2021 Fisheries Restoration Grant Program Proposal Solicitation Notice

North Fork of South Fork Noyo River

Photo Credit: Pre-Project Andrea Garcia (CDFW) and
Post-Project Mimi Caddell (AmeriCorps Watershed Stewards Program)

Application deadline: April 13, 2021

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Ecosystem Conservation Division

Watershed Restoration Grants Branch

In partnership with

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's

Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund

FRGP PSN 2021/2022

Overview

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is pleased to announce funding opportunities under the 2021 Fisheries Restoration Grant Program (FRGP) Proposal Solicitation Notice (Solicitation) for projects that lead to process-based restoration, enhancement, or protection of anadromous salmonid habitat. The projects will additionally contribute to the objectives of the California Water Action Plan, California Water Resilience Portfolio, State Wildlife Action Plan, and fulfillment of CDFW's mission. All qualified, eligible entities are encouraged to submit proposal applications.

The Fisheries Restoration Grant Program Grant Guidelines (Guidelines) provide detailed information on associated laws, regulations, and general grant requirements that the Program uses to establish processes, procedures, and criteria for administering the grants programs. However, the information in this Solicitation supersedes any discrepancies among the two documents.

Funding for Fiscal Year 2021/2022

Total funding available under this solicitation is anticipated to be approximately $14 million, contingent upon allocation from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF). There are no anticipated funds for the Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Fund for Forest Land Anadromous Restoration in 2021/2022.

Proposal Solicitation Schedule

Activity	Dates
Release Proposal Solicitation Notice	March 2, 2021
Application Workshops	See FRGP's Website (Various)
Proposals due by **3:00 p.m.**, Pacific Daylight Time	April 13, 2021
Proposal Evaluation	April 16 to June 22, 2021
Field Reviews	May 3 to June 22, 2021
Director Approval/Announce Award	December 2021 or January 2022
Execute Grant Agreements	Spring 2022
Complete all project work and submit deliverables/final invoice	April 1, 2026

Solicitation Workshops

Workshops highlighting updates to the Solicitation and application submission requirements will be held throughout the state. Workshop attendance is not a requirement for submitting application. Workshops may be recorded and made available online. Locations and dates will be posted on CDFW's Public Meetings and Notices website. Sign up to get notifications about upcoming workshops.

Application Proposal Package

Complete applications must be submitted online at CDFW WebGrants. The proposal application is listed under the WebGrants Funding Opportunity "FRGP 2021 Funding Opportunity". Applicants must have an active WebGrants user account to apply. Instructions for using the online process are on the FRGP PSN Website. When using the online application process, you are required to provide all materials requested in this Solicitation and comply with all requirements listed in the FRGP Guidelines for your project type.

Table of Contents

2021 FISHERIES RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM PROPOSAL SOLICITATION NOTICE

..... 1

OVERVIEW 3

FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021/2022 3

PROPOSAL SOLICITATION SCHEDULE 4

SOLICITATION WORKSHOPS 5

APPLICATION PROPOSAL PACKAGE 5

TABLE OF CONTENTS 6

1.0 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 8

1.1 Applicants *8*

1.2 Projects *8*

2.0 PROJECT TYPES 8

2.1 Priority 1 Project Types *8*

2.2 Priority 2 Project Types *9*

2.3 Priority 3 Project Types *9*

3.0 FRGP Overview and Background *11*

4.0 PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS 11

4.1 Tribal Consultation *12*

5.0 PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SCORING PROTOCOLS 13

5.1 Administrative Review *13*

5.2 Technical review criteria *15*

5.3 Cost Analysis Evaluation *15*

5.4 CDFW and NMFS Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review *19*

5.5 Program Criteria Review *21*

6.0 REFERENCES AND RESOURCES 25

Program *25*

Plans and Guides *25*

Codes and Regulations *27*

Permitting *27*

1.0 Eligibility criteria

1.1 Applicants

Eligible applicants include state and local government agencies, public entities, Native American Indian Tribes, and nonprofit organizations. Proposals from private individuals or for-profit enterprises will not be accepted.

