



California Department of Fish and Wildlife Cutting the Green Tape

Report to the Legislature in Compliance with Item 3600-001-0001,
Section 2.00, of the Budget Act of 2021
(SB 129, Budget Committee, Ch. 69, Statutes of 2021)

October 2022
Minor corrections made March 16, 2023



Cover Photo: The Garcia River Estuary Restoration Project in Mendocino County. The photo on the left shows the installation of engineered log jams. The photo on the right shows Garcia Estuary Upper Floodplain. – Photos by P. van de Burgt

Contents

Glossary	3
Executive Summary	4
Background	5
Legislative Reporting Requirements	5
1. A List and Description of The Restoration Projects Initiated	5
2. Average Restoration Permit Processing Times	7
3. The Number of Restoration Permits Issued	8
4. Specific Strategies and Changes Implemented as Part of This Initiative	8
5. Lessons Learned to Improve Ongoing Permitting Processes and Restoration Work	10
6. Counties and Watersheds In Which CDFW Has Focused Related Efforts	12
Conclusion.....	12
Appendix A	13
New Restoration Projects Funded by CDFW	13
Appendix B	19
Average Restoration Permit Processing Times	19
Appendix C	23
Restoration Projects Initiated by County	23

Glossary

CD – Consistency Determination (Fish & G. Code, § 2080.1)

CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CDP – Coastal Development Permit

CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act

CESA – California Endangered Species Act (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2050-2089.25)

CGT – Cutting the Green Tape Initiative

CNRA – California Natural Resources Agency

FRGP – Fisheries Restoration Grant Program

HREA – Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Act

LSA – Lake and Streambed Alteration

NCCP – Natural Community Conservation Plan

NCSP – North Coast Salmon Project

NOAA – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

PBO – Programmatic Biological Opinion

RMP – Restoration Management Permit

RCIS – Regional Conservation Investment Strategies

RLC – Restoration Leaders Committee

SERP – Statutory Exemption for Restoration Projects

SHaRP – Salmonid Habitat Restoration Priorities

SRGO - Statewide Restoration General Order

SWRCB – State Water Resources Control Board

Executive Summary

The Administration has identified "[Cutting Green Tape](#)" as a priority initiative to increase the pace and scale of ecological restoration, conservation, climate adaptation, and stewardship. Within the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), Cutting Green Tape (CGT) is focused on improving regulatory processes and policies so that ecological restoration and stewardship can occur more quickly, simply, and cost-effectively. CGT also supports and complements CNRA's "[30 by 30](#)" initiative, a commitment to achieving the goal of conserving 30 percent of California's lands and coastal waters by 2030.

With the support of the Administration, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is leading its own CGT initiative and is advancing several new approaches to support improved and enhanced restoration activities within its granting and environmental review programs. Many of these approaches were first supported with one-time funding in the Budget Act of 2020, with the direction "*to increase the scale and pace of restoration work, incorporate efficiencies into grant programs, and incorporate the use of programmatic permitting options.*"¹ CDFW's pilot initiative created several new improvements to CDFW's granting and restoration permitting procedures as described in our previous [Report to the Legislature](#).

Following the success of CDFW's pilot CGT initiative during the 2020-2021 fiscal year (FY 20-21), CDFW received permanent funding to create a new statewide CGT Program beginning in the 2021-22 fiscal year (FY 21-22). This report summarizes the outcomes that CDFW achieved under CGT during FY 21-22 and responds to the reporting mandates identified in Provision 3 of Senate (SB) Bill 129, which amended SEC. 84. Item 3600-001-0001 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2021.

Throughout the first full year, the CGT Program has continued to employ the tools and efficiencies previously developed across a wide spectrum of the state, beginning with our existing Fisheries Restoration Grants Program (FRGP), Proposition 1, and Proposition 68 grant programs. The Program's restoration permitting strike team (CGT Strike Team) is hard at work across the state, matching restoration projects with the most efficient permitting tools. During FY 21-22, CDFW funded, permitted, or assisted with environmental review exemptions for over 146 projects, 134,515 acres, and 103 stream miles saving an estimated \$1,552,600 dollars with an average processing time of 70 days. At the same time, the CGT Program has continued to develop and support new initiatives, including advancing the directives in Secretary Crowfoot's [CGI memorandum, and a new statutory California Environmental Quality Act \(CEQA\) exemption for eligible restoration projects](#), which resulted in CDFW concurring with six projects exemptions in FY 21-22. The pace and scale of

¹ 2020-21 May Revision to the Governor's Budget, Revised Budget Summary

habitat restoration and climate adaptation must increase as quickly as possible to preserve and restore biodiversity. CDFW is leading the way during this vital moment in the history of California.

