

# Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction -Grant Program-

## FY 2014-2015 Proposal Solicitation Notice

---



November 10, 2014

# California Department of Fish and Wildlife



## Table of Contents

<b>PART I: Background</b> .....	1
<b>PART II: Focus</b> .....	2
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Coastal Wetlands .....	3
Mountain Meadow Ecosystems .....	3
<b>PART III: SUBMISSION PROCEDURES FOR ALL APPLICATIONS</b> .....	4
Eligibility Criteria .....	4
Awards .....	4
Application Proposal Package .....	4
Additional Information if Funded .....	6
Environmental Compliance, Landowner Access, and Permits .....	6
<b>PART IV: SCORING PROCEDURE</b> .....	7
Administrative Review .....	7
Technical Review .....	7
Selection Panel Review .....	8
Director of CDFW Review and Action .....	8
<b>PART V: USEFUL INFORMATION</b> .....	20
Definitions .....	20
Useful links .....	22

## **Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction FY 2014-2015 Proposal Solicitation Notice**

---

### **PART I: Background**

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program was developed in response to the [Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006](#). Pursuant to Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Air Resources Board created a market-based Cap-and-Trade Program as a key element of its overall greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategy. The program establishes a statewide emissions limit on the sources responsible for 85 percent of GHGs and creates a financial incentive for investment in clean and efficient technologies. The Cap-and-Trade regulation includes a system of tradable permits to emit GHGs known as 'allowances'. Under the program, portions of the allowances required for compliance are sold at auction. Proceeds from these auctions are deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) and are used to fund projects that support efforts to reduce GHG emissions.

The Budget Act of 2014 appropriated \$25 million to CDFW for restoration or enhancement of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) and coastal wetlands and mountain meadow habitat, and improving water use efficiency/restoring wetlands on Department of Fish and Wildlife lands. This funding is to support projects that reduce GHGs and provide co-benefits such as enhancing fish and wildlife habitat, protecting and improving water quality and quantity, and helping California adapt to climate change. This Solicitation is focused on GHG emission reduction through restoration or enhancement of Delta and coastal wetlands and mountain meadow habitat.

Wetlands provide important and irreplaceable benefits to the human population, fish and wildlife, and serve as high-value carbon sinks. It is estimated that only about 10% of the wetlands that existed in California 200 years ago remain today. Restoring and enhancing wetlands will create a larger and efficient storehouse for atmospheric carbon, and will provide co-benefits, such as providing essential habitat for species of fish and wildlife; protecting and improving water quality through filtration and pollution reduction; and enhanced water storage through the replenishment of groundwater aquifers. The intent of this program is to implement restoration or enhancement actions that integrate carbon sequestration with co-benefits of relevance to fish, wildlife, and plant species and the habitats upon which they depend.

## PART II: Focus

The intent of this grant program is to contribute to the goals of AB 32 and the California Water Action Plan while restoring or enhancing important wildlife and fish habitat (co-benefits). To meet the goals of AB 32 all proposed projects must outline plans to achieve net GHG reductions through restoration or enhancement of wetlands or mountain meadows and be able to demonstrate how project success will be monitored and reported. Proposals must also consider if and how expected climatic changes in California may impact project planning, implementation, and long-term sustainability of the project investment.

Each proposal submitted for consideration must present a conceptual model that describes how the proposed restoration or enhancement activities are expected to result in net GHG reductions. The conceptual model should describe projected emissions and/or sequestration of relevant GHGs (i.e., carbon dioxide [CO<sub>2</sub>], methane [CH<sub>4</sub>], and nitrous oxide [N<sub>2</sub>O]) and how those are anticipated to change over time following implementation of the proposed project. If methane and/or nitrous oxide measurements are excluded from the project, justification must be provided as to why they do not merit inclusion. A brief description of the calculations used to develop the emission estimates presented in the conceptual model, the areas of uncertainty, and how those uncertainties influence the predicted values is required. Emission estimates must be calculated using the Best Available Science<sup>1</sup> and supported by peer-reviewed research that has demonstrated net GHG benefits from project sites in comparable locations with similar characteristics, where available. Proposals must demonstrate that GHG reductions will be additional, or deemed to occur in addition to a conservative Business-As-Usual Scenario.