1.2 Projects

Eligible projects for this solicitation are those for implementation or design projects that restore, enhance, or protect salmonid habitat in anadromous watersheds or projects that support implementation projects through planning, outreach, and/or education. Projects can include multiple project types listed in Section 2.0.

2.0 Project Types

Proposal applications will be accepted for the types of projects listed below, subject to the funding program criteria. Eligible project types are listed below within the NOAA PCSRF Funding Priorities. CDFW has developed a two-letter coding system for project types (see FRGP Guidelines, Part IV for detailed descriptions).

2.1 Priority 1 Project Types

Projects that restore, enhance, or protect salmonid habitat in anadromous watersheds through implementation or design projects that lead to implementation. Approximately 65% of the PCSRF grant award will fund Priority One Projects.

FP*+	Fish Passage at Stream Crossings
HB[1]*+	Instream Barrier Modification for Fish Passage
HI*+	Instream Habitat Restoration
HR*+	Riparian Restoration
HS*+	Instream Bank Stabilization
HU*+	Watershed Restoration (Upslope)
PD*	Project Design (100% design)
RE+	Cooperative Rearing
SC*+	Fish Screening of Diversions
WC*+	Water Conservation Measures

2.2 Priority 2 Project Types

Projects that monitor status and trends and directly contribute to population viability assessments for ESA-listed anadromous salmonids will be administered through a separate solicitation process outside of this 2021 FRGP Solicitation. Approximately 25% of the PCSRF grant award will fund Priority Two Projects.

2.3 Priority 3 Project Types

Projects that support implementation projects through planning, outreach, and/or education. Approximately 10% of the PCSRF grant award will fund Priority Three Projects. Proposals for FRGP programmatic permit required effectiveness monitoring are ineligible.

MO	Monitoring Watershed Restoration (Project-scale)
OR	Watershed and Regional Organization

PD* Project Design (Feasibility study)

PI Public Involvement and Capacity Building

(Includes AmeriCorps projects)

PL* Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning (Project-Scale)

TE* Private Sector Technical Training and Education

WD* + Water Measuring Devices (Instream and Water Diversion)

*Projects may require the services of a licensed professional engineer or licensed professional geologist to comply with the requirements of the Business and Professions Code section 6700 et seq. (Professional Engineers Act) and section 7800 et seq. (Geologists and Geophysicists Act). **If a proposed project requires the services of licensed professionals, these individuals and their affiliations must be identified in the proposal application. If this information cannot be provided with the application, an explanation must be provided.**

+All implementation type projects must have all designs and plans 100% completed prior to grant execution if the proposal is funded.

Projects required for mitigation or used for mitigation (such as under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Endangered Species Act (CESA), Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Forest Practices Act (FPA) or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA)) will not be considered for funding. Projects under enforcement action by a regulatory agency will not be considered for funding.

3.0 FRGP Overview and Background

The goal of the Fisheries Restoration Grant Program (FRGP) is to recover and conserve California's salmon and steelhead trout populations through process-based restoration activities that restore self-sustaining ecosystems. The Program objective is to fund projects that restore, enhance, or protect salmonid habitat in anadromous watersheds of California or projects that lead to restoration, enhancement, or protection of anadromous salmonid habitat.

Projects are determined to be accomplishing this objective by completing, in part or in whole, a task from a State or Federal recovery plan. A general overview of the geographic area covered by FRGP is shown on Map 1 in the FRGP Guidelines. See FRGP Guidelines Table 1: FRGP Focus Watersheds for the specific watersheds eligible under this Solicitation.