Background

CDFW's ongoing CGT initiatives all follow the guiding principle of maintaining the integrity of regulatory oversight while efficiently streamlining processes and reducing costs for restoration projects. CDFW was able to develop and implement improvements in areas with direct benefits to existing projects while demonstrating a proof-of-concept for how a multidisciplinary team of granting and permitting specialists can focus efforts on increasing the pace and scale of restoration. With permanent funding and positions in the Budget Act of 2021 now in place, CDFW is applying these tools and moving towards a broader application of the program across the state, doing more restoration and doing it faster.

Legislative Reporting Requirements

As part of the approval of the CGT Program in the Budget Act of 2021, Provision 3 of SB 129 mandates that:

By October 1 of each year, beginning in 2021 and ending in 2026, the department [CDFW] shall submit to the fiscal committees of the Legislature and the Legislative Analyst's Office a report summarizing outcomes of its Cutting the Green [Tape] Initiative. The report shall include information related to the results of this initiative, beginning with the baseline year of 2020–21 and for each fiscal year thereafter, including: (1) a list and description of the restoration projects initiated, (2) average restoration permit processing times, (3) the number of restoration permits issued, (4) specific strategies and changes implemented as part of the initiative, (5) lessons learned to improve ongoing permitting processes and restoration work, and (6) counties and watersheds in which the department has focused related efforts.

In response to SB 129 and the specific information requested, CDFW provides the following information for each requirement above:

1. A List and Description of The Restoration Projects Initiated

In FY 21-22 as part of the CGT program, CDFW initiated 146 restoration projects across six categories of project or permitting types as follows: restoration management permits, restoration consistency determinations, Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Act projects, lake and streambed alteration

agreements, statutory exempt restoration projects, and restoration grants. The lists of restoration projects are identified in Appendices A through C.

RESTORATION MANAGEMENT PERMITS (RMPs)

The Restoration Management Permit (RMP) consolidates CDFW “take” authorizations that restoration projects may need to obtain into a single streamlined permit. The RMP authorizes take of 1) endangered, threatened, and candidate species pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA); and 2) fully protected species. CDFW initiated and completed the approval of seven RMPs to date.

RESTORATION CONSISTENCY DETERMINATIONS (CDs)

CDFW created new procedures to issue Consistency Determinations (CDs) using federal Programmatic Biological Opinions (PBO) in response to strong interest from the restoration community to develop programmatic permitting options. CDFW worked closely with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries to develop a new process for issuing CDs that involves CDFW’s “pre-approval” of PBOs to ensure general consistency with CESA coupled with an expedited review of project-specific applications. Under this process, possible conflicts between CESA and the PBO are resolved at the front end, resulting in an expedited CD process that focuses solely on project-specific review of an application for consistency with the PBO. CDFW initiated and completed the approval of four Restoration CDs in FY 21-22.

HABITAT RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT ACT (HREA) PROJECTS

The Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Act (HREA) established permitting efficiencies for any person, public agency, or nonprofit organization seeking to implement a habitat restoration or enhancement project. By combining multiple CDFW approvals into a single approval, HREA expedites small voluntary habitat restoration and enhancement projects. HREA is an excellent permitting option for small restoration projects smaller than five acres in size, and under 500 linear feet of impact to streams or shorelines. Thirty-three HREA approvals were initiated and completed in FY 21-22.

LAKE AND STREAMBED ALTERATION (LSA) AGREEMENTS FOR RESTORATION PROJECTS

CDFW requires a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement when a project activity may substantially adversely affect fish and wildlife resources. Fish and Game Code section 1602 requires any person, state or local governmental agency, or public utility to notify CDFW prior to beginning any activity that may do one or more of the following:

- Divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake;
- Change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake;
- Use material from any river, stream, or lake; or
- Deposit or dispose of material into any river, stream, or lake.

Twenty-eight LSA agreements for restoration projects were initiated and completed in FY 21-22.

STATUTORY EXEMPTION FOR RESTORATION PROJECTS (SERP)

Governor Newsom signed SB155, on September 23, 2021, adding Section 21080.56 to California Public Resources Code. This section provides a CEQA statutory exemption until January 1, 2025, for fish and wildlife restoration projects that meet certain requirements (SERP). CDFW's CGT Program is responsible for coordinating with lead agencies seeking SERP concurrence. CDFW initiated the concurrence for twelve SERP projects in FY 21-22. Ten concurrence requests have been approved to date. One initiated concurrence pursued an alternate CEQA pathway, and the lead agency for one initiated project has not yet submitted a SERP concurrence request to CDFW.

NEW RESTORATION PROJECTS FUNDED BY CDFW

CDFW's Watershed Restoration Grants Branch oversees the CGT Program and administers several grant programs to fund science-informed projects for restoration of ecological function and conservation and assesses the success of those efforts at a large-scale. These granting programs include state bond funded programs through Proposition 1 and Proposition 68, the federally funded Fisheries Restoration Grant Program (FRGP), and a wetland restoration program supported with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funding. See **Appendix A New Restoration Projects Funded by CDFW** for a list and description of 62 New Restoration Projects funded by CDFW in FY 21-22.