Due to the relative lack of scientific literature and research related to GHG reduction in mountain meadow ecosystems, proposals in this focal area can be considered pilot projects and must include a research component. Research objectives associated with these projects should advance scientific understanding of carbon sequestration in mountain meadow ecosystems in order to help inform future GHG mitigation projects.

All proposals must describe the proposed method to measure and record actual reduction amounts following project implementation. Each proposal must also identify a

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to Appendix C, of the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013) for guidelines and criteria for defining and assessing best available science. Available: <http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan-0>.

plan or actions to ensure long-term stability to prevent reversals and include a description of the necessary intensive management to maintain benefits beyond the initial project implementation.

Lastly, each proposal must include a clear description of expected co-benefits that will result from project implementation and a proposed approach to evaluate project performance towards achieving the co-benefits as well as reporting those co-benefits that have been accomplished. Examples of project objectives pertinent to co-benefits are described below.

### ***Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Coastal Wetlands***

**Co-Benefit Objectives** (include, but not limited to):

- Restore and enhance wetlands;
- Restore and enhance connectivity to associated wetland and upland natural communities;
- Restore and enhance spawning, rearing, and migration habitats for native fish species;
- Restore and enhance nesting, roosting, foraging, and cover habitats for native wildlife species;
- Increase diversity and relative cover of native plant species and minimize the establishment and growth of non-native, invasive plant species;
- Improve flood protection for local communities while providing habitat for fish and wildlife species;
- Reduce/reverse land subsidence on Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta islands;
- Improve water quantity and quality for native fish and wildlife;
- Protect climate refugia

### ***Mountain Meadow Ecosystems***

**Co-Benefit Objectives** (include, but not limited to):

- Restore and enhance mountain meadows;
- Restore and expand habitat for native plants, fish, and wildlife;
- Restore and enhance connectivity of associated wetland and riparian communities;
- Increase late-season flows downstream of mountain meadows;
- Reduce and delay peak flows on streams that flow through mountain meadows;
- Decrease sedimentation downstream of mountain meadows;
- Improve water quantity and quality for native fish and wildlife;
- Increase water storage capacity in mountain meadows;
- Protect climate refugia

## **PART III: SUBMISSION PROCEDURES FOR ALL APPLICATIONS**

### ***Eligibility Criteria***

Entities eligible to apply for grants are limited to public agencies, Recognized Tribes, and qualified nonprofit organizations (See Part V: Useful Information for definitions). Grant proposals from private individuals or for-profit enterprises will not be accepted. Private individuals and for-profit enterprises interested in submitting restoration or enhancement proposals are encouraged to work with a public agency, qualified nonprofit organization, or recognized tribe.

No project will be considered for funding that is a required mitigation or used for mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Endangered Species Act (CESA), Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Forest Practices Act (FPA) the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Clean Air Act (CAA), or a permit issued by any local, State, or federal agency. No project that is under an enforcement action by a regulatory agency will be considered for funding.

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 proposed project requires the services of licensed professionals, these individuals and their affiliations should be identified in the proposal application.

### ***Awards***

The Department is seeking a diversity of projects that encompass the geographic scope of this solicitation (coastal and Delta wetlands, and mountain meadow ecosystems).

### ***Application Proposal Package***

In order to be considered for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 (FY 2014/15) funding, all proposals must be submitted using the provided application form in [Appendix A](#). Completed proposals may be submitted electronically by e-mail, or hardcopy.

Electronic submittals of proposals as an attachment to an e-mail shall have a subject line of "Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Grant Program" and be sent to [wetlandrestoration@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:wetlandrestoration@wildlife.ca.gov). Proposals submitted by e-mail must be in either Word, RTF, or PDF format, with attachments less than 20 megabytes (mb). If attachments are larger than 20 mbs, please submit a hardcopy proposal. Electronic copies of proposals must be submitted no later than 5:00 p.m. PST December 19, 2014.