4.0 Program Requirements

Specific program requirements and detailed specifications for each project type are available in the FRGP Guidelines. In addition to the information required under Part II and III in the Guidelines. Information requested under each project type must be submitted in detail with the proposal application. The applicant will identify the primary project type that best describes the proposed project. Forms and examples of supplemental documents can be found at the FRGP Guidance Tools website. See FRGP Guidelines, Part V for more information and definitions of supplemental documents.

Implementation type projects must have all designs and plans 100% completed prior to grant execution, if the proposal is funded. Projects that have not been designed to meet all requirements of the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual, 4th Edition* (California Department of Fish and Game) ("CA Restoration Manual" or other approved guidelines and manuals for salmon and steelhead habitat restoration will have the responsibility of developing the

appropriate documentation for CEQA, ESA, and CESA compliance, including financial assurances under CESA (See FRGP Guidelines, Environmental Compliance and Permitting in Part V).

4.1 Tribal Consultation

CDFW recognizes the need for consultation regarding projects that affect California tribal communities. As such, applicants should make every effort to involve Native American Tribes or stakeholder groups as appropriate.

5.0 Proposal Evaluation and Scoring Protocols

5.1 Administrative Review

FRGP staff will conduct an administrative review on all proposals. The review will determine if the proposal is complete and meets all the submission requirements. If any "No" box is checked below, the proposal will be considered incomplete and will not receive further consideration.

Proposal Number & Type: _____	**Yes**	**No**	**N/A**
Proposed project is within the Solicitation focus.	☐	☐	☐
The proposal **as written** addresses the identified Recovery Task and can accomplish the Task in part or in whole.	☐	☐	☐
1. Intermediate Plans included. (Project Types: FP, SC)	☐	☐	☐
2. Conceptual Plans included. (Project Types: HU)	☐	☐	☐
3. Intermediate or Conceptual Plans included. (Project Types: HB, HI, HS, WC, WD	☐	☐	☐
4. Project Location Topographic Map included. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MO, PD, PL, RE, SC, WC, WD)	☐	☐	☐
5. Watershed (or County) Map included. (Project Types: HI, HU, MO, OR, PD, PI, PL, RE, TE, WD)	☐	☐	☐
6. Provisional Landowner Access Agreement/Provisional Resolution. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MO, PD, PL, RE, SC, TE, WC, WD)	☐	☐	☐
7. Applicable Detailed Project Budgets (including subcontractors). (Project Type: All)	☐	☐	☐
8. Federal Approved Indirect Rate Letter included. (Project Type: All)	☐	☐	☐
9. Water Law Compliance documents included. (Project Types: FP, HB, PD, SC, WC, WD)	☐	☐	☐

Proposal Number & Type: _____	Yes	No	N/A
10. Photographs included. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, PD, RE, SC, WC, WD)	☐	☐	☐
11. Status Report included. (Project Types: OR, PI)	☐	☐	☐
12. Fence Maintenance Plan included. (Project Type: HR)	☐	☐	☐
13. Riparian Restoration Plan included. (Project Type: HR)	☐	☐	☐
14. Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan included. (Project Types: MO)	☐	☐	☐
15. Existing Conditions Sketch included. (Project Type: PD)	☐	☐	☐
16. Five Year Management Plan. (Project Type: RE)	☐	☐	☐
17. Evaluation Plan included. (Project Types: TE)	☐	☐	☐
18. Invasive Species Prevention Protocols included. (Project Types: All)	☐	☐	☐
19. Reference Documents included. (Project Type: MO, PL)	☐	☐	☐
20. Program Permit Information Table – Appendix E. (Project Type: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, SC, WC, WD)	☐	☐	☐
21. Instream Benefits and Impact Analysis included. (Project Type: PD, WC)	☐	☐	☐
22. Water Accounting and Consumptive Use Analysis included. (Project Type: PD, WC)	☐	☐	☐
23. This proposal requires the Grace Period for further review.	☐	☐	

Grace Period Conditions: If receiving this review during the Grace Period please supply the missing document(s), marked "No", to WebGrants before the deadline or the proposal will be considered incomplete and rejected from further consideration.