2. Average Restoration Permit Processing Times

CDFW has made major strides to help consolidate and streamline permitting processes, and to educate partners about the most effective vehicle for permitting a given restoration project. CDFW has made significant improvements in timelines for permitting take of species for complex, large scale restoration projects, which historically took between one and three years. In contrast, CDFW's new restoration permits have much shorter processing times. For example, CDFW is targeting issuing RMPs for projects within less than six months of permit initiation, HREAs within 60 days (Fish and Game Code 1652) or 30 days (Fish and Game Code 1653), Restoration CDs within 30 days or less, and SERP concurrences within 60 days or less, and continue to strive for additional improvements whenever possible. **Appendix B Average Restoration Permit**

Processing Times identifies FY 21-22 project timelines working towards these targets. As can be expected, occasional outlier permit processing durations often include factors outside the control of both CDFW and the Applicant.

3. The Number of Restoration Permits Issued

CDFW issued a total of 64 permits and SERP concurrences for restoration projects between July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022. Table 1 provides the total by permit or exemption type for FY 21-22.

Table 1: CDFW Permits and SERP Concurrences Issued for Restoration Projects, July 2021-June 2022

Permit or Exemption Type	RMP	CD	HREA	LSA	SERP
Number	4	4	33	17	6

4. Specific Strategies and Changes Implemented as Part of This Initiative

CDFW's CGT Program continues to focus efforts on increasing the pace and scale of restoration work through the development and implementation of efficiencies in our granting and permitting programs while supporting the efforts of other agencies. The CGT Program also applies an adaptive management approach to adopting and supporting new initiatives, including the new SERP process for CEQA exemption established last year through SB 155.

The CGT Program has continued efforts to improve the expediency and efficiency of grant administration policy and process. CDFW has continued making improvements to the amendment process, and recently developed and implemented a Contingency Request process for current CDFW funded grants experiencing budget shortfalls. This rolling, ongoing solicitation with a simple application process is separate from annual solicitations and is designed to keep projects moving forward with additional funding without delay. The first Contingency Request submitted by a grantee was reviewed, approved, and executed within 30 days.

Working closely with the California Coastal Commission (CCC), CDFW through the FRGP began development of a first of its kind Coastal Development Permit (CDP), which would allow for programmatic coverage for FRGP funded restoration projects in the Coastal Zone. Dedicated CGT staff with CCC experience have aided in the permit negotiations which would allow for programmatic CDP coverage for FRGP projects in the Coastal Zone.

CDFW created a Strike Team that transcends historical boundaries between traditional CDFW regions, headquarters, and programs. Operating in this space

has provided unprecedented opportunities for streamlining, innovation, and collaboration on complex issues. The Strike Team utilizes a cooperative approach to develop permits and procedures in real time, which continues efforts to streamline and expedite project review and permitting.

Other FY 21-22 strategies and accomplishments include:

- Continued improvements to how CDFW processes grant agreements and amendments. Thus, resulting in an expected process time reduction of approximately 40%.
- Revised grant application processes to create a more simplified streamlined application that includes early consultation with CDFW staff.
- Continued engagement with the Restoration Leaders Committee (RLC) to implement and further develop recommendations to improve granting practices.
- Continued coordination with the North Coast Salmon Project (NCSP) to accelerate restoration in the focus areas. CDFW awarded \$14,196,640 to 17 projects located in NCSP watersheds.
- Development of the Lagunitas Creek Salmonid Habitat Restoration Priorities (SHaRP) Action Plan by the NCSP, the second SHaRP action plan completed to date.
- Continued development of the new RMP and Restoration CD to consolidate take authorizations into a single permit, standardize permitting practices within CDFW, facilitate more efficient permitting, and minimize permit applications and fees.
- Advancement of the development and finalization of Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) and Regional Conservation Investment Strategies (RCISs).
- Support for the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in development of a General Order for Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification and Waste Discharge Requirements for Implementation of Large Habitat Restoration Projects Statewide, also known as the Statewide Restoration General Order (SRGO).
- Rapid implementation of SERP. Processes and templates are now established and CDFW anticipates continued routine SERP coordination with lead agencies across California.
- Development of CDFW's new CGT Website to provide project proponents additional information and resources regarding CGT efforts.
- Participation in CGT outreach, training, and interagency coordination events, collaborating with stakeholders and restoration practitioners across the state.

5. Lessons Learned to Improve Ongoing Permitting Processes and Restoration Work

The first year of CDFW's new CGT Program was guided by an adaptive management approach to how and where CDFW should continue to focus our efforts. Continuing to implement new permitting tools while incorporating and developing new initiatives like SERP required an adaptive and collaborative approach. The lessons learned center around several key areas that support continued collaboration internally and with our partners, continued development of new initiatives, a focus on ongoing education, outreach, and personal attention to each project, continued self-assessment, and adaptation to changing conditions.

Continue Collaboration – CDFW focused much of its efforts this past year on engagement with the restoration community through the RLC, public workshops, interagency meetings, conferences and webinars, and many CGT consultations directly with project proponents. This open and transparent dialogue increased our ability to understand what issues are facing the restoration community along with what CDFW could and should be focused on in the near-and long-term. These efforts also provided a renewed sense of collaboration and commitment to the restoration community to support continued investigations into ways in which CDFW can improve and accelerate restoration efforts. Finally, The CGT Program is focused on accelerating restoration in areas that may be underserved by current restoration efforts. This includes tribal lands, urban habitats, and disadvantaged communities who may have limited access to healthy ecosystems. As nature is healed across California, the CGT Program is committed to reaching out to underserved communities to ensure that they are included.

Continued Development of New Initiatives – CDFW has learned that additional solutions may be helpful to move beyond the first phase of CGT tools. For example, the RMP could be improved by more easily and simply incorporating take coverage for common species and species of special concern. CDFW is actively pursuing options to incorporate this take authority into the RMP as soon as possible. Restoration stakeholders have also pointed out that LSA agreement notification fees can run as high as approximately \$100,000 for a single restoration project. CDFW is actively pursuing options to address this issue while ensuring that any changes do not deplete essential revenue necessary to protect California's wildlife from non-restoration activities.

Focus on Education, Outreach, and a Personalized Approach – The main issues surrounding delays in restoration granting and permitting often center around project proponents not being fully aware of the suite of

streamlined permitting processes available, or which pathways to choose. In response to this problem, another key component of our first full year involved increasing our education and outreach efforts, along with a personalized approach to Strike Team staff proactively working through project options with proponents. Working with restoration leaders from the state, federal, and private sectors, CDFW led and participated in multiple public venues to discuss restoration activities and approaches to permitting. The participation and positive feedback from these events were overwhelming with approximately 1,100 participants attending CGT outreach opportunities during FY 21-22. Continued outreach efforts coordinated with pre-project consultations for as many restoration projects as possible will also increase restoration across the state.

Continued Self-Assessment – Problem solving often requires repeated and varied attempts to reach success. Many of the innovations that have come from CGT stem from CDFW's willingness to try new ways of conducting business, evaluating the outcomes, and quickly adjusting as needed. Learning from the projects that we are implementing in our SERP, RMP, and Restoration CD processes, in addition to the projects that have been funded through our North Coast Solicitation, CDFW expects to continue learning and making additional refinements to improve efficiencies. Implementation of improved tools and processes will require ongoing refinements to restoration permitting templates, training CDFW staff, preparing external restoration permitting guidance, holding additional workshops for the restoration community, and providing restoration permitting expertise for early project consultation statewide. Additionally, CDFW identified the need to explore strategies to improve the LSA agreement process for restoration projects and look for ways to integrate restoration project LSA agreements with our new take permitting tools.

Adaptation to Changing Conditions – With the urgent need to address the climate and biodiversity crises, the CGT Strike Team will need to quickly adapt to permitting more projects, larger projects, and in some cases, experimental restoration projects that may be unable to fully address every uncertainty. One important changed condition was the unexpected addition of SERP to the CGT Strike Team's workload, which currently accounts for roughly half of the workload for the entire CGT Program. Although the CGT Program quickly developed procedures to implement SERP, as more restoration projects utilize SERP as an option, the risk increases that the CGT Program could have a difficult time meeting its primary funded and mandated responsibilities described in this report. CDFW may need to augment the CGT Program to adequately address future demands of increased restoration work throughout the state as new tools and expectations change related to CGT efforts.

6. Counties and Watersheds In Which CDFW Has Focused Related Efforts

The CGT pilot program initially focused on accelerating restoration in the North Coast Salmon Project focus areas of Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, and Marin counties and the Lagunitas, Russian, Mendocino (Coast), and South Fork Eel watersheds. However, our emphasis has continued to extend statewide throughout California. **Appendix C Restoration Projects Initiated by County**, Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate areas of focus to date.

Conclusion

In the first full year of CDFW's CGT Program, progress was made in the effort to increase the pace and scale of habitat restoration projects supported by CDFW. Grant funding reached more projects faster, with more efficiency. Permitting tools like HREA, the RMP and the Restoration CD are currently benefitting numerous projects with faster permitting timeframes while the process and scope continue to be refined. Delivering SERP within this fiscal year is a notable success for the CGT team and the concurrences issued have yielded significant and measurable cost and time savings to project proponents. These permitting tools have expedited several projects this past year and the program's goal is to extend this effort statewide this year.

Alongside implementing new restoration projects, CDFW has placed equal focus on the internal effort to further refine these tools and develop new ideas for truly increasing the pace and scale. There is more work to do, and new grant program initiatives and continued rollout of permitting strategies will further the reach of CGT through the next fiscal year.