Hard copy proposals shall be addressed to:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
ATTN: Wetlands Restoration for GHG Reduction Proposal  
1416 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

One complete copy on CD (one proposal per CD) in Word, RTF, or PDF format must also be submitted with the paper copies. All applications submitted in hard copy for FY 2014/15 funding must have a U.S. POSTAL SERVICE POSTMARK no later than December 19, 2014. Hard copy proposals delivered by any other means (FedEx, U.P.S., etc.) including hand delivery must be delivered no later than December 19, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. PST.

Incomplete proposals or applications that have not used the application form provided in Appendix A, or proposals delivered after the identified deadline will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

If there are any questions regarding the PSN or application process, please contact Angela Duvane at [wetlandrestoration@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:wetlandrestoration@wildlife.ca.gov) or (916) 653-4875.

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

### **Indirect Charges**

Indirect charges (administrative overhead) is limited to 20% of the amount requested. Any amount over 20% will not be funded but may be used as cost share. Indirect charges include but are not limited to workers compensation insurance, utilities, offices 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 charges. The grantee will explain the methodology used to



determine rate and provide detailed calculations in support of the indirect charge rate. The rate will be adjusted due to any errors found in the calculation.

### ***Additional Information if Funded***

If a proposal is funded, the grantee must submit additional information 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
- [Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement form \(STD. 19\)](#) for grants of \$5,000.00 or more per Title 2, California Code of Regulations, Section 8113
- [Drug-Free Workplace Certification \(STD. 21\)](#)

### ***Environmental Compliance, Landowner Access, and Permits***

The applicant is responsible for obtaining all permits necessary to carry out the work proposed.

All activities funded under this solicitation must be compliant with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations, including the NEPA, CEQA, the Delta Plan, and other environmental permitting requirements. Funding is contingent upon compliance. Project compliance is the responsibility of the project proponent, and proposals may include in their budgets the funding necessary for compliance related tasks.

Proposals must outline plans for obtaining access to land as necessary to complete projects and subsequent monitoring and oversight.

Permits must be issued to the applicant organization for work specific to the applicant's proposal. Permits transferred from other programs or projects are not acceptable under this solicitation. Grant managers will be conducting audits of regulatory compliance during the period of performance and may freeze payments on invoices and/or require grant funds to be repaid if grantees have not met legal requirements.

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

subcontractors.

Project proponents may need to provide additional information pursuant to guidelines being developed by the Air Resources Board.

**Water Conservation and Efficiency Plan:** 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. Proposals must verify the Applicant's organization has a water conservation and efficiency program in place.

## **PART IV: SCORING PROCEDURE**

### ***Administrative Review***

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

### ***Technical Review***

All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers in accordance with the scoring criteria documented in Table 3. The technical reviewers assigned to each proposal will include representatives from CDFW. CDFW may request reviewers from other agencies (e.g., California Air Resources Board) or other outside experts to participate in the review.

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 and/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 and/or less sufficient rationale.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and/or the documentation and/or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed and/or no documentation or rationale is presented.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

### ***Selection Panel Review***

Following completion of the technical review of all complete and eligible proposals, CDFW will convene a Selection Panel to review the scores and comments. The Selection Panel will generate a preliminary ranking list, by focal area (i.e., Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and coastal wetlands, and mountain meadow ecosystems), of the proposals and make the initial funding recommendations. When developing the ranking list, the Selection Panel will consider the following items:

- Technical review scores and comments
- Amount of Program funds available
- Distribution of Program funding within focus areas

### ***Director of CDFW Review and Action***

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

**Table 1. Administrative Review Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>
Applicant contact information, including person authorized to sign grant agreement, is included.	Pass/Fail
Applicant is an eligible public agency, Recognized Tribe, or qualified nonprofit organization.	Pass/Fail
Application received by deadline.	Pass/Fail
Budget included.	Pass/Fail
Project involves restoration or enhancement of coastal or Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta wetland(s), or mountain meadow ecosystems.	Pass/Fail
The proposal lists all applicable environmental permits obtained, or includes a plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review and permitting requirements.	Pass/Fail
The proposal includes a plan for obtaining access to land as necessary to complete the project, and subsequent monitoring, and oversight.	Pass/Fail
The proposal includes a plan to ensure that project lands are maintained for the proposed purposes in perpetuity.	Pass/Fail