5.2 Technical review criteria

See FRGP Guidelines for details of the review criteria for each project type.

The technical review consists of a Program Review Scoresheet, a Biological Review Scoresheet and an Engineering and Geotechnical Review Scoresheet if applicable. The Program Review is uniform for all proposals and reviews program requirements like qualifications, cost share, and budgets. The Biological Review is specific to each project type and reviews project details to evaluate the need and success of a project. The technical review typically includes a site visit with the applicant and reviewers. The Engineering and Geotechnical Review evaluates concerns to the safety of the public and the success of the project.

Applicants should plan to be available from May 3, 2021 through June 22, 2021. Reviewers review several sites a day and there is little flexibility.

5.3 Cost Analysis Evaluation

Evaluation of project cost analysis will include the following:

1. Comparison of wages, equipment rates, material costs, and other project costs for similar completed and proposed project work within similar geographic regions.
2. Review of labor costs identified by Department of Industrial Relations General Prevailing Wage Determinations, Davis-Bacon labor rates, and recent California Employment Development Department wage data.
3. Review of regional equipment rental cost information, including the most current version of California Department of Transportation's (CalTrans) Labor Surcharge and Equipment Rental Rates publication.

4. Restoration costs, labor requirements, and production rates identified in Appendix I of the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon, DFG 2004.

Cost analysis evaluation will consider project logistics (e.g., site remoteness, accessibility, coordination required with multiple land holdings), review of production rates/labor requirements in the regional area, and benefit to the recovery of anadromous salmonids. The total project cost does not affect the review score.

5.3.1 Cost Share Scoring Matrix

Proposal#: ___ Project Type: ___ Region:___ Reviewer: _____Date:__/_/____

Proposal Name: _____

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

(_____ /_____) x 100 =

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

(_____ /_____) x 100 =

Cost Share Categories

1. Cost share not suitable: Projects, personnel, or supplies and equipment previously funded by CDFW; resources expended prior to the term of the grant; salaries of permanently funded employees working for the CDFW or NOAA Fisheries; indirect charges; mitigation funds; cost share funds that will not be confirmed by December 1, 2021; cost share being used as match for other grants or entities.
2. Hard cost share: All hard cost share must be Non-Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which do not come from a Federal source. Hard cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project confirmed prior to August 1, 2021.
3. Soft cost share: All soft cost share is Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which come from a Federal source. Soft cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project. Cost share funds that will be confirmed after August 1, 2021 up until December 1, 2021.

Cost share scoring matrix:

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

5.4 CDFW and NMFS Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review

Proposal #: _____ Project Title: _____

CDFW or NMFS Review Engineer / Geologist: _____

Question	YES	NO	N/A	Comments
1. Are the problems to be addressed correctly identified and adequately characterized?	☐	☐	☐	
2. Does the design approach, including the O&M, address the identified problems?	☐	☐	☐	
3. Are the techniques proposed appropriate for the channel type (according to the CA Restoration Manual, Part III or accepted methods)?	☐	☐	☐	
4. Are the project materials utilized the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed?	☐	☐	☐	
5. Does the proposal identify all necessary surveys required to complete the design?	☐	☐	☐	
6. Does the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan Report describe the set of conditions, constraints, and requirements necessary for project design and are the plans >65 percent plan development for the following project categories: FP, HB, HS, WD (and some HI and HU)?	☐	☐	☐	