Appendix A
New Restoration Projects Funded by CDFW

Table A1: Prop 1 CGT/NCSP Solicitation Projects Awarded in FY 21-22

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
Garcia River Estuary Enhancement Project	The Nature Conservancy	Mendocino	\$2,838,210.60
Eel River Arundo Eradication Planning Project	Eel River Watershed Improvement Group (ERWIG)	Humboldt	\$52,087
Bull Creek Hamilton Reach Instream and Floodplain Habitat Restoration Project	California Trout, Inc.	Humboldt	\$2,425,232.32
Mt. Gilead Water Conservation and Streamflow Improvement Project	North Coast Resource Conservation & Development Council	Sonoma	\$1,406,464.66
Greene Off-Channel Habitat Enhancement Design Project	North Coast Resource Conservation & Development Council	Sonoma	\$452,869.03
The South Fork Eel River Seasonal Fish Weir: Targeting segregation and removal of an invasive predatory fish to benefit recovering salmonids	California Trout, Inc.	Mendocino	\$542,544.97
Lagunitas Creek Coho Habitat Enhancement Final Design Plan	Marin Municipal Water District	Marin	\$869,178
Ten Mile River Habitat Enhancement Phase 2 Design	The Nature Conservancy	Mendocino	\$694,650.85
Atascadero Subwatershed Streamflow Enhancement Planning Project	Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District	Sonoma	\$85,567.92
Large Wood Augmentation in High Priority Coho Salmon Habitat in Mendocino County	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Mendocino	\$1,768,095

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
Mill Creek Streamflow Enhancement Focused Outreach and Planning	Coast Range Watershed Institute	Sonoma	\$209,639.86
Sproul Creek Road Erosion and Fish Passage Barrier Assessment and Implementation Planning Project	Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife and Wetlands Restoration Association	Humboldt	\$589,454.80
Navarro-Mill Creek Habitat Enhancement Project	The Nature Conservancy	Mendocino	\$787,436.26
Yale Creek Watershed Protection and Enhancement Project	Sonoma State University	Mendocino	\$474,942.20
Indian Creek Aquatic Habitat Improvement Design Project	Eel River Watershed Improvement Group (ERWIG)	Mendocino	\$397,785
Jameson Rock Creek, South Fork Eel River Sediment Reduction Project, Mendocino County, California.	Mendocino County Resource Conservation District	Mendocino	\$263,145.62
Standley Creek Restoration Implementation Plan	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Mendocino	\$639,336.46

Table A2: Proposition 1 Projects Awarded in FY 21-22

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
Cedar Creek Habitat Restoration and Passage Improvement Design	Hoopa Tribal Fisheries	Humboldt	\$202,291
2022 Upper Truckee River Watershed Acquisition	California Tahoe Conservancy	El Dorado	\$1,500,000
Ackerson Meadow Restoration Project- Phase 1 Implementation	American Rivers	Tuolumne	\$3,173,267
Buena Vista Lagoon Enhancement Project Phase II	San Diego Association of Governments	San Diego	\$4,219,328
Clear Creek ACID Siphon Fish Passage Planning Project	Western Shasta Resource	Shasta	\$499,734

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
	Conservation District		
Fall Creek Fish Ladder Rehabilitation Project: Enhancing Survivability of Central California Coast Steelhead and Coho Salmon in the San Lorenzo River Watershed	San Lorenzo Valley Water District	Santa Cruz	\$1,116,166
Feasibility of acoustic telemetry in delta smelt	Regents of the University of California, Davis	Yolo	\$1,226,518
Green Sturgeon Population Monitoring and Habitat Analysis	Regents of the University of California, Santa Cruz	Shasta, Tehama, Glenn	\$812,184
Kelsey Creek Fish Passage Project	Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians	Lake	\$1,976,660
Lower Lacey Meadow Restoration	Truckee River Watershed Council	Nevada, Sierra	\$1,344,890
Lower Stotenburg Creek Coho Habitat Enhancement Implementation Project	Smith River Alliance	Del Norte	\$946,848
Phase 1 Finney-Ramer Unit Habitat Restoration Project	River Partners	Imperial	\$1,816,516
Quantifying Component Mortality Rates of Juvenile Salmonids	Regents of the University of California, Santa Cruz	San Joaquin	\$565,268
Quantifying relative risk of collapse for Delta fish populations	Regents of the University of California, Davis	Yolo	\$358,463
Robles Diversion and Fish Passage Design Planning Project	Ventura County Watershed Protection District	Ventura	\$3,115,851
Rowdy and Dominie Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project	Tolowa Dee-ni Nation	Del Norte	\$6,886,518
Scott Creek Coastal Resiliency Project: Climate Change Technical Studies and Planning	Resource Conservation District of Santa Cruz County	Santa Cruz	\$409,133