The proposal includes a clear description of the predicted net GHG emission reductions that will be achieved through project implementation.	Pass/Fail
<u>For projects involving restoration or enhancement of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta or coastal wetlands</u> – The proposed project is supported by peer-reviewed research that demonstrated net GHG sequestration from project sites of comparable size, location, habitat, and other relevant characteristics.	Pass/Fail
<u>For projects involving restoration or enhancement of mountain meadow ecosystems</u> – The proposed project is based on best available science and incorporates a research component designed to advance understanding of carbon sequestration potential in mountain meadows.	Pass/Fail
The proposal includes a monitoring plan to demonstrate that GHG reductions have occurred.	Pass/Fail
All proposal components have been completed in the required formats, including all application forms and associated documents.	Pass/Fail
<b>Total Possible Maximum Score</b>	<b>Pass</b>

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

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Criterion Score	Proportion of Total Possible Maximum Score
1. Proposer Qualifications/Ability to Accomplish Project	1	5	11.5%
2. Project Description – Plan	2	10	
3. Project Description – Implementation	2	10	
4. Project Description – Linkages With Other Restoration Activities	1	5	
5. Scientific Merit – Scientific Basis	4	20	9.6%
6. Scientific Merit – Enhance Scientific Understanding	1	5	
7. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Predicted Reductions	5	25	38.5%
8. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Additionality	5	25	
9. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Permanence	5	25	
10a. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Coastal or Delta Wetland Proposals: Monitoring and Assessment	5	25	
10b. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Mountain Meadow Ecosystem Proposals: Monitoring and Assessment	3	15	
10c. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Mountain Meadow Ecosystem Proposals: Research Component	2	10	
11. Co-Benefits – Description	2	10	15.4%
12. Co-Benefits – Significance of the Benefits	4	20	
13. Co-Benefits – Monitoring and Assessment	2	10	
14. Climate Change Considerations	3	15	5.8%
15. Data Management and Access	1	5	1.9%
16. Budget	2	10	3.8%
17. Time Frame	1	5	1.9%
18. Readiness to Begin Construction	3	15	5.8%
19. Cost Share Funds	2	10	3.8%
20. Disadvantaged Community Consideration	1	5	1.9%
Total Possible Maximum Score		260	100%

**Table 3. Technical Review Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Standards**

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>1. Proposer Qualifications/Ability to Accomplish Project</b>                      The proposal clearly demonstrated that the project applicant has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontractors). Examples of similar types of work performed by the applicant were clearly described. Licensed professionals were identified, where appropriate.</p>	1	0-5	0-5	Proposals that demonstrate an appropriate level of expertise and, where applicable, successful completion of previously funded grants will receive 4 to 5 points
				Proposals in which the project applicant lacks some expertise, has had some problems with successful completion of previously funded grants, and/or named subcontractors are not appropriate for work will receive 2 to 3 points
				Proposals in which the project applicant lacks a lot of expertise and/or has had many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects will receive 1 point
				Proposals in which the applicant is unqualified, problematic subcontractors are identified, persistent problems with completing previously funded grants, and/or uncooperative will receive a score of zero

<sup>2</sup> Weighting Factor \* Points Value = Criterion Score. Ranges for Point Value and Criterion Score are depicted.

<sup>3</sup> Comments/justification are required in instances where standard scoring criteria are used and a criterion receives a point value less than three.

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
<b>2. Project Description – Plan</b> The proposal included a detailed description of the proposed project, including sufficient rationale to justify the project need. The goals and objectives of the project were clearly stated. The proposal presented a clear link to how the project elements will reduce GHG emissions, sequester carbon, and provide co-benefits. Proposed project location and boundaries were clearly delineated.	2	0-5	0-10	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<b>3. Project Description – Implementation</b> Project description was sufficiently detailed to be used as a statement of work for the grant agreement. The proposed project is technically feasible. The means by which each element of project construction will be implemented (e.g., methods/ techniques used, materials and equipment used, etc.) were adequately described. The project applies methods and technologies that are understood and well proven. If not, does the proposal provide an adequate basis for proposed methods and technologies?	2	0-5	0-10	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<b>4. Project Description – Linkages With Other Restoration Activities</b> Linkages with other restoration activities in the region were identified. The proposed project is complimentary to relevant, on-going planning or implementation efforts (e.g., proposed project is a recommended action in a recovery plan).	1	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<b>5. Scientific Merit – Scientific Basis</b> The applicant demonstrated the scientific and technical merit of the proposal. The scientific basis of the proposed project was clearly described (i.e., presented a well-articulated conceptual model) and based on best available science <sup>4</sup> .	4	0-5	0-20	See Standard Scoring Criteria