Question	YES	NO	N/A	Comments
7. Are any refinements that need to be made to the design reasonable to make between the 65% and 100% design? Does the project proponent / designer seem willing to, capable of, and have funds for making the necessary changes before the project is executed (if funded)?	☐	☐	☐	
8. If the project is likely to require future consultation or evaluation of a conceptual/intermediate plan as it is being developed is this consultation reflected in the project timeline and budget or can it be accomplished within the project timeline/budget?	☐	☐	☐	
9. Do the licensed engineers and/or geologists have the experience and expertise required for project success (e.g., demonstrated experience on similar projects; technical expertise appropriate to the project; communication, coordination, and logistical capabilities)?	☐	☐	☐	
10. If the project is likely to require the participation of a licensed engineer or geologist, is the licensed professional identified or the selection criteria for the licensed professional provided?	☐	☐	☐	
11. From an engineering perspective, should the proposal be considered for funding? Note: If any of the above questions were answered "NO", then the proposal should not be considered for funding at this time. If there are other engineering / feasibility reasons why the proposal should not be funded, state them here.	☐	☐	☐	

5.5 Program Criteria Review

Proposal#: _____ Region: ___ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the "Yes" column indicate "N/A" in lieu of "0".

Program Criteria Review Proposal #_____	**Yes**	**Med**	**Low**	**No**	**Comments**
1. Proposal demonstrates the project applicant or organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks. Yes = appropriate level of qualifications, experience, capacity, and successfully completed previously funded grant(s) (no missing deliverables, no invoicing problems, no missed timelines); Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, capacity, or 1 minor documented problem with completing funded grant(s); Low = lacks significant qualifications, experience, capacity, or more than 1 documented problem with completing funded grant(s); No = unqualified, inexperienced, uncooperative, or many documented problems with completing funded grant(s).	0 ☐ N/A ☐	-0.5 ☐	-1 ☐	DNF ☐	

Program Criteria Review Proposal #_____	Yes	Med	Low	No	Comments
2. Proposal demonstrates the identified subcontractor(s) has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks; if subcontractor(s) not identified, the selection criteria are described to ensure subcontractors will be appropriate to the work. Yes = appropriate level of qualifications, experience, capacity, selection criteria described, or no subcontractors needed; Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, capacity, or one minor documented problem with past work under funded grant(s), or selection criteria needs some clarity; Low = lacks significant qualifications, experience, capacity, or many documented problems with past work under funded grant(s), or selection criteria inadequate; No = unqualified, inexperienced, uncooperative, named subcontractors not appropriate for work proposed and selection criteria missing.	0 ☐ N/A ☐	-0.5 ☐	-1 ☐	DNF ☐	
3. Project Description includes required details as described in the PSN (Part IV introduction and Project Type specifics), necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = description includes required details described in the PSN to write a grant agreement; Med = description is missing required details described in the PSN and needs some clarification before a grant agreement can be written; No = description is missing details, is general, and/or a list of activities with no detail, lacking the detail necessary to write a grant agreement.	0 ☐ N/A ☐	-1 ☐		DNF ☐	

Program Criteria Review Proposal #_____	Yes	Med	Low	No	Comments
4. Project budget is **appropriate** for the work proposed. Yes = budget is appropriate; Med = budget has 1 line item inappropriate for the work proposed; Low = more than 1 budget line item is inappropriate for the work proposed; No = budget is inappropriate for the work proposed.	0 ☐ N/A ☐	-0.25 ☐	-0.5 ☒	DNF ☐	
5. Project budget is **cost effective**. Yes = budget is cost effective; Med = 1 or 2 budget items are not cost effective but overall the budget is acceptable; Low = more than 2 budget items are not cost effective but overall the budget is acceptable; No = overall budget is not cost effective.	0 ☐ N/A ☐	-0.25 ☐	-0.5 ☐	DNF ☐	
6. Project budget is **detailed** in describing project costs. Yes = budget has no unspecified lump sums; Med = budget has 1 unspecified lump sum without supplemental detail or adequate budget justification; Low = budget is lacking detail with more than 1 unspecified lump sum without supplemental detail or adequate budget justification, making it difficult to write a budget; No = budget has multiple lump sums lacking detail necessary to write a grant budget.	0 ☐ N/A ☐	-0.25 ☐	-0.5 ☐	DNF ☐	
7. Information supplied allows for a field review to be conducted. Yes = landowner(s) cooperative and site visit possible; No = landowner(s) uncooperative, site visit not possible.	0 ☐ N/A ☐			DNF ☐	

