





2016 Proposition 1 Watershed Restoration & Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Programs



Proposal Solicitation Notice

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Proposal Deadline: June 24, 2016



California Department of Fish and Wildlife



FOREWORD

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is seeking high quality grant proposals for multi-benefit ecosystem restoration and protection projects that meet the priorities in this Proposal Solicitation Notice (Solicitation), which contribute to the objectives of Proposition 1 (Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014), California Water Action Plan, State Wildlife Action Plan, Delta Plan, California EcoRestore, and the fulfillment of CDFW's Mission. This document details eligibility requirements, the proposal process, proposal review procedures, and other pertinent topics. Potential applicants are encouraged to thoroughly read this Solicitation and the Project Solicitation and Evaluation Guidelines for the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs ([CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines](#)) prior to deciding to submit a proposal. The CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines provide a foundation for the basic requirements for project proposals; however, the information in this Solicitation supersedes any discrepancies between the two documents. All qualified, eligible entities are encouraged to submit grant proposals.

Award Information

- Anticipated Total Funding: Dependent upon allocation in the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget Act. The Fiscal Year 2015-2016 allocation was \$31.4 million
- Length of Funding: 3 years

Eligibility Information

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

Deadline

The complete proposal and all supporting documentation must be submitted via the State Water Resources Control Board's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) by 4:00 PM, Pacific Daylight Time, on **Friday, June 24, 2016**.

Contacts

For questions about this Solicitation please contact CDFW's Watershed Restoration Grants Branch by e-mail at WatershedGrants@Wildlife.ca.gov.

This document, email list subscription information, and further information about the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs can be found at:

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

For questions and assistance regarding FFAST, please contact the FFAST Help Desk at (866) 434-1083 or by e-mail at FFAST_ADMIN@waterboards.ca.gov.

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1 | BACKGROUND..... | 1 |
| 1.1 | Grant Program Requirements | 1 |
| 1.2 | Solicitation Schedule | 2 |
| 2 | FOCUS..... | 4 |
| 2.1 | Funding Priorities by Program | 4 |
| 2.2 | Project Categories | 12 |
| 3 | PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS..... | 15 |
| 3.1 | Eligibility | 15 |
| 3.2 | California Conservation Corps and Certified Community Conservation Corps Consultation | 15 |
| 3.3 | Environmental Compliance and Permitting..... | 16 |
| 3.4 | Project Monitoring and Reporting | 17 |
| 3.5 | Data Management..... | 18 |
| 3.6 | Long-term Management and Maintenance..... | 19 |
| 3.7 | Land Tenure/Site Control | 20 |
| 3.8 | Budget..... | 21 |
| 3.9 | Disadvantaged Community | 22 |
| 3.10 | Licensed Professional Engineers or Geologists | 23 |
| 3.11 | Water Law | 23 |
| 4 | SUBMISSION PROCESS..... | 24 |
| 4.1 | Proposal Submission Deadline..... | 24 |
| 4.2 | Electronic Submission | 25 |
| 5 | PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCEDURE..... | 25 |
| 5.1 | Administrative Review | 25 |
| 5.2 | Technical Review | 26 |
| 5.3 | Selection Panel Review..... | 26 |
| 5.4 | Director of CDFW Review and Final Approval..... | 27 |
| 6 | REQUIREMENTS IF FUNDED..... | 39 |
| 6.1 | Awards | 39 |
| 6.2 | Grant Agreement..... | 39 |
| 6.3 | General Terms and Conditions..... | 41 |
| 6.4 | Signage | 42 |
| 7 | DEFINITIONS AND LINKS..... | 43 |
| 7.1 | Definitions..... | 43 |
| 7.2 | Links..... | 46 |

Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Proposal Solicitation Process and Anticipated Schedule | 3 |
| Table 2: Administrative Review Evaluation Criteria | 28 |
| Table 3: Overview of Technical Review Criteria, Weighting Factors, and Maximum Criterion Scores..... | 29 |
| Table 4: Technical Review Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Standards..... | 30 |

Appendices

Appendix A. Proposal Application Form and Instructions

Attachment 1. Applicant Checklist

Attachment 2. Project Narrative Template

Attachment 3. Monitoring and Reporting Template

Attachment 4. Budget Templates

Attachment 5. The California Conservation Corps Consultation Form

Attachment 6. Environmental Compliance Checklist

Attachment 7. Anadromous Salmonid Recovery Task and Limiting Factors Form

Attachment 8. Water Rights and Hydrogeomorphic Factors Questionnaire

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------|--|
| ACS | American Community Survey |
| CALCC | California Association of Local Conservation Corps |
| CCC | California Conservation Corps |
| CDFW | California Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| CEDEN | California Environmental Data Exchange Network |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| Corps | CCC and CALCC, collectively |
| CVPIA | Central Valley Project Improvement Act |
| CWC | California Water Code |
| FAAST | Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool |
| GAMA | Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment |
| IEP | Interagency Ecological Program |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| NMFS | National Marine Fisheries Service |
| NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration |
| PCSRF | Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund |
| PDT | Pacific Daylight Time |
| Solicitation | Proposal Solicitation Notice |
| SWAMP | Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program |
| SWAP | State Wildlife Action Plan |
| SWP | State Water Project |
| SWRCB | State Water Resources Control Board |
| UTC | University Terms and Conditions |
| WCB | Wildlife Conservation Board |
| WRAMP | Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program |

This page is intentionally left blank

1 BACKGROUND

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

Proposition 1 amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add Sections 79737 and 79738, authorizing the Legislature to appropriate \$372.5 million to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to fund multi-benefit ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects. CDFW will distribute these funds on a competitive basis through two grant programs, the Watershed Restoration Grant Program and the Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program, collectively referred to as the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs. The [CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines](#) for these grant programs were finalized in June 2015.

The purpose of this Proposal Solicitation Notice (Solicitation) is to solicit proposals for multi-benefit ecosystem restoration and protection projects that are consistent with the purposes of Proposition 1 and contribute to the objectives of the California Water Action Plan and [State Wildlife Action Plan](#), as well as other State or federal plans.

1.1 Grant Program Requirements

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

Watershed Restoration Grant Program

- These funds are available for water quality, river, and watershed protection and restoration projects of statewide importance outside of the Delta (CWC §79737[d]).
- Funding shall only be used for projects that will provide fisheries or ecosystem benefits or improvements that are greater than required applicable environmental mitigation measures or compliance obligations, except for any water transfers for the benefit of subsection (d) of Section 3406 of the Central Valley Project

Improvement Act (CVPIA) (Title 34 of Public Law 102-575) (CWC §79737[f]).

- Funds shall not be expended to pay the costs of the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of Delta conveyance facilities (CWC §79737[e]).
- Funds expended for the acquisition of a permanent dedication of water shall be in accordance with Section 1707 of the CWC, where the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) specifies that the water is in addition to water that is required for regulatory requirements as provided in subdivision (c) of Section 1707 (CWC §79709[a]). The acquisition of long-term transfers of water shall be completed in accordance with CWC Sections 1735, 1736 and 1737.
- Funds shall not be used to acquire land via eminent domain (CWC §79711[g]).

Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program

- Funding will be available for projects that will provide fisheries or ecosystem benefits or improvements that are greater than required applicable environmental mitigation measures or compliance obligations (CWC §79732[b]).
- Funds shall not be used to acquire land via eminent domain (CWC §79738[e]).
- Funds shall not be expended to pay the costs of the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of Delta conveyance facilities (CWC §79738[f]).
- Funds expended for the acquisition of a permanent dedication of water shall be in accordance with Section 1707 of the CWC, where the SWRCB specifies that the water is in addition to water that is required for regulatory requirements as provided in subdivision (c) of Section 1707 (CWC §79709[a]). The acquisition of long-term transfers of water shall be completed in accordance with CWC Sections 1735, 1736 and 1737 (CWC §79709[b]).

1.2 Solicitation Schedule

Table 1 identifies the anticipated program timeline from release of the Solicitation through execution of grant agreements. The events listed in this schedule may be subject to change. CDFW may advertise updates through e-mail announcements, postings on the [program website](#), and news releases. For parties that are not already on CDFW's Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs contact list and wish to receive updates on the programs, please [sign up](#) on the [program website](#).