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Appendix C, of the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013) for guidelines and criteria for defining and assessing best available science. Available: <http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan-0>

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>6. Scientific Merit – Enhance Scientific Understanding</b>  The proposed project presents an opportunity to advance the sciences of wetland or mountain meadow restoration/enhancement and carbon sequestration. The proposed project will address key scientific uncertainties and/or fill important information gaps. For mountain meadow ecosystem proposals, the research component is evaluated in criterion 10c.</p>	1	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<p><b>7. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Predicted Reductions</b>  The approach by which net GHG reductions were predicted was adequately described and supported by existing scientific understanding. The proposal included a conceptual model describing expected emissions and/or sequestration of relevant GHGs over time (e.g., characterizes expectations immediately following restoration/enhancement actions and how those expectations are likely to change as the site evolves). Potential GHG emissions associated with project construction are adequately addressed.</p>	5	1-5	5-25	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<p><b>8. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Additionality</b>  The proposal contained sufficient justification that GHG emission reductions produced by the proposed project will be additional, or deemed to occur in addition to a conservative Business-As-Usual Scenario</p>	5	0-5	0-25	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<p><b>9. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – Permanence</b>  The proposal adequately described the expected longevity of the emission reductions, potential reversal risks, and plans to address these risks in perpetuity.</p>	5	0-5	0-25	See Standard Scoring Criteria



Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>10a. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – <u>Coastal or Delta Wetland Proposals: Monitoring and Assessment</u></b>  The proposed approaches to measure and quantify total net GHG reductions were clearly defined and adequate. Performance measures and the types of analyses that will be used to evaluate project performance are adequately defined. The proposal described an approach by which long-term monitoring would be accomplished through partnerships, matching funds, etc.</p>	5	1-5	5-25	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<p><b>10b. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – <u>Mountain Meadow Ecosystem Proposals: Monitoring and Assessment</u></b>  The proposed approaches to measure and quantify total net GHG reductions were clearly defined and adequate. Performance measures and the types of analyses that will be used to evaluate project performance are adequately defined. The proposal described an approach by which long-term monitoring would be accomplished through partnerships, matching funds, etc.</p>	3	1-5	3-15	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<p><b>10c. Greenhouse Gas Reductions – <u>Mountain Meadow Ecosystem Proposals: Research Component</u></b>  The proposed project's research component is adequately defined and presents an opportunity to further understanding of carbon sequestration in mountain meadow ecosystems, including, but not limited to, quantification of net ecosystem carbon balances and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, evaluating factors (e.g., water table elevation, vegetation, soil type) that influence carbon sequestration rate or potential, and contributing to development of a robust methodology for quantifying GHG emissions reductions from restoration of mountain meadows.</p>	2	1-5	2-10	See Standard Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>11. Co-Benefits - Description</b>  The proposed project was designed to provide multiple co-benefits. The objectives related to those co-benefits were clearly stated, and where feasible, were measurable and quantifiable. The supporting documentation demonstrated high likelihood that claimed co-benefits will be realized.</p>	2	0-5	0-10	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<p><b>12. Co-Benefits – Significance of the Benefits (e.g., species, ecosystem, climate change adaptation)</b>  The proposal provided sufficient analysis and documentation to demonstrate the significance (e.g., magnitude) of the claimed co-benefits. Based on documentation presented in the proposal, reviewers will qualitatively assess the significance of the claimed co-benefits. For example, is the project likely to provide substantial habitat improvements capable of supporting multiple sensitive species, how beneficial is the project likely to be for listed species (e.g., contribute to an existing recovery plan, preserve or restore designated critical habitat), what is the significance of the project site within the context of conserved lands in the region, what is the significance of the conservation benefits from a climate change adaptation perspective, etc.</p>	4	0-5	0-20	<p>Proposals that are likely to provide a high level of co-benefits and this finding is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation will receive 5 points</p> <p>Proposals that are likely to provide a high level of co-benefits but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking will receive 4 points</p> <p>Proposals that are likely to provide a moderate level of co-benefits and this finding is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation will receive 3 points</p> <p>Proposals that are likely to provide a moderate level of co-benefits but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking will receive 2 points</p> <p>Proposals that are likely to provide a low level of co-benefits will receive 1 point</p> <p>Proposals that do not have co-benefits or if this criterion is not addressed will receive a score of zero</p>