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
Socio-Ecological Potential for Co-management of Tidal Wetlands for Fish and Fowl	Regents of the University of California, Davis	Solano	\$944,551
Soda Creek Restoration and Fisheries Improvement Planning Project	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Plumas	\$180,326.64
Trade-offs and Co-benefits of Landscape Change in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta: Phase II Tidal Wetlands and Restoration	Point Blue Conservation Science	Solano, San Joaquin	\$196,114
Wheeler Gorge Campground Fish Passage Project-- Implementation	Earth Island Institute	Ventura	\$2,972,220
When the rubber meets the river: an assessment of 6PPD-quinone on Delta species of conservation concern	Regents of the University of California, Davis	Yolo	\$547,024
Where, when, and how do wetlands export food for smelt to open waters of the estuary?	San Francisco State University	Marin, Solano	\$703,883
YMCA Camp Jones Gulch Conservation Easement	Sempervirens Fund	San Mateo	\$1,002,000

Table A3: FRGP Projects Awarded in FY 21-22

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
Brandon Gulch Coho Stream Habitat Enhancement Project	Mendocino Land Trust	Mendocino County	\$249,480
East Branch North Fork Big River Coho Habitat Enhancement Project - Large Wood (Phase III)	California Conservation Corps	Mendocino County	\$364,292
Scott Bar Mill Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project	California Trout, Inc.	Siskiyou County	\$748,749
Garcia River Estuary Salmonid Habitat Enhancement Project - Phase 1B Implementation	The Nature Conservancy	Mendocino County	\$1,473,338

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
Upper Sproul Creek Habitat Enhancement Project	Eel River Watershed Improvement Group (ERWIG)	Humboldt County	\$330,470
Albion River and Tom Bell Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement Project	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Mendocino County	\$363,760.80
Upper SF Eel River Habitat Design Project	Eel River Watershed Improvement Group (ERWIG)	Mendocino County	\$156,483
Red Bank Off-Channel Fisheries and Riparian Habitat Enhancement Project	Salmon River Restoration Council	Siskiyou County	\$1,892,922
Soda Creek Fish Passage and Winter Habitat Refugia Design Project	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Mendocino County	\$264,119
Smith River Estuary Backwater Habitat Enhancement Project - Tedsen Backwater	Smith River Alliance	Del Norte County	\$527,637
Ryan Creek Off-Channel Coho Habitat Implementation Project	Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife and Wetlands Restoration Association	Humboldt County	\$737,716
Buckeye Creek Storm-proofing and Habitat Protection Project	The Conservation Fund	Sonoma County	\$228,248
Dry Dock Gulch Alcove Habitat Enhancement and Fish Passage Project	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Mendocino County	\$1,450,059
South Coast Steelhead Coalition	California Trout, Inc.	Orange, Riverside, San Diego Counties	\$305,473
California Conservation Corps Watershed Stewardship Program	California Conservation Corps - Watershed Stewards Program	Coastal California	\$617,553
Weston-Champagne Cachagua Creek Fish Passage Project	Resource Conservation District of Monterey County	Monterey County	\$669,998
Potrero Creek Fish Passage / Lower Culvert Project -	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Monterey County	\$619,754

Project Title	Organization	County	Funding Amount
Carmel Valley Athletic Club, Carmel Valley			
Jacoby Creek Off-Channel Refuge and Rearing Habitat Planning Project	Redwood Community Action Agency	Humboldt County	\$155,938
Lower Ryan Creek Off- Channel Habitat and Floodplain Enhancement Planning Project	Redwood Community Action Agency	Humboldt County	\$361,964
Matthews Creek Floodplain Habitat Enhancement Design	Salmon River Restoration Council	Siskiyou County	\$463,703
Zanker Farm Salmonid Habitat Restoration Project Phase II	Tuolumne River Conservancy, Inc.	Stanislaus County	\$662,263

Appendix B

Average Restoration Permit Processing Times

Table B1: Restoration Permit and SERP Concurrence Processing Times

Project Title	Permit Initiation Date	Permit Completion Date	Number of Days
Redwoods Rising Ecosystem Restoration Program: Greater Mill Creek and Greater Prairie Creek Ecosystem Restoration - RMP	4/5/2021	9/9/2021	151
Establishment of Unarmored Threespine Stickleback and Southern Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog at Bluff Lake, California - RMP	4/15/2021	4/22/2022	372
Garcia River Estuary Enhancement Project - RMP	2/25/2022	5/27/2022	91
Taylor-Tallac Creek Restoration Project Phase 1 - RMP	4/18/2022	6/1/2022	44
Average RMP Processing Time			165
Paynes Creek Bend Water Users Fish Passage Restoration Project – Restoration CD	6/4/2021	7/6/2021	32
Elk River Sediment Remediation and Habitat Rehabilitation Implementation Pilot Project – Restoration CD	1/11/2022	2/10/2022	30
Cienega Springs Ecological Reserve Restoration Project – Restoration CD	3/8/2022	4/5/2022	28
Redwood National and State Park Visitor Center and Restoration Project – Restoration CD	4/15/2022	5/16/2022	31
Average Restoration CD Processing Time			30
Shady Lane Sewer Removal - HREA	6/7/2021	7/29/2021	52
Kenny Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement Project - HREA	7/30/2021	9/27/2021	59
Slippery Rock Ranch Riparian Habitat Restoration - HREA	9/8/2021	10/27/2021	49
Foster Park Fish Passage Improvement Project- HREA	1/5/2022	3/4/2022	58
Cachagua Creek Fish Passage Restoration Project – HREA Amendment	5/12/2021	7/6/2021	55
Campbell Creek Fish Passage Project – HREA Amendment	5/19/2021	7/16/2021	58

