

March 2015 REVISED DRAFT For Board Review



SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN

DELTA CONSERVANCY

A California State Agency

DRAFT

GRANT GUIDELINES

Fiscal Year 2015-16

PROPOSITION 1

**Delta Conservancy Ecosystem Restoration and Water
Quality Grant Program**

FUNDED BY THE

**Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure
Improvement Act of 2014**

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Background and Purpose	4
Purpose of Grant Guidelines	4
Eligibility Requirements	5
Eligibility of Funds	5
Geographic Area of Focus	5
Eligible Projects	6
Ineligible Projects	6
Eligible Applicants	7
Eligible Costs.....	8
Ineligible Costs	8
General Program Requirements	9
Conflict of Interest	9
Confidentiality	9
Labor Code Compliance	9
Environmental Compliance	10
Water Law	10
Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	11
Due Process	12
Grant Provisions	12
Proposal Selection	13
Proposal Submittal Process.....	13
Proposal Review and Selection Process	13
Evaluation Criteria for Concept Proposal	14
Evaluation Criteria for Full Proposal.....	15
Federal and Local Cost Share and State-Leveraged Funds.....	16
Consultation and Cooperation with State and Local Agencies and Demonstration of Local Support	17
Performance Measures	17

Appendices.....19

Glossary of Terms.....19

Key State, Federal, and Local Plans.....21

DRAFT

Introduction

A. Background and Purpose

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy (Conservancy) is a primary state agency in the implementation of ecosystem restoration in the Delta and supports efforts that advance environmental protection and the economic well-being of Delta residents. The Conservancy collaborates and cooperates with local communities and others parties to preserve, protect, and restore the natural resources, economy, and agriculture of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh. The Conservancy's goals include a set of programs that implement complex economic and environmental objectives, resulting in a vision of a rich, diverse, resilient, and accessible Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh.

The Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Prop. 1) was approved by voters in November 2014. Prop. 1 provides funding to implement the three objectives of the California Water Action Plan: more reliable water supplies, restoration of important species and habitat and a more resilient and sustainably managed water infrastructure. The Conservancy's Ecosystem Restoration and Water Quality grant program intends to focus on the restoration of important species and habitat.

In Prop. 1, \$50 million is identified for the Conservancy "for competitive grants for multibenefit ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects in accordance with statewide priorities (Sec. 79730 and 79731)."

Per Prop. 1 and the Conservancy's enabling legislation, emphasis will be placed on projects using public lands and that "maximizes voluntary landowner participation in projects that provide measureable and long-lasting habitat or species improvements in the Delta."

To the extent feasible, projects need to promote state planning priorities and sustainable communities strategies consistent with Government Code 65080(b)(2)(B). Furthermore, all proposed projects must be consistent with statewide priorities as identified in Prop. 1, the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation, the Delta Plan, and the Conservancy's Strategic Plan. Links to Prop. 1 and the other documents can be found in Appendix B (as well as other local, state, and federal plans).

B. Purpose of Grant Guidelines

These Grant Guidelines (Guidelines) establish the process and criteria that the Conservancy will use to administer competitive grants for multibenefit ecosystem restoration and water quality projects. These Guidelines include the information, requirements, and documentation required for Prop. 1 grants. The Guidelines were posted on the Conservancy's web site for 30 days prior to approval and were vetted via three public meetings (Sec. 79706(b)).

Eligibility Requirements

A. Eligibility of Funds

The Conservancy intends to grant up to \$9 million each year for 5 years. ~~The minimum grant amount is \$100,000 and the maximum grant amount is \$2 million.~~ Grants will be awarded for Category 1 (necessary activities that will lead to on-the-ground projects, e.g., planning, permits, etc.) and Category 2 projects (on-the-ground projects) to eligible entities subject to approval by the Conservancy pursuant to these Guidelines. No more than 5-10 percent of the total bond funds ~~awarded~~ received by the Conservancy may be used for planning; ~~additionally, no more than 5 percent may be used for~~ and or the monitoring necessary for the successful assessment of project performance (see Appendix A: Glossary of Terms for definitions).

Category 1, planning grants, may use 100 percent of awarded funds for planning activities, however, these funds would apply to a future Category 2 proposal for the same project and may not exceed 5-10 percent of the total project funds (Category 1 and Category 2 combined) requested from the Conservancy. Category 2, implementation grants, may use up to 5-10 percent of awarded funds for planning and up to 5-10 percent for monitoring. A total of \$450,000 is available during the FY 15-16 funding cycle for Category 1 grants.

B. Geographic Area of Focus

The Conservancy will fund projects within or near the statutory Delta and Suisun Marsh. The statutory Delta and the Suisun Marsh are defined in Public Resources Code Section 85058.

The Conservancy may take or fund an action outside the Delta and Suisun Marsh if the Board makes all of the following findings (Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009, Sec. 32360.5):

- The project implements the ecosystem goals of the Delta Plan.
- The project is consistent with the requirements of any applicable state and federal permits.
- The Conservancy has given notice to and reviewed any comments received from affected local jurisdictions and the Delta Protection Commission.

- The Conservancy has given notice to and reviewed any comments received from any state conservancy where the project is located.
- The project will provide significant benefits to the Delta.