Table 1: Proposal Solicitation Process and Anticipated Schedule

| Milestone or Activity | Schedule |
|--|---|
| Release 2016 Proposal Solicitation Notice | Monday, May 9, 2016 |
| <p>Applicant Workshops:</p> <p>CDFW has scheduled two online workshops to provide technical assistance with the application. Please visit CDFW's Proposition 1 Program Website for workshop details and web conference link. Workshops will be recorded and posted online.</p> | <p>First Workshop Monday, May 16, 2016 at 10:00 AM</p> <p>Second Workshop Monday, June 6, 2016 at 1:00 PM</p> |
| Proposals must be submitted via the State Water Resources Control Board's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) by 4:00 PM, Pacific Daylight Time (PDT). | Friday, June 24, 2016 at 4:00 PM |
| Proposal Evaluation Process | July – October 2016 |
| The Director of CDFW makes the final funding approval. Award notification letters distributed to successful applicants, with grant amount. | November 2016 |
| CDFW staff work with successful applicants to develop and execute grant agreements. Grant execution is anticipated to occur approximately six months from award. | May 2017 |

2 FOCUS

Under this Solicitation, up to \$31.4 million (contingent upon the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget Act appropriation) is anticipated to be available for award through the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs. CDFW anticipates allocating up to \$24 million for the Watershed Restoration Grant Program and up to \$7 million for the Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program; however, these amounts could change based on proposals received under each Program. In addition, CDFW anticipates that a portion (up to \$4 million) of the projects funded through this Solicitation to protect and restore anadromous salmonid habitat will serve as State match for the 2016 [Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund](#) (PCSRF) grant administered by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries¹.

Section 2.3 of the [CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines](#) provides information regarding eligible project types as established through Proposition 1. All Proposition 1 grants funded by CDFW under this Solicitation must fall within the list of priorities described below. An applicant must demonstrate that the proposed project is consistent with the eligibility requirements, priorities, project categories, CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines, and Proposition 1. CDFW is seeking a diversity of projects that encompass the priorities for this Solicitation.

2.1 Funding Priorities by Program

Watershed Restoration Grant Program

The Watershed Restoration Grant Program will fund multi-benefit projects of statewide importance outside of the Delta that address the priorities established through this Solicitation. Projects must be consistent with the purposes of Proposition 1 and contribute to implementation of the California Water Action Plan. In addition, CDFW is seeking projects that contribute to implementation of State Wildlife Action Plan, Safeguarding California Climate Adaptation Plan, Draft Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy (DWR, 2015), State and federal recovery plans, or other relevant State and federal plans. Proposals must address at least one of the following priorities:

- Protect and Restore Mountain Meadow Ecosystems

¹ If a proposal funded under this Solicitation is used as State match for the PCSRF grant, the funding cannot be used as match for any other program or entity.

- Manage Headwaters for Multiple Benefits
- Protect and Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat
- Protect and Restore Coastal Wetland Ecosystems

Protect and Restore Mountain Meadow Ecosystems

The objective of this priority is to protect and restore mountain meadow ecosystems in the Sierra Nevada and Cascade ranges. Mountain meadows throughout California's high mountain ranges are in a state of degradation due to land management practices and other factors. Restoring and protecting ecological and hydrological functions to mountain meadows will enhance their resiliency to climate change and provide a number of critical functions and services, including increased groundwater storage, reduced and delayed peak flows on streams that flow through meadow systems, improved water quality, protection of climate refugia, and restored and expanded habitat for native species.

Prioritization of projects to protect and restore mountain meadow ecosystems will take into account project scale and regional significance, extent to which the project restores landscapes damaged by large, high-intensity wildfires, the significance and diversity of the project benefits, and, where applicable, relevance to the Sierra Nevada Meadow Restoration Business Plan (National Fish and Wildlife Foundation 2010).

Manage Headwaters for Multiple Benefits

Watersheds in the Cascades, Sierra Nevada and other forested areas of the State are places of origin for more than two-thirds of the State's developed water supply. Many of these crucial watersheds are in poor health. Implementing projects to restore and protect the condition, function, and resiliency of forests, streams, meadows, and soils can contribute to a number of objectives, including:

- Improve and protect the quantity and quality of water available year-round
- Improve and protect habitat for wildlife, fish, and plant species
- Reduce the risk and consequences of large, damaging wildfires
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and stabilize carbon storage
- Improve and protect air quality
- Improve local socio-economic conditions and public safety ([Draft Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program Regional Strategy](#), 2016)

CDFW is seeking projects that contribute to managing headwaters for multiple benefits by:

- Restoring forest health through ecologically sound forest management.
 - Examples of projects include:
 - Thinning of overstocked forest stands to improve forest health
 - Treatment and prevention of forest pests and invasive species
 - Restoration of riparian areas and hardwood communities
 - Reforestation of native species
 - Vegetation treatments to increase carbon sequestration and forest resiliency to climate change
- Protecting and restoring degraded stream and meadow ecosystems to assist in natural water management and improved habitat
- Protecting strategically important lands within watersheds to ensure continued or improved watershed health, function, and resilience.

Prioritization of projects to manage headwaters for multiple benefits will take into account project scale and regional significance, degree to which the project addresses landscapes damaged by large, high-intensity fires, collaboration with the Sierra Nevada Conservancy, California Tahoe Conservancy, and CalFire concerning coordinated implementation of their grant programs, the diversity and significance of the project benefits, and, where applicable, consistency with the [Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program](#).

Protect and Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat

The objective of this priority is to protect, restore, or enhance anadromous fish habitat in watersheds of California, in order to aid in the recovery and conservation of these species. CDFW is seeking projects that address limiting factors and priority actions specified in State or federal recovery plans, State Wildlife Action Plan (Chapter 6), California Water Action Plan, and/or other relevant conservation plans, including:

- Removal of high priority fish passage barriers
- Installation of screens on priority unscreened diversions and repair/replacement of existing substandard screens in the Central Valley (refer to CDFW's 2015 [Priority Unscreened Diversion List for the Central Valley](#))
- Restoration or enhancement of riparian, instream, floodplain, side channel, or estuarine habitat
- Improving instream flow quality and quantity

- Restoration actions to reduce erosion and instream/downstream sedimentation
- Protection (acquisition/easements) of important watershed lands

CDFW will only fund water conservation projects (e.g., off-channel water storage, changes in the timing or source of water supply, moving points of diversion, irrigation ditch lining, piping, stock-water systems, and agricultural tailwater recovery/management systems) that permanently dedicate 100 percent of the water saved due to project implementation for instream purposes to support anadromous fish during water limited seasons. Water conserved by such projects shall be dedicated to the stream for anadromous fish benefits through a mechanism such as a Forbearance Agreement, an Instream Flow Lease, a transfer of water rights pursuant to CWC Section 1735, or an instream dedication pursuant to CWC Section 1707 (1707 petition). Projects for which the main purpose is to enhance stream flow should consider submitting proposals to the Wildlife Conservation Board's (WCB's) California Stream Flow Enhancement Program.

Prioritization of projects to protect and restore anadromous fish habitat will take into account the listing status of the species for which the project is designed to benefit and whether the proposal: focuses on populations and geographies that play a greater role in recovery, implements a high priority recovery action identified in a final or public draft recovery plan, and addresses restoration activities specified in the State Wildlife Action Plan (Chapter 6) and/or California Water Action Plan. Prioritization of projects that eliminate barriers to migration also will be informed by CDFW's [Priority Unscreened Diversion List for the Central Valley](#) (2015) and [Updated List of Anadromous Fish Passage Statewide Priority Barriers](#) (2012). Prioritization of projects designed to enhance stream flows will take into account coordination with WCB's California Stream Flow Enhancement Program.

Protect and Restore Coastal Wetland Ecosystems

The objective of this priority is to implement multi-benefit projects designed to protect, restore, or enhance coastal wetland ecosystems. These projects will seek to protect and restore diversity, quality, and connectivity across the range of wetland types extending from subtidal areas to upland transition areas, including non-tidal wetlands. Restoring ecological condition and function within coastal wetlands will provide a variety of important benefits, such as improved habitat for fish and wildlife, enhanced flood protection, increased resiliency to sea level rise and storm events, and improved water

quality.

The California Water Action Plan calls upon CDFW to implement large-scale habitat projects along the California coast in strategic estuaries to restore ecological health and natural system connectivity and help defend against sea level rise. As such, project scale, regional importance, and significance and diversity of the benefits will be taken into account during prioritization of these projects.

Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program

The Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program will fund projects that benefit the Delta. Projects must be consistent with the purposes of Proposition 1 and contribute to implementation of the California Water Action Plan, State Wildlife Action Plan, Delta Plan, Draft Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy (DWR, 2015), and/or California EcoRestore. Where applicable, project applicants may be required to ensure that an adequate written certification of consistency with the Delta Plan is prepared. Proposals must address at least one of the following priorities:

- Contribute to the Improvement of Water Quality
- Protect, Restore, and Enhance Delta Habitats to Improve the Condition of Special-Status Species
- Scientific Studies to Support Implementation of the Delta Science Plan

Contribute to the Improvement of Water Quality

The objective of this priority is to implement multi-benefit projects that contribute to the improvement of water quality in the Delta to improve ecosystem condition, functions, and resiliency, including projects in Delta counties that provide multiple public benefits and improve drinking and agricultural water quality or water supplies.

Protect, Restore, and Enhance Delta Habitats to Improve the Condition of Special-Status Species

The objective of this priority is to implement projects that improve the condition of special-status, at risk, threatened, or endangered species in the Delta and Delta counties. This includes but is not limited to projects to protect, restore, or enhance habitats, to control invasive species, and to support the beneficial reuse of dredged material for habitat restoration and levee improvements.

Through California EcoRestore, State agencies and multiple partners will undertake

restoration and protection of more than 30,000 acres of critical Delta habitat to support the long-term health of native fish and wildlife species in the Delta. CDFW is seeking to fund habitat restoration and protection projects that are consistent with the Delta Plan, contribute to achieving the objectives set forth by California EcoRestore, and are not associated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities², including:

- Restoration of tidal and sub-tidal habitats
- Enhancement or development of managed wetlands (i.e., palustrine emergent wetlands on subsided lands) for subsidence reversal and carbon sequestration, as well as other ecological benefit
- Protection and restoration of floodplain, riparian, and upland habitats.

Habitat restoration projects must be carried out consistent with Section 1, part II (Habitats), of the [Conservation Strategy for Restoration of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Sacramento Valley and San Joaquin Valley Regions](#) (Conservation Strategy, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service 2014). Applicants should use the elevation map presented in the Conservation Strategy (refer to Figure 4 in the Conservation Strategy) as a guide for determining appropriate habitat restoration actions based on an area's elevation. If a proposed habitat restoration action is not consistent with the Conservation Strategy, the proposal shall provide rationale for the deviation based on best available science.

Scientific Studies to Support Implementation of the Delta Science Plan

Scientific studies and assessments are needed that address priority science needs, which inform water and natural resource policy and management decisions and contribute to achieving the co-equal goals for the Delta. Such actions will be consistent with and facilitate implementation of the Delta Science Plan. This Solicitation is seeking proposals that are partnered with collaborative science initiatives (e.g., Interagency Ecological Program [IEP], Fish Restoration Program, Collaborative Adaptive Management Team, Delta Regional Monitoring Program), are consistent with the [high-impact science actions](#) endorsed by the Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, and address one or more of the following topics.

² Proposition 1 funds cannot be used to meet the existing obligations for habitat restoration established through the biological opinions for the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project operations (USFWS 2008, NMFS 2009), and the CDFW Longfin Smelt Incidental Take Permit for SWP Delta operations.

Topic 1. Assessing the effects of extreme events on the Delta. There is a need for enhanced understanding concerning the effects of extreme events on the Delta system (e.g., drought, flood, seismic events). A key component will be continued analysis, integration, and synthesis of existing information generated through previous and on-going efforts (e.g., recent drought-related studies). There is a need for projects that provide the following:

- Investigate effects of drought-induced environmental (physical, chemical, biological) changes on native fish survival, habitat use, and migration patterns in the Delta.
- Improved understanding of the factors that influence system recovery and resiliency in response to drought and other extreme events.

Topic 2. Developing and coupling modeling and other tools to support resource management in the Delta. There is a continuing need to advance the development and integration of modeling tools that can assess the effects of changes in flow, habitat, entrainment, water quality, food web dynamics, and contaminants on the survival and condition of fish in the Delta. There is a need for projects that provide the following:

- Decision-support tools to evaluate alternative Delta habitat restoration scenarios and potential regional effects of multi-project implementation on water quality, food webs, contaminants, flows, and species population dynamics.
- Improved understanding of how large-scale tidal wetland restoration actions affect tidal excursion, bathymetry, the low salinity zone, and sediment dynamics in the estuary.
- Improved mechanistic understanding of how changes in flows affect fish population dynamics.

Topic 3. Effectiveness and implications of habitat restoration actions. In light of ongoing and proposed landscape-scale restoration projects to begin in the near-term, there is a need for pre-restoration data and synthesis of the ecological functioning of past habitat restoration projects and extant habitat to guide current restoration activities. There is a need for projects that provide the following:

- Enhance current and implement additional monitoring efforts in the Delta and Suisun Marsh to gather and synthesize data on the condition and function of existing intertidal habitats, and shallow-water and channel habitats that are near sites planned for restoration. Proposed monitoring methods should be consistent

with the standardized monitoring framework currently under development by the [IEP Tidal Wetlands Monitoring Project Work Team](#).

- Improved understanding of the effectiveness of wetland habitat restoration on subsidence reversal, carbon sequestration, mercury methylation, flood protection, and levee stability.
- Improved understanding of how different channel morphologies and channel margin habitats affect native fish.

Topic 4. Life histories, habitat requirements, and food webs of Delta estuarine and migratory species in a changing landscape. This encompasses several priority topics including native fish distribution, food web dynamics, and flow effects on native species. Projects addressing this topic will identify key informational needs for management of estuarine and migratory species management. There is a need for projects that provide the following:

- Improved salmon genetic stock identification and understanding of life history diversity through analyses of tissues and otoliths in strategic locations of scientific and management value.
- Improved understanding of food web dynamics and productivity and how they can be improved for native estuarine and migratory species.
- Improved understanding of flow effects on native estuarine and migratory species; for example conduct research to:
 - Examine the direct and indirect effects of flows and other drivers and stressors on essential fish production processes and vital rates.
 - Examine how the time and space dynamics of water flows affect fish movement through passive transport, active swimming, and as triggers that cue migrations or spawning activities.
- Improved understanding of the effects of toxicants, including their interactions with physical parameters, on food webs and fish condition, sensory perception, and bioenergetics.
- Improved understanding of resident fish community structure, abundance, and distribution, including non-native species.

2.2 Project Categories

Eligible project categories for this Solicitation are Planning, Implementation, Acquisition, and Scientific Studies. Each project category is described below.

Planning

Planning grants provide funding for necessary activities that will lead to a specific future on-the-ground implementation project(s). Planning grants are intended to support the development of projects that are likely to qualify for future implementation funding. If the proposal seeks funding for permitting, a complete description of the permits needed and a timeline for obtaining them must be included in the proposal. Eligible activities and expenses for Planning projects include, but are not limited to:

- Project administration
- Preparing plans or supplementing existing plans (e.g., watershed and habitat assessments) that will result in a specific project or set of projects
- Performing necessary studies and assessments, collecting baseline data, and developing project designs related to a specific site or physical project
- Acquiring permits for a specific future on-the-ground project
- Completion of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental documentation for a specific future on-the-ground project

Implementation

Implementation grants fund construction of restoration and enhancement projects and new or enhanced facilities. They are intended to support "shovel ready" projects that have advanced to the stage where planning, land tenure, and engineering design plans have been completed. CEQA/NEPA compliance must be completed prior to grant execution (anticipated to occur within 6 months of award). Applicants should, at a minimum, complete intermediate plans (i.e., design plans at ~65% level of development) prior to grant execution. Implementation projects may include final engineering design and permitting as project activities. Engineering design will be subject to review by CDFW Engineering staff.

For clarification, project design consists of several phases. The naming convention for these phases may vary, depending on the agency or locality, but generally the process advances as follows:

1. Conceptual Plans (or ~30% plans):
 - a. Conceptual plans, along with the Conceptual Report, should indicate the general location of any activities and project elements, show overall layout of the project location, and identify any constraints.
 - b. The Conceptual Report and Plans should demonstrate that the project is feasible and reflect a preferred alternative. Alternatives analysis often compares a number of concept level plans.
2. Intermediate Plans (or ~65% plans):
 - a. These plans should show detailed plan views and profiles of any improvements and standard details.
 - b. Individuals reviewing Intermediate Plans should be able to interpret exactly where the project will be built and where project impacts will occur.
3. Draft Plans (or ~90% plans):
 - a. These plans should incorporate revisions to the Intermediate Plans and add details that are required for construction, such as survey notes, instructions for erosion and sediment control, staging areas, access, and the like.
4. Final Plans (or 100% plans):
 - a. These plans should incorporate any revisions to the Draft Plans and should represent the final set of design documents. These are the plans used for construction bids.