Program Criteria Review Proposal #_____	Yes	Med	Low	No	Comments
8. Project addresses wildfire impacts Yes = Project addresses substantial ecological impacts to the watershed and salmonids caused by wildfire or wildfire suppression and/or provides benefits to the watershed and salmonids quickly after implementation in affected wildfire areas. Wildfire Priority Justification is included as a supplemental document. No = Project does not improve ecological function in an area immediately affected by wildfire or Wildfire Priority Justification supplemental document is not included.	Add 0.5 ☐			0 ☐	
9. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).					

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Comments:

6.0 References and Resources

Program

CDFW's Public Meetings and Notices

FRGP Solicitation Documents

FRGP Guidance Tools

PCSRF Data Dictionary (select "Definitions" at top right)

CDFW WebGrants

Plans and Guides

California Department of Fish & Game. *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon*. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, 2004. (PDF)

Coho Salmon Recovery Tasks

Flosi, Gary, Scott Downie, James Hopelain, Michael Bird, Robert Coey, and Barry Collins. *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual, 4th edition*. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, 2010.

Volume 1 (PDF); *Volume 2* (PDF)

National Marine Fisheries Service. *Final Coastal Multispecies Recovery Plan: California Coastal Chinook Salmon, Northern California Steelhead, Central California Coast Steelhead*. NMFS West Coast Region, Santa Rosa, 2016.

National Marine Fisheries Service. *Final Recovery Plan for the Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit of Coho Salmon* *("SONCC plan")*. NMFS West Coast Region, Arcata, 2014.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1997. *Fish Screening Criteria for Anadromous Salmonids.* NMFS Southwest Region, 1997. (PDF)

National Marine Fisheries Service. *Guidelines for Electrofishing Waters Containing Salmonids Listed Under the Endangered Species Act*. 2000. (PDF)

National Marine Fisheries Service. *Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings*. NMFS Southwest Region, 2001. (PDF)

National Marine Fisheries Service. *Recovery Plan for Evolutionarily Significant Unit of Central California Coast Coho Salmon* *("CCC plan")*. NMFS Southwest Region, Santa Rosa, 2012.

National Marine Fisheries Service. *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.* NMFS West Coast Region, Sacramento, 2014. (PDF)

National Marine Fisheries Service. *South-Central California Steelhead Recovery Plan*. NMFS Southwest Region, Long Beach, 2013. (PDF)

National Marine Fisheries Service. *Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan*. NMFS Southwest Region, Long Beach, 2012.

California Water Action Plan

California Water Resilience Portfolio

State Wildlife Action Plan

Coastal Watershed Planning and Assessment Program (CWPAP)

Codes and Regulations

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.4: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts

California Employment Development Department wage data

California Endangered Species Act (CESA)

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

California Forest Practices Act (FPA), AKA, Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act or California Forest Practice Rules (PDF)

Code of Federal Regulations

- Federal Uniform Grant Guidance 2 CFR section 200
- Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC) 2 CFR section 200.68

Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA)

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

Permitting

CDFW Document Library – previous years' permit documents

CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit (SCP)

California Rapid Assessment Method

Coastal Development Permit(s) from the California Coastal Commission

Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Act

Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600 permit)

FRGP Mitigated Negative Declaration

NMFS Biological Opinions

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Amended General 401 Water Quality Certification Order for Small Habitat Restoration Projects

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) CWA Section 404 permitting

USACE Regional General Permits (RGP) (PDFs)

- RGP 12 (North Coast counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo (northeast, non-coastal), San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, Solano, Sonoma, and Trinity).

- RGP 16 (portions of the following Central Valley counties: Alameda, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Benito, San Joaquin, Shasta, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Tuolumne, Yolo, and Yuba Counties).

- RGP 78 (South Coast counties of Los Angeles District: Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura).