subcontractor will accomplish.</u> Subcontractors not discussed in this section cannot be included in the Operating Expenses section of the budget.

4) <u>Materials:</u> All materials required for the project and included in the budget must be described. Include:

- What is being used;
- how it is being used;
- purpose of material and;
- why it is required for the project.

5) <u>The List of Tasks</u> must include a list of all tasks to be accomplished and a detailed description of what is necessary to complete each task. Include all tasks for the project not just those funded by grant funds. <u>If an item or expense is not included in this section, it cannot be included in the budget.</u>

6) <u>The Deliverables</u> must include by task:

- A complete list of what will be delivered as a result of the project;
- a complete list of quantifiable expected results of the project;
- a list and description of all reports, maps, databases and other products to be prepared and delivered to FRGP;
- all specific deliverables required for each Project Type as described in Part VI;
- periodic status reports, annual reports, and;
- a Final Report.

7) <u>The Timeline</u> should be linked to the tasks. The timeline must include estimated completion dates of all tasks, deliverables, and steps of implementation. All tasks, including submission of the final invoice and final report, must occur within the timeframe listed in Box 24 of Section 1. Duration of projects cannot exceed two years.

8) Protocols: In order to be included in the FRGP CEQA process, the following protocols must be used in project implementation. (Check applicable box):

☐ DFG *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*
Manual part number:
☐ DFG Fish Bulletin 180: California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring: Strategy, Design, and Methods.
☐ CDFW Aquatic Invasive Species Decontamination protocol.

Suggested Standards for Proposal Development, Current Acceptable Protocol List:
DFG's *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual* 4th edition (Available via Internet at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/Resources/HabitatManual.asp).

A. Habitat typing
B. Channel typing
C. Riparian / LWD survey
D. Spawner survey form (Page IV-11)
E. Electrofishing form (Page IV-16)
F. Part VII Implementation Methods
G. Part VIII Evaluation and Monitoring Methods
H. Part IX Fish Passage
I. Part X Upslope Assessment and Restoration Practices
J. Part XI Riparian Habitat Restoration
K. Part XII Fish Passage Design and Implementation

If protocols other than those in the list above are to be used, list and reference the protocols and explain why they were selected. Indicate if CDFW/NOAA engineers have been consulted.

9) Expected Quantitative Results (project summary): Expected results must be consistent with the performance standards as described in the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund - Definitions. These can be found at https://www.webapps.nwfsc.noaa.gov/apex/f?p=309:13: If project occurs at more than one site, summarize the results for the project as a whole. You must report the measurements in the units listed in the tables in Section 5.9 of the Application Form in Appendix B. Only include the tables for your project type. (If using online application system, following the directions in Appendix A.)

Section 6: Qualifications and experience of applicant and professionals.

1. **Applicant's qualifications and experience:** Describe how the applicant or the organization is qualified to perform the proposed work.

2. **Previous projects funded by FRGP:** Provide a list of projects by FRGP grant number for which the applicant has been the grantee (i.e. received grant funds directly), and indicate status of project (i.e. completed, not completed, on-going, not started, cancelled). Only include projects for the last five years. Also indicate how these past projects relate to this proposal.

3. **Professionals qualifications and experience:** List qualifications and experience of principal licensed professional(s). Please specify which professional(s) will be providing direct oversight on

the project. If this information cannot be provided with the application, the selection criteria for choosing the subcontractors must be provided. Also list qualifications expected of subcontractors and other employees hired to do work on the project.

4. **Examples of similar work:** Provide at least three examples of similar work the licensed professional(s) has completed in the last five years. Indicate if work was funded by FRGP.

Section 7: Landowners Access, Permits

1. Landowners granting access for project: (Attach Provisional Landowner Access Agreement[s]) *List all landowners involved or affected by this project.* ***Indicate here if applicant is the landowner.*** *List and reference attached access agreements. See sample access agreement form on the FRGP PSN website. For projects that require obtaining multiple landowner access agreements such as status and trend monitoring, at least one major landowner access agreement and a description of how access will be secured for the entire project is required.*	
2. Permits:	*List all government permits known to be needed to complete project. Indicate which permits the applicant will secure if project is funded.*
3. Lead CEQA Agency:	*Lead CEQA agency for project. If the applicant will complete their own CEQA, list applicant here. If applicant will go through another agency for CEQA, list that agency here. If applicant requests inclusion under the FRGP CEQA process, list CDFW here.*
4. Gallons of Fuel Used to Complete the Project	_____ gallons of gasoline _____ gallons of diesel *Indicate the total number of gallons of gasoline and/or diesel that will be used by the applicant and/or subcontractors in carrying out the project. This information is required for CEQA. If the applicant will be completing CEQA independently of CDFW, or if no gasoline or diesel will be used, please enter zeroes in the fields.*
5. Listed species:	*Indicate if any State or Federal listed species consultation or surveys are required and who will conduct the consultation. This is not limited to fish.*

Section 8: Project Budget

1. Detailed Project Budget

All applicants must submit a detailed budget. If submitting a paper application, you must use the budget form in Appendix B, Section 8. If any other budget template is submitted other than the one in Appendix C, Section 8, the proposal will be penalized on the score sheet.

Project proposals must include a detailed line item budget broken down into four categories:

A. Personnel Services
B. Operating Expenses
C. Indirect Costs
D. Grand Totals

Line item expenditures in each category should include cost detail (i.e. unit costs, number of units, etc.,) whenever possible. **The amount requested from each source must be divisible by the listed hours or unit cost.** Large, undefined lump sums in the budget limit the ability of reviewers to evaluate the proposed project and will result in point deductions on the score sheet. If subcontractor costs are extremely detailed and will result in an excessively long budget, a lump sum may be entered **only if accompanied by a detailed breakdown included in supplemental information.**

The budget must identify:

- the amount being requested from CDFW,
- the amount of the applicant's cost share, including cash or in-kind services,
- the amount of each partner's cost share, including cash or in-kind services, and
- the total cost of each line item.

The project budget should be sufficiently detailed, align with the proposed task, and allow for a cost analysis of proposed project. The total project budget must contain all project costs for all tasks. **All costs listed in the budget must be justified and described in the project description including in-kind costs.** Projects approved for funding will be required to submit invoices matching this budget format.

During the proposal review, CDFW will perform a cost analysis using the detailed project description and budget. CDFW recognizes that project proposals for the same project type may vary in cost due to the size of the stream, accessibility, statewide variation in costs for heavy equipment and labor, or a variety of other factors. Project cost analysis will be based on costs for comparable existing projects and professional cost analysis by CDFW staff. The cost analysis is based on the total project cost, which includes the amount requested from FRGP plus all cost share from other funding sources. An important aspect of project cost effectiveness is the employment of individuals at a pay scale commensurate with the tasks to be performed.

When compiling the budget, include costs for required species/permit consultations, permit costs/fees, necessary pre-surveys (e.g. biological or geomorphic surveys), costs for biological monitoring during project implementation, and costs to ensure that aquatic invasive species are not spread between sites, streams, or watersheds.

A) Personnel Services

Include all employee titles/classifications and costs required to complete the proposed project. All personnel who will be implementing the project and completing the project tasks must be discussed in the Project Description in order to be included in the Personnel Services section of the budget. If the personnel that are required to complete the project are not included in the budget and Project Description, their work hours cannot be billed on invoices if project is funded.

- List each personnel classification, the number of individuals in that classification, their total hours, hourly pay rate, and the total. Personnel hours must be broken down into three columns. One column for the number of hours under "Amount Requested", a second column for the number of hours under "Applicant Cost Share", and a third column for the number of

hours under “Partner Cost Share”. **The total must equal the line item calculation, including both the cost-share and requested amounts. (Do not include staff benefits in the hourly pay rate.)**

- A “Staff Benefit(s)” amount must be listed and calculated. Staff benefits include but are not limited to vacation, sick leave, medical insurance, and retirement; these items cannot have separate line items in the budget.

- Do not list subcontractors in the “Personnel Services” section. Subcontractors are listed under “Operating Expenses: Subcontractors” in the budget.

- Do not list workers’ compensation insurance in this section. Workers’ compensation insurance should be included in the Administrative Overhead.

For projects that include students, FRGP will only pay the salary of the student while working on the project. FRGP will not pay tuition.

Prevailing Wage
Projects awarded grants by the CDFW, depending on the type of project undertaken, may be required to pay prevailing wages. 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.

California Fish and Game Code, Section 1501.5 exempts grants with public agencies, nonprofit organizations, or Native American Indian Tribes that exceed $50,000 in cost, excluding the cost of gravel, from the prevailing wage requirements. Assembly Bill 2690 amended Labor Code, Section 1720.4 to exclude most work performed by volunteers from the prevailing wage requirements. Grants with CDFW for public works undertaken by public agencies, nonprofit organizations, or Native American Indian Tribes for less than $50,000 in cost, excluding the cost of gravel, are subject to prevailing wage laws (Labor Code section 1720 et seq.).

Questions regarding the Labor Code should be directed to the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations, the State Department having jurisdiction in these matters. You may also refer to the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) website at http://www.dir.ca.gov.

B) Operating Expense

Include all sub-contractor services, materials, equipment, and incidental costs to complete the project. All items must be described in the project description in order to be included in the budget.

Operating Expenses: Sub-contractor
Sub-contractor services are those necessary for the implementation of the project for which the applicant will subcontract. These services are undertaken by a provider external to the applicant’s organization.

- List each sub-contractor on a separate line.
- If sub-contractor costs are listed as lump sums, provide a separate detailed budget for sub-contractor costs that specifically detail out the lump sums. Include this as supplemental documentation.

Operating Expenses: Other

Other operating expenses are those necessary to the implementation of the project other than subcontractor costs and equipment. This may include: travel expenses by applicant (not sub-contractor) and permitting fees. Provide as much cost detail as possible. Every item must have a unit cost (per lb., per day, cubic yard, linear foot, each, etc.).

Travel: Expenses must be consistent with state guidelines for reimbursed travel expenses based on travel over a 24 hour period. Per Diem and mileage rates may not exceed State of California standards: lodging $90.00 plus tax per night (certain counties have a higher standard, see table below), per diem $46.00 per day, and 57 cents per mile. State guidelines can be found at http://www.calhr.ca.gov/employees/Pages/travel-reimbursements.aspx.

Lodging Reimbursement	
All Counties/Cities located in California (except as noted below)	Actual expense up to $90 per night, plus tax
Napa, Riverside, and Sacramento Counties	Actual expense up to $95 per night, plus tax
Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura Counties and Edwards AFB, excluding the city of Santa Monica	Actual expense up to $120 per night, plus tax
Alameda, Monterey, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara Counties	Actual expense up to $125 per night, plus tax
San Francisco County and the City of Santa Monica	Actual expense up to $150 per night, plus tax

1602 Permitting Fees: Fish and Game Code, Section 1609 authorizes the Department to recover the total costs it incurs to administer and enforce its Lake and Streambed Alteration Program by charging applicant fees for Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements. The actual fees charged will depend on the total cost of the project. The definitions, instructions, and forms are available on the Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements website at https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA.

Standard Agreement	
If project costs is:	**Permit fee will be:**
less than $5,000	$224.00
$5,000 to less than $10,000	$280.25
$10,000 to less than $25,000	$560.25
$25,000 to less than $100,000	$840.25
$100,000 to less than $200,000	$1,233.25
$200,000 to less than $350,000	$1,673.00
$350,000 to less than $500,000	$2,521.50
$500,000 or more	$4,482.75

Operating Expenses: Electronic and Purchased Equipment

CDFW policy does not normally allow for purchases of equipment. However, under certain circumstances and with adequate justification, the CDFW may approve the purchase of equipment. All equipment approved under this PSN shall remain the property of the State of California and shall be returned to the State. For grant agreement purposes, equipment is defined as all moveable articles of non-expendable property, which has:

A. A normal useful life including extended life due to repairs of one (1) year or more.
B. An identity which does not change with use (i.e., it is not consumed by use or converted by fabrication into some other form of property).
C. A unit cost of $5,000.00 or more; and
D. Used to conduct business in accordance with the grant agreement.

Any electronic equipment (such as computers, cameras, GPS units, stream gauges etc.) regardless of cost and purchased with grant funds are the property of the State and must be returned to the State.

C. Indirect Charges

Indirect charges (previously called administrative overhead) should be applied only to projected administrative costs that cannot be recovered in other budget categories. Indirect charges are **limited** to 20% of amount requested from the FRGP. Costs for subcontractors and purchase of equipment cannot be included in the calculation of indirect charges. Any amount over 20% will not be funded but can be used as cost share. Indirect charges include but are not limited to: utilities, offices space rental, phone, and copying which are directly related to completion of the proposed project. Workers compensation insurance is considered part of doing business and should be included in the indirect charges total; it cannot be listed in a separate line item. Provide a list of what is included in indirect charges in Section 8, number 3. Items included in indirect charges cannot be included as separate line items in the budget.

2. Budget Justification

This section can be used to explain lump sums costs, unusual line items, or charges under subcontractor. This section cannot take the place of explaining line items in the project description or supplemental budgets. This justification section should also be used to explain the need for high cost, high number of hours for a task, high number of personnel, anything that may be or seem out of the ordinary for the work proposed. Maximum 3,000 character limit.

3. Indirect Charges justification/explanation

Provide a detailed list of what is included in the indirect charges. Maximum 500 character limit, if character limit will exceed this include the remaining information as a supplemental document.

4. Summary of Project Costs

Proposals providing cost share in the form of cash or in-kind services for the execution of the project must specify the source and dollar amount of all proposed cost share. Applicant must also indicate if

any of the cost share is being used as match for other grants or entities. Failure to provide this information may be considered non-responsive and/or result in the withdrawal of funding approval. ***If a proposal is funded by FRGP, the FRGP funding cannot be used as match for any other program or entity.*** When completing the table on the application, use a separate line for each source of funds. Be sure to enter the funds under the correct entity type.

Cost share can be either money or resources other than money (in-kind contributions), provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners (e.g. private companies, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, and/or other entities) involved in the implementation of the proposed project. In-kind contributions must be applied directly to the project in order to be considered cost share. When including existing equipment or vehicles in cost share, they must be prorated based on the life of the equipment/vehicles. To be eligible, cost share must be used during the term of the grant. Cost share definitions are as follows:

Cost share not suitable: Projects, personnel, or supplies and equipment previously funded by CDFW; resources expended prior to the term of the grant; salaries of permanently funded employees working for the CDFW or NOAA Fisheries; mitigation funds and funds used in enforcement actions; cost share funds that will not be confirmed by February 1, 2016.

Hard cost share: All hard cost share must be **Non-Federal** sourced money or in-kind contributions that do not come from a Federal source. Hard cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project and must be confirmed prior to August 15, 2015.

Soft cost share: All soft cost share is **Federal** sourced money or in-kind contributions that come from a Federal source. Soft cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project. The following in-kind contributions can only be counted as soft cost share regardless of funding source: indirect charges (as described in Part IV page 30); **and** cost share funds (cash or in-kind) that will be confirmed after August 15, 2015 up until February 1, 2016.

If a proposal is funded, verification of the proposed cost share is required to complete the grant agreement and all cost share must be secured before the grant agreement can be executed. Project proponents failing to comply with these requirements will be considered non-responsive and ineligible for funding. A certification form, provided by CDFW, will be required for all non-federal cost share. If the project is funded, all cost share must be included in the Final Budget. Supporting documentation may be required for cost share expenses.

5. In-kind Detail Table

Describe in detail all in-kind cost share on the "In-kind Detail" table. Specify the following information, as applicable: total number of volunteer hours; dollar value of volunteer work; dollar value of non-volunteer labor; description of how the labor value was determined; and description and dollar value of non-labor in-kind contributions to the project.

6. Estimated Project Cost by Task Table

Project proposals must provide an estimated cost breakdown for each objective included in the project. Use only the categories provided in the table on the application in Appendix A, do not add your own.

Section 9: Supplemental Information:

For required information for each Project Type, see Appendix A. In the order listed on the application in Appendix C, attach the required items to the application, as appropriate to the proposal project type. The actual checklist does not need to be included with the Proposal Application. It is provided as an aid to the applicant. Use this checklist to help ensure you have included all required supplemental information.

Appendix C: Paper Application Form

SHRRC 2015 Proposal Application Form

Section 1: Summary Information

1. Focus	SHRRC ☐
2. Project type:	
3. Project title:	
4. Applicant/Organization name:	
5. Applicant/Organization mailing address: Check if changed from previous applications ☐	
6. Applicant/Organization - city, state, zip:	
7. Applicant/Organization phone #	
8. Applicant/Organization - Fax #:	
9. Person authorized (PA) to sign grant agreement (Name and Title)**:**	
10. PA - Email address:	
11. Contact person (CP) (Name and Title)**:**	
12. CP - Email address:	
13. Organization type:	Public Agency ☐ Nonprofit Organization ☐ Indian Tribe ☐
14. Certified nonprofit organization:	Yes ☐ No ☐ Nonprofit Organization Number: _____
15. Past grantee:	Yes ☐ No ☐
16. Mitigation:	Yes ☐ No ☐
17. Licensed Professional	Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes provide: Name _____, License number _____, Affiliation _____, Contact information (phone/e-mail) _____.
18. Amount requested:	
19. Total project cost:	
20. Salmonid species benefited:	**Coho** ☐ **Steelhead** ☐ (Cutthroat ☐ Chinook ☐)
21. Project objectives:	
22. Recovery/Restoration Plan:	
23. Task number or reference: (only list one task)	Angler Benefit
24. Time frame:	
25. Stream:	

26. Tributary to:	
27. Focus Watershed System:	
28. County(ies):	
29. Coastal Zone:	Yes ☐ No ☐

Section 2: Location Information

1. Latitude, Longitude (in decimal degrees, geographic, NAD83):	
2. USGS Quad Name and surrounding quads. Township, Range and Section	
3. Location description:	
4. Directions from nearest town or landmark:	

Section 3: Watershed Information:

All questions in this Section refer to the watershed named in Number 1 below.

1. Watershed name:	
2. Watershed area:	square miles = _____
3. Watershed area directly affected by the proposed project:	percent = _____
4. Land use statement:	
5. Watershed ownership:	% Private:_____% State:_____% Federal_____ % Other _____
6. Length of anadromous streams in watershed:	miles = _____
7. Watershed Plan(s):	

8. Background information:

Section 4: Project Objectives

1. **Describe how project accomplishes listed task:** (for task listed in box 25 Section 1)**:**

2. **Need for the project:**

3. **Limiting factors to salmonids remediated by proposed project:**

☐	Water quantity	(lack of flow, diversions, runoff)
☐	Water quality	(temperature, chemistry, turbidity)
☐	Riparian dysfunction	(lack of shade, excessive nutrients, roughness, elements)
☐	Excessive sediment yield	(pool and gravel quality)
☐	Spawning requirements	(gravel, resting areas-pools)
☐	Rearing requirements	(velocity, lack of shelter, pools)
☐	Estuary / lagoon issues	(closure during migration periods)
☐	Fish passage	(emigration and immigration)

4. **Limiting factor remediation:**

Section 5: Project Description

1. ***Introduction:***

2. ***Objectives:***

3. ***Project Set Up:***

4. ***Materials:***

5. ***List of Tasks:***

6. ***Deliverables:***

7. ***Timeline:***

8. ***CDFW protocols to be used in project development and implementation (check applicable box):***
   - ☐ DFG *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*
     Manual part number:
   - ☐ DFG Fish Bulletin 180: California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring: Strategy, Design, and Methods.
   - ☐ CDFW Aquatic Invasive Species Decontamination protocol.
   - ☐ Other protocols (list & reference):

9. ***Expected quantitative results (project summary):*** Only include the tables for your project type.

Americorps (AC)

a. Number of outreach/educational events	____#
b. Number of students educated	____#
c. Number of schools/institutions reached	____#
d. Number of educational documents completed/distributed	____#
e. Number of interpretive exhibits/posters prepared	____#
f. Number of interpretive signs prepared	____#
g. Number of different locations where interpretive exhibits/signs/posters displayed	____#
h. Number of media materials prepared	____#
i. Number of workshop/training events	____#
j. Number of participants in workshop/training events	____#
k. Number of landowners reached by projects	____#
l. Miles of stream assessed	____miles
m. Miles of road assessed	____miles
n. Acres of habitat assessed	____acres
o. Number of restoration projects reviewed/evaluated	____#

Enforcement and Protection (EF)

a. Name of plan developed/implemented	
b. Description of plan developed/implemented	____#
c. Acres of land affected	____acres
d. Number of volunteers committed to restoration/enforcement actions	____#
e. Number of restoration or protection projects proposed	____#
f. Acres of habitat restored or protected	____acres
g. Number and list of watersheds restored or protected	____#
h. Number of students educated	____#
i. Number of workshops/training event	____#
j. Number of outreach/education documents completed and distributed	____#
k. Number of schools and other institutions reached	____#
l. Name of education/outreach document	

Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP)

a. Miles of stream treated (include only the actual length of stream *treated* by the project, not the length of stream *affected* by the project)	____miles
b. Number of stream crossings/culverts improved for fish passage (total)	____#
c. Type(s) of crossings treated	☐ culvert ☐ bridge ☐ ford
d. Miles of stream made more accessible by treating stream crossings (accessible to next barrier or to upstream end of anadromy)	____miles
e. Number of culverts replaced/improved	____#
f. Number of bridges installed/improved	____#
g. Number of rocked fords placed	____#
h. Number of road crossings removed	____#