Proposed Implementation projects must provide proof of CEQA/NEPA compliance, such as a Notice of Determination or Notice of Exemption, upon request. Implementation projects that include an action that is likely to be deemed a [covered action](#) pursuant to CWC Section 85057.5, must provide documentation of consistency with the Delta Plan. If permits are to be obtained for a proposed project, a complete description of the permits needed and a timeline for obtaining them must be included in the proposal. Eligible activities and expenses for Implementation projects include, but are not limited to:

- Project management/administration
- Preparation of bid packages and subcontractor documents (when subcontractors have not been identified at the time of grant award)

- Development of the final engineering design
- Acquiring necessary permits
- Construction activities (e.g., dredging, earthmoving, construction of facilities)
- Habitat restoration and enhancement (e.g., revegetation, invasive vegetation removal, placement of refugia, removal of fish passage barriers)
- Pre- and post-project monitoring (within grant term)

Acquisition

Acquisition grants fund purchases of land or interests in land or water to support the State Wildlife Action Plan, California Water Action Plan, and the goals of the Delta Stewardship Council's [Delta Plan](#). Acquisitions must be from willing sellers and at fair market value. A completed appraisal, approved by the Department of General Services Real Property Services Section, is not required at the time of proposal; however, if awarded, the appraisal must be completed prior to execution of a grant agreement (current projection of grant execution is within 6 months of award). Properties acquired by an eligible entity with Proposition 1 funds can be transferred to a federal, State, or nonprofit entity to ultimately own, manage, and steward consistent with the purpose of the grant. Unless the project's lead agency has already completed a CEQA analysis that addresses Acquisition and Implementation activities, proposals for acquisition projects must be standalone (i.e., cannot be combined with other project categories). This is because projects solely for acquisitions may be exempt under CEQA. However, where Acquisition would be followed by Implementation activities, such activities may result in project impacts that would complicate reliance on the exemption. Eligible activities and expenses for Acquisition projects include, but are not limited to:

- Project administration
- Pre-acquisition costs incurred after grant execution for the express purpose of, but prior to, obtaining the property, including but not limited to: feasibility studies and personnel costs
- Interests in land that include perpetual conservation easements
- Water acquisitions that include permanent or long-term transfers or dedications (not less than 20 years)

Scientific Studies

Scientific Studies grants fund projects to assess the condition of natural resources, inform policy and management decisions, or assess the effectiveness of grant projects and programs. Scientific Studies grants will only be awarded under the Delta Water

Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program. Eligible activities and expenses for Scientific Studies projects include, but are not limited to:

- Project administration
- Data collection, analysis, and management
- Reporting, publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, and other means of communicating findings

3 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

In order to submit proposals, applicants must be in full compliance with all stated requirements of this Solicitation and the [CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines](#).

3.1 Eligibility

Eligible entities are limited to public agencies (State agencies or departments, public universities, special districts, joint powers authorities, counties, cities, or other political subdivisions of the State), nonprofit organizations, public utilities, federally recognized Indian tribes, State Indian tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's California Tribal Consultation List, and mutual water companies (CWC §79712[a]). Additional eligibility requirements for public utilities, mutual water companies, and agricultural and urban water suppliers can be found in Section 2.1 of the [CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines](#).

Proposals from federal agencies, private individuals, or for-profit enterprises are ineligible for funding under this Solicitation.

3.2 California Conservation Corps and Certified Community Conservation Corps Consultation

Prior to the submission of proposals, all applicants for ecosystem restoration and protection projects shall first consult with the California Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Certified Community Conservation Corps (as represented by the California Association of Local Conservation Corps [CALCC]), collectively referred to as the Corps, as to the feasibility of using their services to implement projects (CWC §79734). The CCC is a State agency with local operations throughout the State. CALCC is the representative for the certified local conservation corps defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code.

Attachment 5 includes guidance on the steps necessary to ensure compliance as well

as sections to be completed by the applicant, the CCC and CALCC. An applicant that submits a proposal to CDFW where it has been determined that Corps services can be used must identify the appropriate Corps and the component(s) of the project in which they will be involved in the Project Narrative and include estimated costs for those services in the Budget. Further, applicants awarded funding must thereafter work with either the CCC or CALCC to develop a statement of work and enter into a contract with the appropriate Corps.

Projects that solely involve Planning, Acquisition, or Scientific Studies with no fieldwork are exempt from consulting with the Corps. However, the applicant is still required to check the appropriate box on Attachment 5 and submit the document through the proposal process.

Applicants that fail to engage in such consultation and fail to submit a completed Attachment 5 with their proposal will not be eligible to receive funding through this Solicitation.

3.3 Environmental Compliance and Permitting

Activities funded under the Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs must be in compliance with applicable State, tribal, and federal environmental laws and regulations, including the CEQA, NEPA, Delta Reform Act, and other environmental permitting requirements. Several local, State, tribal, and federal agencies may have permitting or other approval authority over projects that are eligible for grant funding. The applicant is responsible for obtaining all permits necessary to carry out the proposed work. A list of common permit types is provided in the Proposal Application (see Attachment 6 Environmental Compliance Checklist).

Applicants must identify the project's expected permitting requirements, state what permits have been obtained or the process through which the permits will be obtained, and describe the anticipated timeframe for obtaining each permit. Projects that are undertaken to meet mitigation obligations, or projects that are under an enforcement action by a regulatory agency, will not be considered for funding.

Proposals for projects that are subject to CEQA and NEPA must identify the State and federal lead agencies and document whether that the agency or agencies have accepted the role. The applicant must coordinate with CDFW prior to proposal

submission if CDFW is anticipated to act as CEQA lead agency for the project. Projects that fail to comply with this requirement will not be eligible for funding for this Solicitation. Implementation projects must complete CEQA/NEPA compliance prior to the time of grant agreement execution (anticipated to occur within 6 months of award). If CEQA/NEPA compliance for a proposed implementation project is not complete at time of proposal submission, CDFW will determine the likelihood of CEQA/NEPA completion by the anticipated grant agreement execution date based upon the applicant's schedule for and progress toward completion. Implementation project proposals must provide proof of compliance, such as a Notice of Determination or Notice of Exemption, upon request.

When applicable, projects must be consistent with the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Plan. For grant proposals that include an action that is likely to be deemed a [covered action](#) pursuant to CWC Section 85057.5, the applicant is responsible for ensuring and documenting consistency with the Delta Plan policies. In such instances, the proposal shall include a brief description of the project's consistency with the Delta Plan.

3.4 Project Monitoring and Reporting

Implementation and Acquisition project applicants are required to develop performance measures and include a Monitoring and Reporting Plan that explains how project success will be evaluated and reported. Performance of Planning projects and Scientific Studies will be evaluated based on completion of project deliverables per the grant agreement. The specific terms and conditions for monitoring and reporting may be negotiated prior to grant execution, to ensure appropriate measures have been identified and to assist with consistency of nomenclature, units, and measurements.

The scope of the Monitoring and Reporting Plan will vary depending on the nature of the project; however, each plan shall include:

- Project-specific performance measures that are clearly linked to project objectives and have quantitative and clearly defined targets, at least some of which must be feasible to meet within one to two years post-implementation. Performance measures can be placed into two broad categories.
 - Output performance measures track project implementation and evaluate factors that may be influencing ecosystem outcomes (e.g., acres of habitat restored or preserved, number of barriers to fish migration treated).

- Outcome performance measures evaluate direct ecosystem responses to project activities (e.g., improvement in environmental conditions).
- Description of the metrics and associated monitoring approaches that will be used to document progress towards the performance measure targets, including
 - Metrics that evaluate structural changes at the project site(s) (e.g., as-built surveys), when applicable
 - Characterization of baseline and post-project conditions
 - Pre-implementation data collection, when applicable
- Identify opportunities to extend the monitoring activities beyond the term of the grant (e.g., by using standardized, readily replicated monitoring and evaluation processes; leveraging on-going monitoring programs; and building partnerships capable of attracting funding from multiple sources over time)
- A plan for reporting monitoring results and progress toward performance measures.

In instances where a proposed implementation project is located, either in whole or in part, within the Delta or Suisun Marsh and is likely to be deemed a [covered action](#) pursuant to CWC Section 85057.5, the applicant should consider the applicability of incorporating [Delta Plan performance measures](#).

Applicants shall incorporate standardized approaches, where applicable, into their monitoring plans and evaluate opportunities to coordinate with existing monitoring efforts (e.g., California Coastal Monitoring Program, Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program [SWAMP]) or produce information that can readily be integrated into such efforts. For example, wetland and riparian restoration projects shall collect and report project and environmental monitoring data in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the [Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program \(WRAMP\)](#) framework and tools. If an applicant determines that the use of standardized approaches is not appropriate, the proposal must provide a clear justification and a description of the proposed approach.