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
<b>13. Co-Benefits – Monitoring and Assessment</b> The proposed approach to monitor the project's effectiveness at achieving the claimed co-benefits was adequate. Performance measures and the types of analyses that will be used to evaluate project performance were appropriate and adequately described.	2	0-5	0-10	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<b>14. Climate Change Considerations</b> Climate change considerations were adequately taken into account in the proposal (applicant has considered how future climate conditions might affect the project's long-term impacts or benefits).	3	0-5	0-15	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<b>15. Data Management and Access</b> The proposal adequately described the means by which data collected by the project will be stored and made publicly available. Data were identified as a project deliverable to CDFW.	1	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<b>16. Budget</b> Project budget was appropriate to the work proposed, cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	2	0-5	0-10	Proposals for which the budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and considered reasonable will receive 5 points
				Proposals for which the costs appear reasonable, but some budget detail is needed, it includes a few inaccuracies and/or 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums will receive 3 to 4 points
				Proposals for which the budget lacks sufficient detail, includes many inaccuracies, contains more than two unspecified lump sums, and/or includes inappropriate costs will receive 1 to 2 points

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
				Proposals for which the budget lacks sufficient detail, is inaccurate, contains many unspecified lump sums, and/or is not cost effective will receive a score of zero
<b>17. Time Frame</b> The proposed project's timeline is sufficiently detailed and reasonable. The proposal included a schedule for implementation of the project showing the sequence and timing of the proposed project. The deliverables (e.g., quarterly progress report, final report) were clearly identified in the schedule. The timeline included start and end dates, as well as milestones for each project task described in the Project Description.	1	0-5	0-5	See Standard Scoring Criteria
<b>18. Readiness to Begin Construction</b> Taking into consideration information presented in the project description (e.g., proposed approach to ensure compliance with all applicable environmental review and permitting requirements), how many months are anticipated to occur between assumed grant agreement execution date (June 2015) and the start of project construction?	3	0-5	0-15	Proposals that demonstrate a readiness to begin construction no later than six months after the anticipated award date will receive 5 points ...no later than 12 months after the anticipated award date will receive 4 point ...no later than 18 months after the anticipated award date will receive 3 point ...more than 18 months after the anticipated award date will receive 1 to 2 points Proposals in which the schedule is omitted will receive a score of zero
<b>19. Cost Share Funds</b> To what extent was a cost share (money or in-kind contributions) provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in implementation of the proposed project?	2	0-5	0-10	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

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
				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
<b>20. Disadvantaged Community Consideration</b> Is the proposed project located within and/or provides direct, meaningful, and assured benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities, consistent with at least one of the criteria in Appendix A of the Air Resources Board's Interim Guidance for investments to benefit disadvantaged communities (SB 535 Guidance)?	1	0, 3, or 5	0, 3, or 5	Proposed projects that are located within <b>AND</b> provide direct, meaningful, and assured benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities will receive 5 points Proposed projects that are <b>NOT</b> located within a disadvantaged community <b>BUT</b> provide direct, meaningful, and assured benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities will receive 3 points Proposed projects that are <b>NOT</b> located within a disadvantaged community <b>AND DO NOT</b> provide direct, meaningful, and assured benefits to a disadvantaged community will receive a score of zero
<b>Total Possible Maximum Score – Technical Review</b>	<b>260</b>			
<b>How well does the Proposal support the overall intent of the program as outlined in Parts I and II of this PSN? (Rater Comments)</b>				