Instream Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)

a. Miles of stream treated (include only the actual length of stream *treated* by the project, not the length of stream *affected* by the project)	____miles
b. Number of barriers other than culverts improved for fish passage	____#
c. Type(s) of barriers treated	☐ diversion dam ☐ push-up dam ☐ wood or concrete dam ☐ weir ☐ logs ☐ debris
d. Miles of stream made more accessible by removing barriers other than culverts (accessible to next barrier or to upstream end of anadromy)	____miles
e. Number of fishway chutes/pools installed	____#

Instream Habitat Restoration (HI)

a. Miles of instream habitat treated overall (count stream reach only once, even if it has multiple treatments)	____miles
b. Type of channel reconfiguration and connectivity	☐ creation/connection to off-channel habitat ☐ creation of instream pools ☐ channel bed restored ☐ meanders added

c. **Miles** of stream treated for channel reconfiguration and connectivity	____miles
d. **Miles** of off-channel stream created	____miles
e. **Number** of instream pools created for channel reconfiguration	____#
f. **Type** of materials used for channel structure placement	☐ individual logs (unanchored) ☐ individual logs (anchored) ☐ logs fastened together (logjam) ☐ rocks/boulders (unanchored) ☐ rocks/boulders (fastened or anchored) ☐ stumps with roots attached (rootwads) ☐ weirs ☐ deflectors/barbs ☐ other engineered structures
g. **Miles** of stream treated with channel structure placement	____miles
h. **Number** of instream pools created by structure placement	____#
i. **Number** of structures placed in channel	____#
j. **Miles** of stream treated with spawning gravel placement	____miles
k. **Cubic yards** of spawning gravel placed	____cubic yards
l. **Miles** of stream treated for removal of aquatic non-native invasive plants	____miles
m. **Species scientific name(s)** of plants removed	

Riparian Restoration (HR)

a. **Miles** of stream treated overall (count stream reach only once, even if it has multiple treatments)	____miles
b. **Miles** of riparian stream bank treated (measure both sides of bank, if appropriate)	____miles
c. **Acres** of riparian area treated (total)	____acres
d. **Acres** of riparian area planted	____acres
e. **Number** of plants	____#
f. **Species scientific name(s)** of plants planted	
g. **Miles** of fence installed/repaired	____miles
h. **Acres** of riparian area protected by fencing	____acres
i. **Number** of livestock water gap installations	____#
j. **Acres** of riparian area treated for removal of non-native invasive plants	____acres
k. **Species scientific name(s)** of plants removed	

Bank Stabilization (HS)

a. **Miles** of stream treated overall (count stream reach only once, even if it has multiple treatments)	____miles
b. **Type** of materials used for streambank stabilization	☐ logs ☐ rocks/boulders ☐ rock barbs ☐ log barbs ☐ revetments ☐ vegetation
c. **Miles** of streambank treated (measure both sides of bank, if appropriate)	____miles

Watershed Restoration – Upslope (HU)

a. **Miles** of road treated (total)	____miles
b. **Acres** of upslope area treated (total)	____acres
c. **Miles** of road treated for road drainage system improvements	____miles
d. **Miles** of road decommissioned/abandoned	____miles
e. **Type(s)** of upland erosion and sediment control	☐ erosion control structures ☐ planting ☐ slope stabilization

f. Species scientific name(s) of plants planted	
g. Number of erosion/sediment control installations	____#
h. Type(s) of upland livestock management	☐ livestock watering schedules ☐ livestock water development
i. Number of livestock water installations	____#
j. Acres of upslope area treated for vegetation removal/control	____acres
k. Species scientific name(s) of plants removed	
l. Cubic yards of sediment prevented from entering the stream	____cubic yards
m. Number of stream crossings treated	____#

Monitoring Projects (MD)

a. Miles of stream monitored	____miles
b. Acres of habitat monitored	____acres
c. Type of monitoring conducted	☐ adult salmonid population monitoring ☐ salmonid smolt or fry production monitoring ☐ biological monitoring (other than salmon) ☐ redd counts ☐ carcass counts ☐ water quality monitoring ☐ water quantity (flow) monitoring ☐ habitat condition monitoring ☐ modeling and data analysis ☐ tissue sampling and analysis ☐ genetic analysis
d. What research or management question is the field work designed to answer?	
e. Describe the comprehensive monitoring strategy/program of which the project is a part, if applicable	
f. Describe the component of the comprehensive monitoring strategy that the project addresses	
g. Number of organizations cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy	____#
h. Name(s) of organizations cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy	
i. Number of reports prepared on key management or restoration data, information and needs	____#

Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO)

a. Miles of stream monitored	____miles
b. Acres of habitat monitored	____acres
c. Type of monitoring conducted	☐ post-project implementation or design compliance monitoring ☐ restoration effectiveness monitoring ☐ restoration validation monitoring
d. What research or management question is the field work designed to answer?	
e. Describe the comprehensive monitoring strategy/program of which the project is a part, if applicable	
f. Describe the component of the comprehensive monitoring strategy that the project addresses	
g. Number of organizations cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy	____#
h. Name(s) of organizations cooperating with the project as part of a comprehensive monitoring strategy	____
i. Number of reports prepared on key management or restoration data, information and needs	____#

Watershed Organization Support and Assistance (OR and PI)

a. Number of public meetings	____#
b. Number of public meeting attendees	____#
c. Number of landowners reached by project	____#

Project Design (PD)

a. Number of restoration projects that will be proposed as a result of this project	____#
b. Acres of habitat proposed for protection/restoration as a result of this project	____acres

Watershed Evaluation, Assessment and Planning (PL)

a. Acres of land area affected by the planning/assessment activity	____acres
b. Type(s) of planning activities conducted	☐ coordination/implementation of a recovery plan ☐ coordination/implementation of watershed conservation and restoration ☐ watershed council support ☐ support to local entities or agencies involved in salmonid restoration planning and coordination ☐ habitat restoration scoping and feasibility studies ☐ evaluation/prioritization of restoration plans and projects ☐ designing and maintaining restoration data systems ☐ engineering/design work for restoration projects ☐ developing restoration action plans
c. Name of the plan developed or updated by the project	
d. Describe extent, purpose and application of the plan	
e. Type(s) of stream survey/assessment activities conducted	☐ salmonid presence/absence survey ☐ instream habitat condition assessment ☐ habitat use by salmonids ☐ fish passage barrier inventory
f. Type(s) of watershed habitat survey/assessment activities conducted	☐ riparian condition ☐ road condition/inventory ☐ wetlands ☐ estuarine habitat conditions ☐ LiDAR or other remote mapping ☐ landscape mapping ☐ invasive species ☐ floodplain mapping ☐ overall watershed condition assessment or mapping ☐ stream typing
g. Name of the assessment document developed by the project	
h. Acres of habitat assessed to determine habitat conditions affecting salmonids	____acres
i. Miles of stream assessed	____miles
j. Miles of road assessed	____miles