3.5 Data Management

Environmental data collected under these grant programs must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users in a timely manner, except where limited by law, regulation, policy or security requirements. Where applicable, each proposal must include a description of how data and other information

generated by the project will be handled, stored, and shared. Applicants should account for the resources necessary to implement data management activities in the project budget. Projects generating environmental data must include data management activities that support incorporation of those data into statewide data systems (e.g., [California Environmental Data Exchange Network](#) [CEDEN]), where applicable. Additional specifications of relevance to water quality and wetland and riparian restoration data are described below.

Unless otherwise stipulated, data collected and/or created with CDFW grant funds shall be required as deliverables and will become the property of CDFW. A condition of final payment shall include the delivery of all related data. Geospatial data must be delivered in an [ESRI](#)-useable format where applicable and documented with metadata in accordance with the [CDFW Minimum Data Standards](#).

Water Quality Data

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

Wetland and Riparian Restoration Data

Wetland and riparian restoration project data shall be uploaded to [EcoAtlas](#). For the purpose of this requirement, examples of project data include project proponent, project name, location (e.g., latitude/longitude, project boundary), pertinent dates (e.g., site construction), activity type (e.g., restoration), and habitat type and amount. For additional information, refer to the “Project Tracker” online tool on the EcoAtlas website.

3.6 Long-term Management and Maintenance

Applicants proposing Implementation or Acquisition projects shall summarize long-term management and maintenance planning for the project as part of their grant proposal. The goal of long-term management and maintenance is to foster the long-term success of the project and long-term viability of the site’s natural resources. In instances where a

proposed restoration project is located, either in whole or in part, within the Delta or Suisun Marsh and is likely to be deemed a [covered action](#) pursuant to CWC Section 85057.5, the applicant shall ensure consistency with Delta Plan adaptive management ([Delta Plan General Policy 1](#)). Specific terms and conditions appropriate to the scope of the project may be negotiated prior to grant execution. If a detailed Long-Term Management Plan has not been prepared for your project, you may be asked to develop one as a deliverable for your grant. Properties restored, enhanced, or protected, and facilities constructed or enhanced with funds provided by CDFW shall be operated, used, and maintained consistent with the purposes of the grant.

3.7 Land Tenure/Site Control

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

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

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

CDFW and its representatives shall have access to the project site at least once every 12 months from the start date of the grant for 25 years, or an appropriate term negotiated prior to grant execution. CDFW shall provide advance notice to landowners prior to accessing the project site.

3.8 Budget

Cost Share

Cost share is the portion of the project cost not funded by the awarding agency (CDFW) and is provided by the applicant and/or other sources (e.g., private companies, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, and/or other entities). Proposals with higher proportions of secured cost share contribution towards total project cost will receive higher scores during the proposal evaluation process. Proposals providing cost share in the form of cash or other resources (in-kind services) for the support of the project must specify the source and dollar amount of all proposed cost share. Cost share must be:

- Used to support the proposed project
- Spent between grant award and end of the proposed CDFW funded project term
- Secured prior to grant award

Where applicable, cost share agreements or funding assurances will be required prior to grant execution. Applicant must also indicate if any cost share is being used as match for other grants or entities and whether they intend to leverage CDFW Proposition 1 funds as match, if awarded.

Indirect Costs

Indirect cost (administrative overhead) rates are limited to 20 percent of the total Budget³, minus subcontractor and equipment costs. 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 in the overall project Budget. Subcontractors' indirect costs should be reflected in the Subcontractor Budget and are also limited to 20 percent. The applicant must explain the methodology used to determine the rate and provide detailed calculations in support of the indirect cost rate. Please refer to the supplied Budget Tables (Attachment 4) for proper calculation of indirect costs.

Ineligible Costs

Following are examples of costs that are ineligible for reimbursement through an

³ The total requested funds through this Solicitation only, not total project amount.

awarded grant:

- All costs incurred outside of the grant agreement term
- All costs related to the preparation and submission of the grant proposal
- Travel costs not specifically identified in the grant budget
- Out of state travel without prior written authorization from the State
- Appraisal, title, or escrow costs
- Costs associated with CEQA or NEPA completion for implementation project proposals

3.9 Disadvantaged Community

Proposition 1 defines a disadvantaged community as “a community with an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income” (CWC §79505.5). Proposition 1 does not require that CDFW direct a specific portion of funding to projects that benefit disadvantaged communities. However, CDFW will strive to ensure that a portion of its Proposition 1 funding benefits these communities.

The Department of Water Resources has developed the [Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool](#) that shows the location and boundaries of disadvantaged communities in the State, based on the *US Census American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Data: 2009-2013* (with an annual median household income of \$61,094 and a calculated disadvantaged community threshold of \$48,875). The interactive map Application allows users to overlay the following three US Census geographies as separate data layers:

- Census Place
- Census Tract
- Census Block Group

Applicants are required to use the following two-step process to evaluate whether their proposed project will benefit one or more disadvantaged communities.

Step 1 – Determine whether a majority (50%+) of proposed project area is located within a disadvantaged community. For interactive maps of disadvantaged communities, refer to the [Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool](#). The applicant may use the ACS data at the census place, census tract, or census block group geography levels to determine whether the project is located within a disadvantaged community, based on the geography that is the most representative for that community.

Step 2 – Determine whether the proposed project will provide benefits to a disadvantaged community. If the proposed project meets one or more of the following criteria, it will be deemed to provide benefits to a disadvantaged community.

- Project preserves, restores, or enhances a site where the majority of the (50%+) of the land area is located within a disadvantaged community
- Project preserves, restores, or enhances a site that allows public access, enhances public recreational opportunities (e.g., fishing, hiking, bird watching), and is within 1 mile of a disadvantaged community
- Project significantly reduces flood risk to one or more adjacent disadvantaged communities
- Project reduces exposure to local environmental contaminants (e.g., water quality contaminants) within a disadvantaged community
- Project includes recruitment, agreements, policies, or other approaches that are consistent with federal and State law and result in at least 25% of project work hours performed by residents of a disadvantaged community
- Project includes recruitment, agreements, policies, or other approaches that are consistent with federal and State law and result in at least 10% of project work hours performed by residents of a disadvantaged community participating in job training programs which lead to industry-recognized credentials or certifications

3.10 Licensed Professional Engineers or Geologists

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

3.11 Water Law

An applicant whose project may impact a water right, including any project that would require a change to water rights, involve water diversion, or address stream flows or water use, shall comply with the CWC, as well as any applicable federal, State, or local laws or regulations. If the project would require a change to water rights, including, but not limited to, bypass flows, point of diversion, location of use, purpose of use, or off-stream storage, the applicant shall demonstrate an understanding of the SWRCB processes, timelines, and costs necessary for project approvals by SWRCB and the ability to meet those timelines within the term of a grant. In addition, any proposal that

involves modification of water rights for an adjudicated stream shall identify the required legal process for the change as well as associated legal costs. If awarded, a project involving a water right acquisition must, prior to execution of the grant agreement, be supported by a water rights appraisal approved by the Department of General Services Real Property Services Section (refer to the discussion concerning Acquisitions in Section 2.2, Project Categories, for additional information).

For projects involving water diversions or diversion-related infrastructure, an applicant must demonstrate to CDFW a legal right to divert water consistent with the project proposal and sufficient documentation regarding actual water availability and use. For post-1914 water rights, the applicant must submit with their proposal a copy of the applicable water right permit or license on file with the SWRCB. Applicants whose projects involve a water diversion based on a riparian or pre-1914 water right must submit with their proposal written evidence of the right to divert water and the priority in the watershed of that diversion right. An applicant must submit to CDFW with their proposal any operational conditions, agreements, or court or SWRCB orders or decrees affecting the asserted water right. An applicant must submit past water diversion and use information reported to the SWRCB, pursuant to CWC Section 5101. Such reports include Progress Reports of Permittee and Reports of Licensee for post-1914 rights, and Supplemental Statements of Water Diversion and Use for riparian and pre-1914 water rights. Projects involving activities described in Fish and Game Code Section 1602 may require a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement.

4 SUBMISSION PROCESS

Submitted proposals must be in full compliance with all stated requirements of this Solicitation as well as the requirements outlined in Section 3 of the [CDFW Restoration Grant Guidelines](#).

4.1 Proposal Submission Deadline

Proposals will be accepted from May 9, 2016 to June 24, 2016 through SWRCB's [Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool \(FAAST\)](#).