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Point Value	Criterion Score <sup>2</sup>	Scoring Standards/Comments <sup>3</sup>
<b>Miscellaneous Comments:</b>				

## **PART V: USEFUL INFORMATION**

### ***Definitions***

#### **Disadvantaged Community**

To receive the maximum points, Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Grant proposals should be located within and/or provide direct, meaningful, and assured benefits to a disadvantaged community, as defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Chapter 830, Statutes of 2012 (SB 535, DeLeón). More information about disadvantaged communities can be found on the Air Resources Board's [Cap and Trade Auction Proceeds Website](#).

#### **Mountain Meadows**

For the purposes of this PSN, 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).

Detailed descriptions can be found at:

[http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cwhr/wildlife\\_habitats.asp](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cwhr/wildlife_habitats.asp)

#### **Prevailing Wage**

State funded grants may be subject to California Labor Code requirements, which include prevailing wage provisions. Certain State funded grants administered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife are not subject to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 1720) of Part 7 of Division 2 of the Labor Code. For more Details, Please refer to California Fish and Game Code Section 1501.5 and to the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) website at <http://www.dir.ca.gov>. Grantee shall pay prevailing wage to all persons employed in the performance of any part of the Project if required by law to do so.

Applications to the Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Grant Program that are awarded grants by CDFW, may be required to pay prevailing wages. Typically, the types of projects that are subject to the prevailing wage requirements are public works projects. Existing law defines "public works" as, among other things, construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work done under contract and paid for in whole or in part out of public funds.

California Fish and Game Code, Section 1501.5 exempts grants with public agencies, nonprofit organizations, or Recognized Tribes that exceed \$50,000 in cost, excluding the cost of gravel, from the prevailing wage requirements. Assembly Bill 2690 amended Labor Code, Section 1720.4 to exclude most work performed by volunteers from the prevailing wage requirements. Grants with CDFW for public works projects undertaken

by public agencies, nonprofit organizations, or Recognized Tribes for less than \$50,000 in cost, excluding the cost of gravel, are subject to prevailing wage laws (Labor Code section 1720 et seq.).

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

### **Provisional Landowner Access Agreement**

Proposals for projects conducting on-the-ground work must include plans for obtaining access to land, as necessary to complete projects, and subsequent monitoring and oversight.

### **Public Agency**

Public Agencies include federal, state, county, city, city and county, resource conservation district, district, public authority, municipal corporation, or any other political subdivision or public corporation in the state.

### **Purchase of Equipment**

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

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

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

### **Qualified Nonprofit Organization**

A qualified nonprofit organization means any nonprofit public benefit corporation formed pursuant to the Nonprofit Corporation Law (Division 2 (commencing with Section 5000) of Title 1 of the Corporations Code) qualified to do business in California and qualified for exempt status under Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code.



## **Recognized Tribe**

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

## **Wetlands**

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

Wetland types include, but are not limited to (FGC 1791):

- (1) Perennial freshwater marsh
- (2) Perennial brackish marsh
- (3) Seasonal freshwater marsh
- (4) Wet meadow
- (5) Vernal pool
- (6) Riparian woodland
- (7) Riparian scrub

## ***Useful links***

[Assembly Bill 32](#)

[State Water Action Plan](#)

[Safeguarding California: Reducing Climate Risk](#)

[National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy](#)

[CDFW](#)

- [Grant Opportunities](#)
- [Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Grant Program](#)
- [California Wildlife Habitat Relationships \(CWHR\)](#)
- [Ecosystem Restoration Program Conservation Strategy \(May 2014\)](#)

[Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Legal Delta Boundary](#)

[Delta Plan](#)

- [Best Available Science](#)

[California Environmental Quality Act \(CEQA\)](#)

[National Environmental Policy Act \(NEPA\)](#)

[Department of Industrial Relations](#)

[Approaches to Identifying Disadvantaged Communities](#)

[ARB Auction Proceeds](#)

[Interim Guidance on Investments to Benefit Disadvantaged Communities](#)