Cooperative Fish Rearing (RE)

a. Purpose of rearing	☐ supplementing ESA listed salmonid spawning ☐ reintroducing a salmonid population
b. Number of fry/smolt released (by species)	____#

c. Name(s) of the habitat restoration project(s) complemented by this project	

Fish Screening of Diversions (SC)

a. Miles of stream treated	____miles
b. Number of new fish screens installed	____#
c. Flow rate in cfs of diversions with new screens installed	____cfs
d. Number of fish screens modified or replaced	____#
e. Flow rate in cfs of diversions with screens modified/replaced	____cfs
f. Acre-feet per year of water protected by screens	____acre-feet

Private Sector Technical Training and Education (TE)

a. Number of workshop/training events	____#
b. Number of participants in workshop/training events	____#
c. Number of landowners reached by project	____#
d. Number of educational documents completed/distributed	____#

Water Conservation Measures (WC)

a. Miles of stream protected for adequate flow	____miles
b. Flow rate in cfs of water conserved	____cfs
c. Start date of return flow to the stream	__/__/____
d. End date of return flow to the stream	__/__/____
e. Number of days that flow was returned to the stream	____#
f. Acre-feet of water conserved	____acre-feet

Water Measuring Devices (WD)

a. Number of water flow gauges installed	____#

Additional components of above project types. Provide these quantitative results if they apply.

Public School Watershed and Fishery Conservation Education components

a. Number of educational events	____#
b. Number of students educated	____#
c. Number of schools/institutions reached	____#
d. Number of educational documents completed/distributed	____#
e. Number of interpretive signs/posters prepared	____#
f. Number of different locations where interpretive signs/posters displayed	____#

Section 6: Qualifications and experience of applicant and professionals:

1. ***Applicant's qualifications and experience:***

2. ***Previous projects funded by FRGP:***

3. ***Professionals qualifications and experience:***

4. ***Examples of similar work:***

Section 7: Landowners Access, Permits

1. Landowners Granting Access for Project: (Attach provisional access agreement[s] and indicate here if applicant is the landowner).	
2. Permits:	
3. Lead CEQA agency:	
4. Gallons of fuel used to complete the project:	_____ gallons of gasoline _____ gallons of diesel
5. Listed species:	

Section 8: Project Budget

1. *Detailed Project Budget* *(Excel spreadsheets can be used)*

DETAILED PROJECT BUDGET								
PROJECT NAME:								
	Hours or Units of Amount Requested	**Hours or Units of Applicant Cost Share**	**Hours or units of Partner Cost Share**	**Hourly Rate or Unit Price**	**Amount Requested**	**Applicant Amt. of Cost Share**	**Partner Amt. of Cost Share**	**Total Project Cost**
A. PERSONNEL SERVICES (ensure that all personnel are described in the project set up)								
Level of Staff								
Subtotal								
Staff Benefits @ ____								
TOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICES								
B. OPERATING EXPENSES: SUBCONTRACTORS								
Description (indicate type of units)	**# of Units Amount Requested**	**# of Units Applicant Cost Share**	**# of units of Partner Cost Share**	**Unit Price**	**Amount Requested**	**Applicant Amt. of Cost Share**	**Partner Amt. of Cost Share**	**Total Project Cost**
Subcontractors (indicate type of units) (ensure all subcontractor tasks are described in the project description)								
Subtotal of Subcontractors								
OPERATING EXPENSES: OTHER (i.e. Materials and Supplies, indicate type of units)								

DETAILED PROJECT BUDGET								
PROJECT NAME:								
	Hours or Units of Amount Requested	**Hours or Units of Applicant Cost Share**	**Hours or units of Partner Cost Share**	**Hourly Rate or Unit Price**	**Amount Requested**	**Applicant Amt. of Cost Share**	**Partner Amt. of Cost Share**	**Total Project Cost**
OPERATING EXPENSES: Electronic and Purchased Equipment (See PSN for definition)								
Subtotals of Other								
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES								
C. SUBTOTALS & INDIRECT CHARGES								
Subtotal A + B (Personnel + Operating)								
Requested Indirect Amount (max. 20%) @								
Applicant Indirect Amount @								
Partner Indirect Amount @								
D. GRAND TOTAL								

2. ***Budget justification:***

3. ***Indirect Charges justification/explanation:***

4. ***Summary project costs:***

Sources of Funds	Cash	In-kind (if applicable)	Status S,P,U (secured, pending, unknown)	Anticipated award date	Total
Fisheries Restoration Grant Program					
Other State Agencies Name(s) and amount(s) of each:					
Federal Name(s) and amount(s) of each:					
Applicant (indicate if Federal):					
Other Sources Name(s) and amount(s) of each:					
Total					

For the above table indicate if any of the cost share is being used as match for other (non-FRGP) funding for the project?

5. ***In-kind Detail:***

In-kind Detail: Labor				
Type of In-kind Contribution	**Source of In-kind Contribution**	**Total Hours**	**Value of Labor ($)**	**Describe how the labor value was determined**
Volunteer labor				
Non-volunteer labor (employees whose labor is not paid for by FRGP funding)				

In-kind Detail: Materials and Equipment		
Description of In-kind Contribution (materials, equipment, etc.) ***[Add rows as needed]***	**Source of In-kind Contribution**	**Value of contribution ($)**

6. *Estimated Project Cost by Task:*

Estimated Project Cost by Task - Project Name_____			
Type of Work	**Amount Requested**	**Cost Share**	**Total**
Fish Screens			
Fish Passage			
Instream Flow			
Instream Habitat			
Riparian Habitat			
Upland Habitat			
Wetland Habitat			
Estuarine Habitat			
Planning / Assessment / Design			
Outreach / Education / Training			
Monitoring			
Salmon Enhancement / Rearing			
Total			

Section 9: Supplemental or Specialized Information

In the order listed below, please attach the following required items to the application, as appropriate to the proposal project type:

☐ 1. Intermediate Plans.
(Project Types: FP, SC)

☐ 2. Conceptual Plans.
(Project Types: HS, HU, WC)

☐ 3. Intermediate **or** Conceptual Plans.
(Project Types: HB, HI, WD)

☐ 4. Project Location Topographic Map.
(Project Types: EF, FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MD, MO, PD, PL, RE, SC, WC, WD)

☐ 5. Watershed (or County) Map.
(Project Types: AC, EF, HU, MD, MO, OR, PD, PI, PL, RE, TE, WD)

☐ 6. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement/Provisional Resolution.
(Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MD, MO, PD, PL, RE, SC, WC, WD)

☐ 7. Water Right Verification
(Project Types: FP, HB, SC, WC, WD)

☐ 8. Photographs
(Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, PD, RE)

☐ 9. Status Report.
(Project Types: OR, PI)

☐ 10. Fence Maintenance Plan.
(Project Type: HR)

☐ 11. Riparian Restoration Plan.
(Project Type: HR)

☐ 12. Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan
(Project Type: MD, MO)

☐ 13. Existing Condition Sketch.
(Project Type: PD)

☐ 14. Five year Management Plan
(Project Type: RE)

☐ 15. Evaluation Plan
(Project Type: EF, TE)

☐ 16. Training Curriculum
(Project Type: EF)

☐ 17. Description of protection issues needing
(Project Type: EF)