Online submission of proposals must be received before 4:00 PM, PDT on Friday, June 24, 2016.

All information requested in this Solicitation is mandatory unless otherwise indicated.

Failure to submit any required attachment or complete all required Application components will make the proposal incomplete. Incomplete proposals will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

Proposals are subject to Public Records Act requests and may be publicly available.

4.2 Electronic Submission

The complete proposal must be submitted electronically through SWRCB's [FAAST](#). Hardcopy or email submissions of the proposal will not be reviewed or considered for funding. The name of this Solicitation in FAAST is "[CDFW - 2016 Prop 1 Watershed Restoration & Delta Water Quality and Ecosystems Restoration](#)." To access this Solicitation, applicants must register and have an account in FAAST. Applicants are encouraged to watch the "How to Create a FAAST Account" video. The FAAST Help Desk is staffed Monday – Friday (8:00AM – 5:00PM). Questions regarding the FAAST website should be directed to 1-866-434-1083 or FAAST_ADMIN@waterboards.ca.gov. If there are any questions regarding the Solicitation or proposal process, please email WatershedGrants@wildlife.ca.gov.

The Proposal Application in FAAST consists of multiple sections or “tabs”. Within FAAST, pull down menus, text boxes, multiple-choice selections, or uploaded attachments will be used to receive answers to the questions. FAAST will allow applicants to type text or cut and paste information from other documents directly into a submittal screen. The Proposal Application is provided as Appendix A for applicants to prepare responses and cut and paste information into the FAAST website; however, the proposal must be submitted online using FAAST. Once submitted, applicants cannot alter their proposal or submit additional information without first contacting the FAAST Help Desk. Applicants are encouraged to allow sufficient time to submit proposals to avoid last minute errors and omissions.

5 PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

5.1 Administrative Review

An administrative review will determine if the proposal is complete and meets all the requirements for technical review. This review will use a “Pass/Fail” scoring method, based on the criteria presented in Table 2. Proposals which receive a “Fail” for one or more of the Table 2 criteria will be considered incomplete and will not be considered for

funding under this Solicitation.

5.2 Technical Review

Table 3 provides an overview of the technical review criteria, as well as the weighting factors, maximum criterion scores, and percent of total maximum score. All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers in accordance with the scoring criteria documented in Table 4. Technical reviewers may make narrative comments that support their scores. Technical reviewers assigned to each proposal will include representatives from CDFW. CDFW may request reviewers from other agencies or other outside experts to participate in the review. The review process may encompass an independent scientific review. Individuals selected to serve as technical reviewers will be professionals in fields relevant to the proposed project (CWC §79707[f]).

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

- A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.
- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is less than fully addressed and is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed or the documentation or rationale is incomplete or insufficient.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed or no documentation or rationale is presented.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

5.3 Selection Panel Review

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

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

- Review scores and comments for each proposal
- Availability of funds
- Program purposes
- Balance/distribution of funds: a) by and within priorities identified in Section 2.1, b) by project types, c) by geographic area, or d) by type of institutions
- Results of coordination and consultation with partner agencies implementing other relevant granting programs (e.g., Proposition 1 and California Climate Investments)
- For Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program proposals, results of coordination and consultation with the Delta city or Delta county in which a grant is proposed to be expended or an interest in real property is proposed to be acquired (CWC §79738[b])

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

5.4 Director of CDFW Review and Final Approval

The Director of CDFW will review the Selection Panel recommendations and associated materials and make the final funding approval. CDFW anticipates awarding grants in November 2016, with grant agreement execution approximately six months from award date.

Table 2: Administrative Review Evaluation Criteria

| Criteria | Score |
|---|--------------|
| All proposal components have been completed in the required formats, including all proposal forms and associated documents. | Pass/Fail |
| Applicant contact information, including person authorized to sign grant agreement, is included. | Pass/Fail |
| Applicant is an eligible entity. | Pass/Fail |
| Proposal was received by the deadline. | Pass/Fail |
| Budget is included using supplied templates | 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, California Endangered Species Act, federal Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, Porter-Cologne, other pertinent laws and regulations, or a permit issued by any local, State, or federal agency. | Pass/Fail |
| Applicant has included a completed consultation form from the California Conservation Corps AND Certified Community Conservation Corps (as represented by the California Association of Local Conservation Corps) (collectively, "the Corps") to determine the feasibility of the Corps' participation or a form noting exemption from consultation, consistent with the guidance stipulated in Attachment 5 of the Solicitation. | Pass/Fail |
| If the Corps participation in proposed project is feasible, the budget includes estimated costs for the components of the project involving the Corps. | Pass/Fail |

Table 3: Overview of Technical Review Criteria, Weighting Factors, and Maximum Criterion Scores

| Criteria | Weighting Factor | Maximum Criterion Score | Percent of Total Maximum Score |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Importance and Applicability | | | |
| 1. Applicability to Solicitation Priorities | 2.0 | 10 | 30.0% |
| 2. Consistency with and Implementation of State and Federal Plans | 1.0 | 5 | |
| 3. Project Outcomes – Diversity and Significance of the Benefits | 1.0 | 5 | |
| 4. Durability of Investment | 1.0 | 5 | |
| 5. Climate Change Considerations | 1.0 | 5 | |
| Technical / Scientific Merit | | | |
| 6. Purpose and Background | 2.5 | 12.5 | 27.5% |
| 7. Approach and Feasibility | 2.0 | 10 | |
| 8. Project Category – Specific Considerations | 1.0 | 5 | |
| Organizational Capacity | | | |
| 9. Project Team Qualifications | 2.0 | 10 | 20% |
| 10. Schedule and Deliverables | 2.0 | 10 | |
| Project Costs | | | |
| 11. Budget | 1.0 | 5 | 12.5% |
| 12. Cost Share | 1.5 | 7.5 | |
| Community / Stakeholder Support | | | |
| 13. Community Support and Collaboration | 1.5 | 7.5 | 10% |
| 14. Disadvantaged Communities | 0.5 | 2.5 | |
| Total Possible Score | | 100 | 100% |

Table 4: Technical Review Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Standards

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|---|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Importance and Applicability | | | |
| <p>1. Applicability to Solicitation Priorities To what extent does the project align with at least one of the priorities stated in the Solicitation (refer to Section 2.1. Funding Priorities by Program), and promote and implement the California Water Action Plan?</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 2 | 0-5 | 10 |

⁴ Planning Projects – where applicable, the evaluation of planning proposals will take into consideration the future on-the-ground project(s) that the pre-project activities are intended to support.

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|---|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <p>2. Consistency with and Implementation of State and Federal Plans Extent to which the project implements, and the proposal clearly explains its linkage to, at least one action in an existing State or federal conservation, restoration, or recovery plan, or relevant regional water plan, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Wildlife Action Plan • California EcoRestore • Draft Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy (DWR, 2015) • Safeguarding California Climate Adaptation Plan • California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan • California Essential Habitat Connectivity Strategy for Conserving a Connected California • State and Federal Recovery Plans • Natural Community Conservation Plans/Habitat Conservation Plans • Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program Regional Strategy • Sierra Nevada Meadow Restoration Business Plan • Integrated Regional Water Management Plans • Delta Plan / Delta Science Plan <p>Note - the degree to which the project implements the California Water Action Plan is addressed above in Criterion 1. Applicability to Solicitation Priorities.</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 1 | 0-5 | 5 |

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|--|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <p>3. Project Outcomes - Diversity and Significance of the Benefits The extent to which the project provides multiple tangible benefits and the proposal provides sufficient analysis and documentation to demonstrate significance and a high likelihood that the benefits will be realized.</p> <p>Examples of potential benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change response actions • Restoration actions in response to natural disasters (e.g., high intensity wildfires, floods) • Drought preparedness • Integrated flood management • Protection or improvement of water quality • Use and reuse water more efficiently • Expand environmental stewardship • Protect or increase habitat for threatened and endangered species • Protect strategically important lands within watersheds • Reduce stressors on native species <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation will receive 5 points • Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking will receive 4 points • Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation will receive 3 points • Proposals that are likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking will receive 2 points • Proposals that are likely to provide a low level of multiple benefits will receive 1 point • Proposals that do not provide multiple benefits will receive a score of zero | 1 | 0-5 | 5 |