Project Title	Permit Initiation Date	Permit Completion Date	Number of Days
Jameson Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project – HREA Amendment	6/24/2021	7/14/2021	20
South Fork Scott River Floodplain Restoration- Phase II - HREA	6/22/2021	7/22/2021	30
Hayworth Creek Large Wood Augmentation Project - HREA	8/9/2021	8/19/2021	10
Middle Fork Ten Mile Large Wood Augmentation Project - HREA	8/9/2021	8/19/2021	10
Bond Creek Large Wood Augmentation Project - HREA	8/9/2021	8/19/2021	10
Neefus Gulch Fish Passage and Habitat Improvement Project - HREA	8/9/2021	8/19/2021	10
Mill Creek Ward Dam Sediment Removal Project - HREA	8/20/2021	8/26/2021	6
Stevens Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project - HREA	8/9/2021	9/8/2021	30
Round Valley Meadow Restoration Project - HREA	8/19/2021	9/2/2021	14
China Creek Wood Loading Project - HREA	8/19/2021	9/17/2021	29
Lost River Road Upgrade Project - HREA	9/3/2021	10/1/2021	28
Aldergrove Marsh Restoration Project Phase 1 - HREA	9/8/2021	10/6/2021	29
Horse Creek Off-channel Alcove Project - HREA	9/15/2021	10/15/2021	30
Upper Sugar Creek Accelerated Wood Recruitment Project - HREA	9/21/2021	10/21/2021	30
Lower Flynn Creek Infiltration Pilot Project - HREA	11/17/2021	12/16/2021	29
Strawberry Creek at Clam Beach Fish Passage Improvement Project - HREA	11/17/2021	12/16/2021	29
Rock Creek Meadow Shasta Crayfish Habitat Augmentation - HREA	11/29/2021	12/29/2021	30
Elk Creek Fish Passage and Sediment Reduction Project - HREA	12/15/2021	1/11/2022	27
East Weaver Dam Removal and Intake Relocation Project - HREA	1/12/2022	2/11/2022	30
Cedar Creek Dam Removal Project - HREA	3/15/2022	4/14/2022	30
Fish Creek Fish Passage Project - HREA	4/1/2022	4/28/2022	27

Project Title	Permit Initiation Date	Permit Completion Date	Number of Days
South Fork Floodplain Connectivity Phase III - HREA	4/19/2022	5/4/2022	15
Santa Ana River Stream Habitat Improvement Project - HREA	4/25/2022	5/25/2022	30
Mindego Creek Fish Passage Project - HREA	5/3/2022	6/2/2022	30
Live Willow Sediment Baffles & Brush/Wood Gully Grade Control Project - HREA	5/17/2022	6/16/2022	30
San Geronimo Creek Roy's Pools – HREA Amendment	7/19/2022	7/29/2022	10
Ten Mile River Mainstem Enhancement Project Phase 1 – HREA Amendment	9/27/2022	10/27/2022	30
Average HREA Processing Time			29
FRGP Agreement Q2110507 - Upper Sproul Creek Habitat Enhancement Project – LSA Agreement	5/27/2021	6/15/2021	19
Rowdy and Dominie Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project – LSA Agreement	11/1/2021	6/30/2022	241
FRGP Big River Riparian Roads Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	8/20/2021	8/27/2021	7
FRGP - Bull Creek Hamilton Reach Instream and Floodplain Habitat Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	6/8/2021	7/2/2021	24
Canon Creek Instream Habitat Improvement Project (FRGP) – LSA Agreement	5/9/2022	6/1/2022	23
Garcia River Estuary Habitat Enhancement Project – LSA Agreement	2/17/2022	5/23/2022	95
English Meadow Floodplain Enhancement and Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	1/3/2022	5/16/2022	133
Taylor and Tallac Restoration Project - Phase One Aquatic Invasive Plants Removal – LSA Agreement	7/26/2021	10/29/2021	95
Hemphill Diversion Structure Project – LSA Agreement	4/21/2022	6/21/2022	61
Upland Watercourse Restoration and Enhancement – LSA Agreement	7/30/2021	10/6/2021	68
Bale Slough Bear Creek Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	11/22/2021	6/23/2022	213