☐ 18. Protocols to prevent the spread of invasive species
(Project Type: AC, FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MD, MO, RE, SC, WC, WD)

☐ 19. Water conservation and efficiency program/plan
(All Project Types)

Supplemental Information Checklist by Project Type
(Refer to the item numbers above)

Project Type	Item Number
AC	5, 18, 19
EF	4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 19
FP	1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19
HB	3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19
HI	3, 4, 6, 8, 18, 19
HR	4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 18, 19
HS	2, 4, 6, 8, 18, 19
HU	2, 4, 5, 6, 18, 19
MD	4, 5, 6, 12, 18, 19
MO	4, 5, 6, 12, 18, 19
OR	5, 9, 19
PD	4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 19

PI	5, 9, 19
PL	4, 5, 6, 19
RE	4, 5, 6, 8, 14, 18, 19
SC	1, 4, 6, 7, 18, 19
TE	5, 15, 19
WC	2, 4, 6, 7, 18, 19
WD	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 18, 19

Appendix D: Proposal Evaluation and Scoring

D.1 Administrative Review

Report Card program staff will conduct an administrative review on all hard copy proposals submitted to 830 S Street. The staff administrative review will determine if the proposal package is complete and meets all the requirements for submission in the 2015 PSN. If the proposal does not pass the administrative review, the proposal will not be considered further for funding this year.

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

D.2 Cost Analysis Evaluation

Evaluation of project cost analysis will include the following:

- Comparison of wages, equipment rates, material costs, and other project costs for similar completed and proposed project work within similar geographic regions.

- Review of labor costs identified by Department of Industrial Relations General Prevailing Wage Determinations (http://www.dir.ca.gov/dlse/dlseWagesAndHours.html), Davis-Bacon labor rates (http://www.access.gpo.gov/davisbacon/), and recent California Employment Development Department wage data (http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/).

- Review of regional equipment rental cost information (including the most current version of California Department of Transportation's (CalTrans), *Labor Surcharge and Equipment Rental Rates* publication (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/equipmnt.html).

- Restoration costs, labor requirements, and production rates identified in Appendix I of the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon,* DFG 2004 http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/documents/SAL_SH/SAL_Coho_Recovery/ReportToCommission_2004/22.I_CostAndSocioeconomicImpacts.pdf

Cost analysis evaluation will consider project logistics (e.g. site remoteness, accessibility, coordination required with multiple land holdings), review of production rates/labor requirements in the regional area, and benefit to the recovery of anadromous salmonids.

D.3 Cost Share Scoring Matrix

Proposal#: ___ Project Type: ____ Region: ___ Reviewer: Date: __/__/___

Proposal Name: _____

% Soft Cost Share = (Soft Cost Share / Total Project Cost) x 100
(_____ / _____) x 100 =

% Hard Cost Share = (Hard Cost Share / Total Project Cost) x 100
(_____ / _____) x 100 =

Cost Share

1. *Cost share not suitable:* projects, personnel, or supplies and equipment previously funded by CDFW; resources expended prior to the term of the grant; salaries of permanently funded employees working for the CDFW or NOAA Fisheries; mitigation funds; cost share funds that will not be confirmed by February 1, 2016.

2. *Hard cost share:* All hard cost share must be Non-Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which do not come from a Federal source. Hard cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project confirmed prior to August 15, 2015.

3. *Soft cost share:* All soft cost share is Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which come from a Federal source. Soft cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project. The following in-kind contributions can only be counted as soft cost share regardless of funding source: administrative overhead or the components of administrative overhead (as described in Part IV page 30); **and** cost share funds that will be confirmed after August 15, 2015 up until February 1, 2016.

Cost share scoring matrix:

	% Hard										
% Soft	90-99 %	80-89 %	70-79 %	60-69 %	50-59 %	40-49 %	30-39 %	20-29 %	10-19 %	5 - 9 %	0 - 4 %
90-99 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
80-89 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70-79 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60-69 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-59 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25
40-49 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.25
30-39 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.50	-0.50
20-29 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.50	-0.75	-0.75
10-19 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.50	-0.75	-1.0	-1.0
0 - 9 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.50	-0.75	-0.75	-1.0	-1.0

D.4 CDFW and NMFS Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review

Proposal #:_____ Project Title:_____
CDFW or NMFS Review Engineer/Geologist:_____

Question:	YES	NO	N/A	Comments
1. Given the background information and/or data provided in the proposal, is the project described thoroughly enough, is the approach appropriate to the problem, and does the project approach/design match the stated goals?				
2. Does the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan Report describe the set of conditions, constraints, and requirements necessary for project design and are the plans >65 percent plan development for the following project categories: FP, HB, HS, WD (and some HI and HU)?				
3. Are any refinements that need to be made to the design reasonable to make between the 65% and 100% design? Does the project proponent/designer seem willing to, capable of, and have funds for making the necessary changes?				
4. If the project is likely to require future consultation or evaluation of a conceptual/intermediate plan as it is being developed, is this consultation reflected in the project time line and budget or can it be accomplished within the project timeline/budget?				
5. Does the project team have the experience or compliment of expertise required for project success (e.g., demonstrated experience on similar projects; technical expertise appropriate to the project; communication, coordination and logistical capabilities)?				
6. If the project is likely to require the participation of a licensed engineer or geologist, is the licensed professional identified?				
7. If applicable, has the responsible party signed a letter agreeing to the operation and maintenance responsibilities identified in the PSN for the O&M 1600 for the project after the Report Card program grant ends? (applies to SC projects).				
8. From an engineering perspective, should the proposal be considered for funding? Note: If any of the above questions were answered "NO", then the proposal should not be considered for funding at this time. If there are other engineering/feasibility reasons why the proposal should not be funded, state them here.				

D.5 Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP) and Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)

Proposal#: _____Region: _____Reviewer: _____Date: ___/___/____
Proposal Name:
_____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
1. The proposal as written addresses a direct or indirect benefit to the angler.	0			DNF
2. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks. Yes = Appropriate level of qualifications, experience, successfully completed previously funded grants (no missing deliverables, no invoicing problems, no missed timelines); Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, one minor documented problem with completing a funded grant; Low = lacks significant qualifications, experience, more than one documented problem with completing a funded grant; No = unqualified, inexperienced, many documented problems with completing funded grants, uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
3. Proposal demonstrates the identified subcontractors have the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks; if subcontractor(s) not identified, the selection criteria are described to insure subcontractors will be appropriate to the work. Yes = appropriate level of qualifications, experience, and/or selection criteria described or no subcontractors needed; Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, one minor documented problem with past work on a funded project, named subcontractors not appropriate for work, and/or selection criteria needs some clarity; Low = lacks significant qualifications, experience, many documented problems with past work on a funded project, and/or selection criteria inadequate; No = unqualified, inexperienced, problematic subcontractors, uncooperative, and selection criteria missing.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
4. Project description includes required details as described in the PSN (Part IV and Part VI,) necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = description includes required information for project type and is clear and comprehensive/complete; Med = description is missing a few elements of the required information and needs some clarity before statement of work can be written; No = description is missing several elements, is general, and/or a list of activities with no detail, lacking the detail necessary to write a statement of work.	0	-1		DNF