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|--|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <p>4. Durability of Investment</p> <p>4a. Implementation and Acquisition Projects The extent to which the project will deliver sustainable outcomes in the long-term. How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability beyond the term of the grant agreement?</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals that provide a well-defined long-term management and maintenance plan and include documentation of protection in perpetuity will receive 5 points • Proposals that provide a well-defined long-term management and maintenance plan for a minimum of 25 years will receive 4 points • Proposals that provide a less-than-well-defined long-term management and maintenance plan for a minimum of 25 years will receive 3 points • Proposals that provide a well-defined long-term management and maintenance plan for less than 25 years will receive 3 points • Proposals that provide a less-than-well-defined long-term management and maintenance plan for less than 25 years will receive 1 to 2 points • Proposals that provide an inadequate long-term management and maintenance plan will receive a score of zero <p>4b. Planning Projects The degree to which the project will advance planning towards a specific future on-the-ground project (i.e., will it advance the project to a shovel-ready stage that qualifies for future implementation funding?) that is likely to proceed and yield the stated natural resource benefits.</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> <p>4c. Scientific Study Projects The extent to which the project will generate information and associated products (e.g., publications, models) that will inform water and natural resource policy, restoration and management decisions in the Delta.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the project produce and report results within the term of the grant agreement? • Is there a plan for widespread and effective dissemination of information gained from the project? • Will the information produced by the project be useful to resource managers and policy-makers? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 1 | 0-5 | 5 |

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|---|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <p>5. Climate Change Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the proposal discuss potential vulnerabilities of the project site to climate change effects? How well does the project account for and provide adaptation and/or resiliency to potential climate change effects? <p><u>Additional Considerations for Scientific Studies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the proposed study improve scientific understanding of climate change effects and/or inform management responses to climate change? Will the proposed study produce information that will aid future assessments of climate change effects? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 1 | 0-5 | 5 |
| Technical / Scientific Merit | | | |
| <p>6. Purpose and Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal includes a detailed description of the project purpose and background, including sufficient rationale to justify the project need. Is the underlying scientific basis for the proposed work clearly explained (i.e., does it include a clearly articulated conceptual model, if applicable) and is it based on the best available science? Are the goals, objectives, hypotheses, and questions clearly stated and internally consistent? Are the project location and boundaries clearly delineated? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 2.5 | 0-5 | 12.5 |
| <p>7. Approach and Feasibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project narrative sufficiently detailed to serve as a statement of work for a grant agreement? Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Is the project technically feasible from a biological and engineering perspective? Are the means by which each element of the project will be implemented (e.g., methods/techniques used, materials and equipment used, etc.) adequately described? Does the project apply methods and technologies that are appropriate, understood, and well proven? If not, does the proposal provide an adequate basis for the use of new or innovative technology or practices? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 2 | 0-5 | 10 |

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|--|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <p>8. Project Category – Specific Considerations</p> <p>8a. Acquisition and Implementation Projects – Project Monitoring and Reporting The proposed approach will be evaluated in the context of the project type, objectives, scale, and complexity of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project’s Monitoring and Reporting Plan demonstrate a clear and reasonable approach for monitoring, assessing, and reporting project effectiveness / performance consistent with the project’s objectives? Are the performance measures appropriate and adequate to demonstrate the project’s outcomes? Does the proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts or produce data that can be readily integrated with such efforts, where applicable/feasible? Does the proposal contain a description of baseline monitoring that would be or has already been conducted, in order to support effectiveness monitoring and does it appear to be reasonable? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> <p>8b. Planning Projects – Preparing for Project Effectiveness Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal contain a description of baseline monitoring that would be or has already been conducted, in order to support future effectiveness monitoring and does it appear to be reasonable? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> <p>8c. Scientific Study Projects – Addressing Key Scientific Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the idea timely and important? Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? To what extent does the project address key scientific uncertainties and fill important information gaps? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodologies, or approaches? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 1 | 0-5 | 5 |
| Organizational Capacity | | | |
| <p>9. Project Team Qualifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well does the proposal demonstrate that the project team has the appropriate experience, facilities/equipment, and capacity to successfully perform the proposed tasks? Where applicable, how well does the proposal demonstrate appropriate or necessary partnerships to complete the project? | 2 | 0-5 | 10 |

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|---|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria | | | |
| <p>10. Schedule and Deliverables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the schedule demonstrate a logical sequence and timing of project tasks? • Does the project have reasonable milestones and appropriate deliverables? • Do the tasks in the schedule align with the tasks in the project narrative? • How well does the proposal demonstrate the means by which data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, and made publicly available? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Where applicable, how well does the proposal address the specific requirements identified in Section 3.5, Data Management, of this Solicitation (e.g., CEDEN, EcoAtlas)? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 2 | 0-5 | 10 |
| Project Costs | | | |
| <p>11. Budget</p> <p>The proposed Budget and Justification are appropriate to the work proposed, cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. The tasks shown in the Budget Justification are consistent with the tasks shown in the Project Narrative and schedule.</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for which the Budget is detailed, accurate, and considered reasonable will receive 5 points • Proposals for which the Budget appears reasonable, contains moderate detail, inaccuracies or unspecified lump sums of up to 20 percent of the total Budget will receive 3 to 4 points • Proposals for which the Budget lacks sufficient detail, includes; many inaccuracies, unspecified lump sums of 20 to 50 percent of the total Budget, or inappropriate costs will receive 1 to 2 points • Proposals for which the Budget lacks sufficient detail, is inaccurate, contains unspecified lump sums exceeding 50 percent of the total Budget, or is not cost effective will receive a score of zero | 1 | 0-5 | 5 |
| | | | |

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|---|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <p>13. Cost Share To what extent does the project provide secured federal, State, private, or local cost share? Cost share includes cash and in-kind services. To be considered eligible, for the purposes of scoring this criterion, cost share must be secured at time of Application submission and must be spent between the anticipated award date (November 2016) and the end of the proposed grant agreement.</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost share of >40% will receive 5 points • Cost share of 31-40% will receive 4 points • Cost share of 21-30% will receive 3 points • Cost share of 11-20% will receive 2 points • Cost share of 1-10% will receive 1 point • Cost share of 0% will receive a score of zero | 1.5 | 0-5 | 7.5 |
| Community/Stakeholder Support | | | |
| <p>14. Community Support and Collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project have broad-based public and institutional support at the local, regional, or larger scale? • Does the applicant demonstrate that the community is engaged in the project by providing funds, in-kind contributions (i.e., administrative/ technical services, labor, materials, equipment, etc.), partnerships, or other evidence of support? • Does the applicant describe efforts to include stakeholders in project planning, design, outreach/education, implementation, monitoring, maintenance, etc.? <p><u>Additional Consideration for Scientific Studies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the proposal partnered with collaborative science initiatives (e.g., Interagency Ecological Program [IEP], Collaborative Adaptive Management Team, Delta Regional Monitoring Program)? <p><u>Scoring:</u> See Standard Scoring Criteria</p> | 1.5 | 0-5 | 7.5 |

| Criteria ⁴ | Weight Factor | Point Value | Maximum Criteria Score |
|--|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <p>15. Disadvantaged Communities The extent to which the project benefits a disadvantaged community as defined in CWC Section 79505.5 (refer to Section 3.9. Disadvantaged Community).</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects that are located within and provide benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities will receive 5 points Projects that are either located within but do not provide benefits to a disadvantaged community, or are not located within a disadvantaged community but provide benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities will receive 3 points Projects that are not located within a disadvantaged community and do not provide benefits to a disadvantaged community will receive a score of zero | 0.5 | 0, 3, 5 | 2.5 |
| Total Possible Score | | | 100 |
| Reviewer Summary Comments⁵ | | | |
| <p>CDFW Regional Priorities (CDFW Regional Staff only) Provide a score (scale of 0-5) based on how well the proposal addressed CDFW Regional Priorities.</p> | N/A | 0-5 | N/A |
| <p>Overall Evaluation: Please provide an overall assessment of the Proposal (scale 0-5), identifying key strengths and deficiencies, likelihood of success (technical and financial feasibility), opportunities to strengthen the proposal, and other relevant information. Please be clear and concise. This field will be used to summarize the entire review, so be sure to include all major points.</p> | N/A | 0-5 | N/A |

⁵ The point values assigned to CDFW Regional Priorities and Overall Evaluation are meant to provide additional context for the Selection Panel's deliberations and will not be incorporated into the proposal score.

6 REQUIREMENTS IF FUNDED

6.1 Awards

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

6.2 Grant Agreement

Development of grant agreements will begin following announcement of awards. 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 \(STD. 21\)](#)
- Water Conservation and Efficiency Program (refer to Section 7.1)
- Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

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

Responsibility of the Grantee

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

Invoicing and Payments

Grant agreements, with the exception of Acquisition grants, will be structured to provide for payment in arrears of work being performed. Funds cannot be disbursed until there is an executed grant agreement between CDFW and the project applicant. Payments will be made on a reimbursement basis (i.e., the grantee pays for services, products or supplies, submits an invoice that must be approved by the CDFW grant manager, and is then reimbursed by CDFW). Funds for construction will not be disbursed until all of the required environmental compliance and permitting documents have been received by CDFW.