Project Title	Permit Initiation Date	Permit Completion Date	Number of Days
Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	11/29/2021	1/11/2022	43
StopWaste Pond M1 Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	7/31/2021	8/24/2021	24
Pleasanton Ridge Ponds 22 and 39 Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	7/25/2021	8/26/2021	32
Green Oaks Restoration Project – LSA Agreement	2/8/2022	6/27/2022	139
Federal Boulevard Chollas Creek Restoration & Trail Project – LSA Agreement	9/16/2021	4/27/2022	223
Vegetation Enhancement Project at Clubhouse – LSA Agreement	10/13/2021	12/7/2021	55
Average LSA Agreements for Restoration Projects Processing Time			88
Garcia River Estuary Enhancement Project – SERP Concurrence	12/20/2021	12/28/2021	8
Lakeville Creek Restoration Project – SERP Concurrence	3/9/2022	3/30/2022	21
Ormond Beach Initial Restoration Project – SERP Concurrence	3/24/2022	4/18/2022	25
Big Canyon Coastal Habitat Restoration and Resiliency Project – Phase 3 – SERP Concurrence	3/24/2022	5/16/2022	53
Butano Creek Backfield Floodplain and Streamflow Enhancement Project – SERP Concurrence	4/15/2022	6/20/2022	66
Riparian Area 1 Restoration Project at River Garden Farms – SERP Concurrence	4/19/2022	6/24/2022	66
Average SERP Processing Time			40

Appendix C
Restoration Projects Initiated by County

Table C1: Restoration Projects Initiated by County

County	RMP	CD	HREA	LSA	SERP	CDFW Grants	Total
Alameda				3			3
Contra Costa				1			1
Del Norte			1	2		3	6
El Dorado	1			1		1	3
Humboldt	2	2	5	3	1	8	21
Imperial				1		1	2
Lake					1	1	2
Madera					1		1
Marin			2			1	3
Mariposa				1	1		2
Mendocino	1		10	3	1	16	31
Merced				1			1
Monterey			1	1		2	4
Napa				1			1
Nevada				1	1		2
Nevada, Sierra				1			1
Orange					1		1
Placer				1			1
Plumas						1	1
Riverside			1				1
San Bernardino	1						1
San Diego				1		1	2
San Joaquin						1	1
San Mateo			1	1	1	1	4
Santa Barbara			1				1
Santa Clara			1				1
Santa Cruz						2	2
Shasta			1			1	2
Siskiyou			5	1		3	9

County	RMP	CD	HREA	LSA	SERP	CDFW Grants	Total
Solano						1	1
Sonoma				1	1	5	7
Stanislaus					1	1	2
Sutter				1			1
Tehama	1	1	2	2			6
Trinity			1				1
Tuolumne						1	1
Ventura	1	1	1		1	2	6
Yolo					1	3	4
Marin, Solano						1	1
Nevada, Sierra						1	1
Shasta, Tehama, Glenn						1	1
Solano, San Joaquin						1	1
Orange, Riverside, San Diego Counties						1	1
Coastal California						1	1
Total	7	4	33	28	12	62	146



Watershed Restoration Grants Branch Cutting The Green Tape - FY 21/22 Projects

CUTTING THE GREEN TAPE

Categories

Project Category

- △ Restoration CDs (4)
- ▲ Fisheries Restoration Grant Program Projects (21)
- Habitat Restoration Enhancement Areas (33)
- Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements (28)
- Proposition 1 Projects (24)
- Proposition 1 NSCP Projects (17)
- ◇ Restoration Management Permits (7)
- ◆ Statutory Exemption for Restoration Projects (12)



0 25 50 100 Miles

August, 2022



Watershed Restoration Grants Branch Cutting The Green Tape - FY 21/22 Projects

CUTTING THE GREEN TAPE

Watersheds



Watershed	Sites	Watershed	Sites	Watershed	Sites
Big-Navarro-Garcia	22	Monterey Bay	1	Scott	4
Big Chico Creek-Sacramento River	4	Newport Bay	1	Smith	7
Calleguas	1	Paynes Creek-Sacramento River	3	South Fork Eel	14
Central Coastal	4	Russian	5	Suisun Bay	1
Clear Creek-Sacramento River	2	Sacramento-Stone Corral	2	Thomes Creek-Sacramento River	1
Coyote	1	Salmon	2	Trinity	3
East Branch North Fork Feather	1	Salton Sea	2	Truckee	2
Gualala-Salmon	2	San Diego	2	Upper Cache	2
Lake Tahoe	2	San Francisco Bay	1	Upper Carson	1
Lower Eel	3	San Francisco Coastal	5	Upper Coon-Upper Auburn	1
Lower Klamath	1	South	1	Upper Klamath	2
Lower Pit	1	San Joaquin Delta	4	Upper Merced	1
Lower Sacramento	5	San Luis Rey-Escondido	1	Upper San Joaquin	1
Mad-Redwood	10	San Pablo Bay	4	Upper San Joaquin	1
Mattole	2	Santa Ana	2	Upper Tuolumne	2
Middle San Joaquin-Lower Chowchilla	3	Santa Barbara Coastal	1	Upper Yuba	2
		Santa Clara	1	Ventura	4

**Cutting the Green Tape
FY 21/22 Projects**

- Watersheds with Sites
- Other Watersheds

Data Source: National Hydrography Dataset, HUC8)



0 25 50 100 Miles

August, 2022