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
5. Project budget is appropriate for the work proposed. Yes = budget is appropriate; Med = budget has 1 line item inappropriate for the work proposed; Low = more than 1 budget line item is inappropriate for the work proposed; No = inappropriate for the work proposed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF
6. Project budget is cost effective. Yes = budget is cost effective; Med = 1 or 2 budget items are not cost effective but overall the budget is acceptable; Low = more than 2 budget items are not cost effective but overall the budget is acceptable; No = overall budget is not cost effective.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF
7. Project budget is accurate. Yes = budget has no errors; Med = budget has a few minor errors that don't impact writing a grant budget; Low = budget contains inaccuracies making it difficult to write a grant budget; No = many inaccuracies and errors, so that a budget cannot be written.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF
8. Project budget is sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget has no unspecified lump sums; Med = budget has 1 unspecified lump sum; Low = budget is lacking detail with more than 1 unspecified lump sum, making it difficult to write a budget; No = budget lacks detail necessary to write a grant budget.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
9. Supplemental information is present and sufficiently detailed, as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is present and sufficiently detailed; Med = 1 piece is missing or insufficiently detailed; Low = 2 pieces of supplemental information are missing or insufficiently detailed; No = more than 2 pieces of supplemental information are missing or insufficiently detailed.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
10. Information supplied allows for a field review to be conducted. Yes = provisional access agreement included and landowner(s) cooperative; No = provisional access agreement missing and/or landowner(s) uncooperative.	0			DNF
11. Based on the DFW/NOAA Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
12. Extent of existing barrier to migrating adult or juvenile anadromous salmonids. Yes = complete barrier to either; Med = partial barrier to either; No = not a barrier to both adults and juveniles or no assessment completed.	0	-0.5		DNF
13. The proposed project meets CDFW and NOAA Fisheries fish passage criteria (see Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX Appendix A and B, and Part XII). Yes = project will provide unimpeded passage for adults and juveniles; Med = improves adult and juvenile passage but does not meet criteria under some high or low flows; Low = project only addresses adult passage where juvenile passage is needed; No = project will not meet fish passage criteria.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
14. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next barrier. Yes = > 1 mile; Med = 1 to 0.5 mile; Low = 0.5 to 0.25 mile; No = < 0.25 (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
15. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next barrier. Yes = Excellent/Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2
16. Documented absence of other downstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers. Yes = no barriers downstream; Med = barrier downstream with a plan to identify and treat; Low = partial barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat; No = Complete barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
17. Documented absence of upstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers. Yes = no barriers upstream; Med = barrier upstream with a plan to identify and treat; No = barrier upstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.25		-0.5
18. Field review conducted (Y or N. Informational, therefore no score.) If no then explain.				
19. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

D.6 Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS)

Proposal#: _____Region: _____ Reviewer: Date: ___/___/____
Proposal Name: _____
Scientific and Technical Review
Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
1. The proposal as written addresses a direct or indirect benefit to the angler.	0			DNF
2. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
3. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
7. Instream limiting factors have been identified within the watershed: (Such as Spawning, Over-winter habitat, Summer Rearing, Escape Cover, Passage, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2
8. Extent to which proposed project corrects the problem being addressed. Yes = completely; Med = partially; No = does not.	0	-0.5		-5
9. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
10. The problems have been adequately identified and the techniques proposed are appropriate for the channel type (according to PSN Part III). Yes = all; or No = none.	0			-5
11. The project will utilize CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the manual or approved by CDFW/NOAA engineers. Yes = described in manual, Med = not in manual but approved by CDFW/NOAA engineers, No = not in manual or approved by engineers.	0	-0.5		-5
12. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

D.7 Riparian Restoration (HR)

Proposal#:_____ Region:_____ Reviewer: Date: ___/___/____
Proposal Name: _____
Scientific and Technical Review
Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
1. The proposal as written addresses a direct or indirect benefit to the angler.	0			DNF
2. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
3. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. Is riparian restoration plan adequate to implement project.	0			-5
7. Riparian limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Canopy, Riparian Stability, Escape Cover, Complexity, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2
8. Extent to which proposed project implements priority riparian recommendations from the plan to restore natural function of the riparian corridor for the entire identified reach/sub-watershed: Yes = > 75%; Med = 74-50%; Low 25-49% partial; No < 25%.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
9. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
10. The project will utilize CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the manual (Part VII and XI).	0	-0.25	-.5	-1
11. The plants will be monitored and replanted (if necessary) to achieve the specified standard for success: Yes = 3 years or more; Med = 2 years; Low = 1 year; No = not monitored.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Where necessary to achieve specified standard for success the plants will be maintained including irrigation, weeding, and herbivore protection: Yes = Not necessary to achieve specified standard for success or maintained for 3 years; Med = Maintained for 2 years; Low = Maintained for 1 year; No = Not maintained but maintenance necessary to achieve specified standard for success.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type and appropriate successional species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
14. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

D.8 Status and Trends (MD) and Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO)

Proposal#:_____Region: _____ Reviewer:_____Date: ___/___/____
Proposal Name: _____
Scientific and Technical Review
Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
1. The proposal as written addresses a direct or indirect benefit to the angler.	0			DNF
2. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
3. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-0.5	-2	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI, including QA/QC plan. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Med = one element is insufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0	-1	-2	DNF
6. Yes = The project monitoring goals are clearly defined and objectives are quantifiable with proposed study design, Med = one element does not meet this standard, Low = two elements do not meet this standard, Do Not Fund = more then two element do not meet this standard.	0	-1	-2	DNF

7. For MD: The project will employ study design, sampling scheme, protocols and analysis as described in Fish Bulletin 180. Yes = study designs as in Bulletin 180, Med = study designs not in Fish Bulletin 180 but from other scientifically valid plan and its use fully explained; Do Not Fund = study design not scientifically valid or appropriate.	0	-1		DNF
8. For MO[1]: The project will employ scientifically accepted study design, sampling scheme, protocols and analysis as described in published, monitoring plans for Pacific salmonids. Yes = As described in published monitoring plans for Pacific salmon and appropriate to the application; Med = protocols not published but determined to be scientifically appropriate; Do Not Fund = not valid or acceptable.	0	-1		DNF
9. [2] (a) For existing monitoring projects: Yes = Grantee has delivered all data, analyses and reports related to past and open monitoring grants to CDFW; Med = grantee is in process of submitting final data, analyses, or report from its previous completed closed grant with CDFW; Do Not Fund = the grantee has failed in the past to deliver data, analyses and reports required under previous grants; (b) For new monitoring projects: Not Applicable.	0	-1		DNF
10. For new monitoring proposals, the application includes an example of previous work that demonstrates ability to summarize, and analyze/interpret data appropriate to project proposed. Yes = applicant or partners demonstrate ability to summarize and analyze/interpret data; Med = applicant or partners demonstrate ability to summarize, but analysis/interpretation is not well demonstrated; No = applicant or partners do not demonstrate their ability.	0	-1		DNF
11. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

[1] Criterion 7: For validation monitoring [fish response], ratings refer to Duffy et al. 2006. For habitat response, there is no single, best document for following design, sampling, protocols, or analyses.

[2] Criterion 8: Past Grantees: For YES, application includes a copy of the latest full final report which includes data summary, analysis, and interpretation; for MED, application includes letter from CDFW Regional Office that final report is expected by a particular date.

D.9 Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL)

Proposal#:_____ Region:_____ Reviewer: Date: ___/___/____
Proposal Name: _____
Scientific and Technical Review
Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

		Circle one			
		Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
1.	The proposal as written addresses a direct or indirect benefit to the angler.	0			DNF
2.	Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
3.	Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
4.	Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
5.	Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6.	Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
7.	Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
8.	Project will utilize CDFW acceptable assessment protocols.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
9.	If there are significant social issues associated with successful restoration of the watershed, the proposal adequately addresses those issues, or references a prior document adequately addressing those issues.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
10. Extent to which proposed project encompasses or completes an entire watershed or sub-watershed; Yes = 80-100% of the watershed; Med = 70-80% of the watershed; Low = 60-70% of the watershed; No = <50% of the watershed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
11. Extent to which project will develop complete watershed plan: Yes = Complete watershed plan or NA; Med = Specific assessment based on CDFW-acceptable watershed plan; Low = CDFW-acceptable ranch implementation plan; No = Specific assessment not based on previous planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
12. Extent to which project will develop and maintain a database: Yes = Complete database that address Report Card program needs or NA; No = not provide a complete ready to use database, does not meet Report Card program needs, or appropriate QA/QC/maintenance.	0			-5
13. The proposed deliverables include plans, reports, databases, maps, and outreach efforts and will effectively convey limiting factors and prioritized solutions to landowners and other interested people.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
14. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner interest for plan implementation or a detailed description of how landowner support will be secured. Yes = Landowner support is documented by landowner access or a description is adequate to ensure landowner interest, Med = a few landowners have not been contacted, Low = landowner support is questionable, No = applicant has not demonstrated contact with landowners or has not described how landowner support will be achieved.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
15. The project proposal has been favorably reviewed by a CDFW or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer (for project which require engineer review) and plan determined to be appropriate.	0			-5
16. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

D.10 Project Design (PD)

Proposal#:_____ **Region:** _____ **Reviewer:** _____ **Date:** ___/___/____

Proposal Name:

_____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
1. The proposal as written addresses the identified Recovery Task and can accomplish the Task in part or in whole.	0			DNF
2. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
3. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
7. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat for anadromous salmonids? Yes = addresses a Key limiting factor, Low = addresses a contributing factor, No = does not address any factors.	0		-2	-5
8. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
9. Licensed professional(s) has the expertise as appropriate to the type of project being designed.	0			-5
10. The proposal identifies all necessary surveys required to complete the design. Yes = identifies all surveys, Low = does not identify 1 or 2 surveys, No = does not identify any surveys.	0		-2	-3
11. The project proposal has been favorably reviewed by a CDFW or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer and plan determined to be appropriate.	0			-5
12. Degree to which proposed project will develop implementation project(s); Yes = Implementation directly after this project (Final Plan), Med = Proposal is a feasibility study, No = not a feasibility study and design produced is less than Final Plan (100%)	0	-1		-5
13. The proposed deliverables include plans and maps, and will effectively convey limiting factors and prioritized solutions to landowners and other interested people.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
14. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner support for project implementation after project design is completed. Yes = Landowner support is documented by landowner access or a description is adequate to ensure landowner interest, Med = a few landowners have not been contacted, Low = landowner support is questionable, No = applicant has not demonstrated contact with landowners or has not described how landowner support will be achieved.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
15. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

D.11 Steelhead Subcommittee Scoresheet

Proposal#:_____ **Region:** _____ **Reviewer:** _____ **Date:** ___/___/____

Proposal Name: _____

PRC Review

The Steelhead Subcommittee evaluates and scores each proposal based on the following criteria. Each criterion below is worth a maximum of one point. Points are added to achieve a final score. Maximum final score is 5, lowest score is 0.

Criteria	Maximum score of 1 point (fractions allowed)
1. Benefit to Species. The proposal addresses a recovery or restoration need documented for the target species, age-class, and location (site, reach, watershed, and/or population) and the beneficial response of fish will be maintained over a reasonable if not permanent duration.	
2. Technical Merit. The write-up is sufficient for reviewers to fully understand and evaluate the technical merits of the project (project plans, designs with specific sites, activities identified). Objectives, approach, and scope of work are clear and technically sound; the project both feasible and appropriate for the site and can be completed on schedule given reasonably foreseeable constraints (weather conditions, planting seasons, operational conditions).	
3. Cost Effectiveness. The budget details identify unit costs, hourly rates, and line items, indirect charges do not exceed 20% percent, and the project is cost effective (total cost, market rate). The proposal identifies cost share source(s) (federal, state, other), type (cash, in-kind), the status of the cost share (secured, pending [if pending, the date a decision is expected to be made]), and the dollar amount/percent share of total cost.	
4. Community and Partner Involvement. There is demonstrated local area stakeholder support for the project (number, diversity of partners, contact information/letters demonstrating involvement). The project will be coordinated with local agencies and stakeholders.	
5. Organization Qualifications. The project manager, principal investigator(s), and other key personnel have experience and expertise required for the project, and individual roles and responsibilities are well defined and appropriate. The proposal demonstrates relevant field experience, completed projects, published reports, or other materials. When necessary, licensed professionals are identified for design, construction, or oversight of on-the-ground activities. Subcontractor selection and roles are clearly explained and justified.	
Total Score	

Comments:

Appendix E: Funding Approval Submissions

If a proposal is funded, the grantee must submit additional information before a grant agreement is prepared and executed. Special requirements for various agreements are explained below. The applicable forms described in this section are for informational purposes only. **Do not submit these forms with your proposal.** When applicants are notified that their project has been approved for funding, they shall be required to complete, sign, and return the forms provided if not already on file.

- *Final Resolution of project approval* – If the applicant is a public entity, such as a resource conservation district, city, county, water agency, etc. that has a governing body, then a resolution of project approval from the governing body will be a requirement of entering into an agreement. It is suggested that the governing body be made aware of the proposal and be prepared to submit the resolution when returning the signed agreement. Nonprofit organizations do not fall into this category.

- *Certification of Nonfederal Contributions: In-kind/Third Party.* Applicants that have identified nonfederal cost share will be asked to sign and submit a certification which allows FRGP to use those funds as Federal Match. Supporting documentation of cost share expenses must be maintained by the grantee and a summary will be required as part of the Final Report of the grant.

- *Payee Data Record* form (STD. 204) The State of California is required to file reportable payment information with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) in accordance with Section 6041 of the IRS code and Section 18802 of the state's Revenue and Taxation Code.

- Federal Taxpayer ID Number

- *Final Landowner Agreements* will be required for all projects which require access to private or public lands. Agreements must include reasonable access by the grantee and CDFW or its agents for oversight of project implementation, inspection, monitoring, and post-project evaluation for a period of 10 years following completion of the project. Agreements should also outline the terms of maintenance for the project for a 10 year period. Additional landowner agreement requirements apply by project type.

- A *Drug-Free Workplace Certification* (STD. 21) will be required for all grants regardless of grant dollar amount. Federal and State agencies and public entities such as resource conservation districts are excluded from this requirement.

- *Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act 2006 Certification* (FG GMB 868). Any project receiving federal funds as part of the grant award is required to complete this form. The form will be included in the grant package.