Performance Retention

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

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

Loss of Funding

Work performed under the grant agreement is subject to availability of funds through the State's normal budget process. If funding for the grant agreement is reduced, deleted, or delayed by the Budget Act or through other budget control actions, CDFW shall have the option to either cancel the grant agreement, offer to the grantee a grant agreement amendment reflecting the reduced amount, or to suspend work. In the event of cancellation or suspension of work, CDFW shall provide written notice to the grantee and be liable for payment for any work completed pursuant to the agreement up to the date of the written notice and shall have no liability for payment for work undertaken after such date. In the event of a suspension of work, CDFW may remove the suspension of work through written notice to the grantee. CDFW shall be liable for payment for work completed from the date of written notice of the removal of the suspension of work forward, consistent with other terms of the grant agreement. In no

event shall CDFW be liable to the grantee for any costs or damages associated with any period of suspension invoked pursuant to this provision, nor shall CDFW be liable for any costs in the event that, after a suspension, no funds are available and the grant agreement is then cancelled based on budget contingencies.

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


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

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

- Failing to execute an agreement with CDFW within six months of the award announcement. In such situations, the applicant may apply to a future Solicitation
- Withdrawing from the grant program
- Failing to acquire land or water at an approved fair market value
- Losing willing seller(s)
- Failing to complete proposed water right changes/dedications
- 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

6.3 General Terms and Conditions

Successful applicants must agree to the appropriate terms and conditions for their entity type. In accordance with AB 20, awarded University of California and California State University applicants must agree to the [UTC-116 - University Terms & Conditions - Exhibit "C" for University of California and California State University Agreements](#) (UTC-



116 Exhibit C). All other awarded entities must agree to the CDFW [General Grant Provisions](#). UTC-116 Exhibit C and the CDFW General Grant Provisions include information regarding audits, amendments, liability insurance and rights in data.

6.4 Signage

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

7 DEFINITIONS AND LINKS

7.1 Definitions

Acquisition

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

Agricultural Water Supplier

A water supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water to 10,000 or more irrigated acres, excluding recycled water, including a supplier or contractor for water, regardless of the basis of right that distributes or sells water for ultimate resale to customers (CWC §10608.12[a])

Coastal Wetland

Coastal wetlands include saltwater and freshwater wetlands located within coastal watersheds – specifically United States Geological Survey 8-digit hydrologic unit watersheds which drain into the Pacific ([US EPA](#))

Delta

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

Disadvantaged Community

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

Eligible Entities

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

Federally Recognized Indian Tribe

Indian tribes that are recognized by the United States Department of the Interior,

Bureau of Indian Affairs and listed annually in the Federal Register

Mountain Meadows

For the purposes of this Solicitation, mountain meadows include wet meadow, fresh emergent wetland, riverine, lacustrine, aspen, and montane riparian as described in [California Wildlife Habitat Relationships](#) (CWHR, Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988).

Mutual Water Companies

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

Nonprofit Organization

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

Performance Measure

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

Public Agency

A State agency or department [including public universities], special district, joint powers authority, county, city, city and county, or other political subdivision of the State (CWC §79702[s])

Public Utilities

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

State Indian Tribe

Indian tribes that are listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's California

Tribal Consultation List

State Wildlife Action Plan

The [State Wildlife Action Plan \(SWAP\)](#) is the key wildlife conservation planning tool for California. The SWAP takes an ecosystem approach for conserving California's fish and wildlife resources by identifying strategies intended to improve conditions of Species of Greatest Conservation Need and the habitats upon which they depend (CDFW 2015). The SWAP 2015 Update is a guide for resource managers, conservation partners, and the public in how they can participate in conserving California's precious natural heritage.

Urban Water Supplier

A supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually. An urban water supplier includes a supplier or contractor for water, regardless of the basis of right, which distributes or sells for ultimate resale to customers (CWC §10617)

Water Conservation and Efficiency Program

Pursuant to Governor Brown's [April 2014 Executive Order](#), recipients of funding for future projects that impact water resources, including groundwater resources, must have appropriate water conservation and efficiency programs in place in response to persistent drought conditions. CDFW is interpreting this to include all of the eligible project types that could be funded through this Solicitation. The water conservation and efficiency program is specific to the organization, not the proposed project. The Executive Order did not provide specific guidance concerning format or content of the programs. As such, each entity can develop a program that is appropriate for the type and scale of their organization.

Wetlands

Lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface or the land is covered by shallow water. For purposes of this classification, wetlands must have one or more of the following three attributes: (1) at least periodically, the land supports predominantly hydrophytes; (2) the substrate is predominantly undrained hydric soil; and (3) the substrate is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by shallow water at some time during the growing season of each year (Cowardin et al. 1979).

7.2 Links

State Departments and Programs:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

- [Grant Opportunities](#)
- [Proposition 1 Restoration Grant Programs](#)
- [ERP Conservation Strategy \(2014\)](#)
- [State Wildlife Action Plan](#)
- [California Wildlife Habitat Relationships \(CWHR\)](#)
- [Coho Salmon Habitat Enhancement Leading to Preservation Act \(Coho HELP Act, AB 1961, Huffman\)](#)
- [Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Act of 2014 \(AB 2193, Gordon\)](#)
- [Priority Unscreened Diversion List for the Central Valley](#)

California Conservation Corps

- [Proposition 1](#)

California Natural Resources Agency

- [Bond Accountability](#)
- [California EcoRestore](#)

Delta Stewardship Council / Delta Science Program

- [Delta Plan](#)
- [Delta Plan Covered Actions](#)

California Department of Conservation

- [Watershed Program](#)

California Department of Industrial Relations

California Department of Water Resources

- [Integrated Regional Water Management](#)
- [Draft Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy](#)

State Water Resources Control Board

- [California Environmental Data Exchange Center](#)
- [Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool \(FAAST\)](#)
- [Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program](#)

Other Relevant Resources:

[California Aquatic Resources Inventory](#)

[California Rapid Assessment Method](#)

[California Water Action Plan](#)

[California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup](#)

CEQA Information

- [Summary](#)
- [California State Clearinghouse Handbook](#)

Climate Change Information

- [CDFW's Climate Science Program](#)
- [Safeguarding California: Reducing Climate Risk](#)
- [National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy](#)

Coastal Wetlands Information

- [United States Environmental Protection Agency](#)

Disadvantaged Community Information

- [Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool](#)

[EcoAtlas](#)

Enabling Legislation

- [Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 \(Proposition 1\)](#)

Metadata Information

- [Biogeographic Information and Observation System \(BIOS\)](#)

Mutual Water Companies

- [California Corporations Code §14300](#)

[National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration](#)

NEPA Information

- [United States Environmental Protection Agency](#)

Recovery Plans for Coho Salmon, Steelhead, and Chinook Salmon

- [2013 Task List for the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California \(DFG\)](#)

1996)

- [Recovery Strategy for California Coho \(DFG 2004\)](#)
- [Coho Salmon Recovery Tasks](#) – this site contains the most recent changes to the Coho Recovery Strategy and must be used for task selection instead of the original document (above)
- [Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan NOAA Final: January 2012](#)
- [South-Central California Steelhead Recovery Plan NOAA Final: September 2013](#)
- [Recovery Plan for Evolutionarily Significant Unit of Central California Coast Coho Salmon Final Plan: September 2012](#)
- [List of Central California Coast Coho Salmon Recovery Actions](#)
- [Recovery Plan for the Evolutionarily Significant Unit of Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Coho Salmon Public Final: September 2014](#)
- [Recovery Plan for the Evolutionarily Significant Units of Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and the Distinct Population Segment of California Central Valley Steelhead NOAA Final: July 2014](#)
- [Coastal Multispecies Recovery Plan, North Central California Coast Recovery Domain: California Coastal Chinook Salmon, Northern California Steelhead, Central California Coast Steelhead NOAA Public Draft: October 2015](#)

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta

- [Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as defined in Proposition 1 \(CWC §79702\[e\]\)](#)
- [Map of Legal Delta](#)
- [Statutory Definition of Legal Delta \(CWC §12220\)](#)

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

United States Forest Service

Water Conservation and Efficiency Plans

- [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency](#)
- [Alliance for Water Efficiency](#)