C. Eligible Projects

Prop. 1 identifies projects to protect and restore California rivers, lakes, streams, and watersheds that may be funded with Prop. 1 funding (Sec. 79732 *et seq*). The Conservancy's highest priority projects will address the following:

- Restoration and Enhancement. Examples include:
 - Channel margin enhancement projects and riparian habitat restoration or enhancement projects.
 - Watershed adaptation projects to reduce the impacts of climate change on California's communities and ecosystems.
 - Restoration and protection projects of aquatic, wetland, and migratory bird ecosystems, including fish and wildlife corridors.
 - Endangered, threatened, or migratory species recovery projects that improve watershed health, inland wetland restoration, or other means, such as natural community conservation plan and habitat conservation plan implementation.
- Water Quality. Examples include:
 - Polluted runoff reduction projects that restore impaired waters, prevent pollution, improve water management, increase water conservation, and conduct environmental education.
 - Pollution reduction projects that focus on the contamination of rivers, lakes, or streams, prevent and remediate mercury contamination from legacy mines, and protect or restore natural system functions that contribute to water supply, water quality, or flood management.
- Agricultural Sustainability. Examples include:
 - Agricultural analysis and investment strategy.
 - Projects that support agricultural sustainability in areas where agriculture is impacted by restoration or other water-related projects.
 - Projects that protect and increase the economic benefits arising from healthy watersheds.

NOTE: Any grantee acquiring land with Prop. 1 may use the Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit Act of 2000 (Division 28 (commencing with Section 37000) of the Public Resources Code) (Section 79711[h]).

D. Ineligible Projects

Examples of ineligible projects include:

- Construction equipment purchased solely for purposes of implementing a single project.
- Projects dictated by a legal settlement or mandated to address a violation of, or an order (citation) to comply with, a law or regulation.
- Education, outreach, or event related projects, although these types of activities may be included as part of the overall implementation of a project eligible for Conservancy grant funds.
- Projects that subsidize or decrease the mitigation obligations of any party.
- Projects to design, construct, operate, mitigate, or maintain Delta conveyance facilities.
- Projects that do not comply with all legal requirements of Prop. 1 and other applicable laws.

NOTE: Funds will only be used for projects that will provide fisheries or ecosystem benefits or improvements that are greater than required applicable environmental mitigation measures or compliance obligations.

E. Eligible Applicants

Eligible grant applicants include public agencies, nonprofit organizations, public utilities, federally recognized Indian tribes, state Indian tribes, and mutual water companies that will have an eligible proposal or project that provides a public benefit in the Delta (Public Resources Code Section 75004) and that will satisfy all the grant requirements. Specifically, eligible applicants are:

- Public agencies (any city, county, district, or joint powers authority; state agency; public university; or federal agency). To be eligible, public utilities that are regulated by the Public Utilities Commission must have a clear and definite public purpose and shall benefit the customers and not the investors.
- Qualifying 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations. “Nonprofit Organization” means a private, nonprofit organization that qualifies for exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of Title 26 of the United States Code, and whose charitable purposes are consistent with those of the Conservancy.
- Eligible tribal organizations (includes any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, or a tribal agency authorized by a tribe, which is listed on the National Heritage Commission’s California Tribal List).
- Mutual water companies, including local and regional companies. Additionally, in order to be eligible:
 - Mutual water companies must have a clear and definite public purpose and shall benefit the customers of the water system and not the investors.
 - An urban water supplier shall adopt and submit an urban water management plan in accordance with the Urban Water Management Planning Act.

- An agricultural water supplier shall adopt and submit an agricultural water management plan in accordance with the Agricultural Water Management Planning Act.
- An agricultural water supplier or an urban water supplier is ineligible for funding unless it complies with the requirements of Part 2.55 of their respective water management planning acts.

NOTE: As a general rule, organizations or individuals performing non-grant related work for the Conservancy under contract are ineligible to apply for a grant from the Conservancy during the life of the contract. This policy applies to organizations that:

- Contract directly with the Conservancy.
- Are providing services as a subcontractor to an individual or organization contracting directly with the Conservancy.

Employ an individual, on an ongoing basis, who is performing work for the Conservancy under a contract whether as a contractor or as a subcontractor. If you have a contract with the Conservancy and are contemplating applying for a grant, please consult with Conservancy staff to determine eligibility.

F. Eligible Costs

Only project costs for items within the scope of the project and within the time frame of the project agreement are eligible for reimbursement. Costs related to project-specific performance measures and reporting are required to be addressed in the project budget.

Eligible administrative costs must be directly related to the project and may not exceed five (5) percent of the project implementation cost. To determine the amount of eligible administrative costs, the applicant must first determine the cost of implementing the project, not including any administrative costs. Once the project implementation cost has been determined, the applicant may calculate administrative costs and include them in the total grant request.

G. Ineligible Costs

Indirect expenditures billed as a percentage of costs are not eligible for reimbursement. These are expenses that involve ongoing operations, or repair or maintenance costs, regardless of whether the repair or maintenance may last more than one year.

In addition, grant funding may not be used to establish or increase a legal defense fund or endowment, make a monetary donation to other organizations, pay for food or refreshments, or eminent domain processes.

If ineligible costs are included in the project budget, it could result in the project being deemed ineligible. In some cases, the project may be approved for funding with the total amount of the award reduced by the amount of the ineligible costs. In that event, the Conservancy will contact the applicant to confirm that the project is still viable. Applicants should avoid including ineligible costs in the application and should contact Conservancy staff with questions.

General Program Requirements

A. Conflict of Interest

All applicants and individuals who participate in the review of submitted proposals are subject to State and federal conflict of interest laws. Any individual who has participated in planning or setting priorities for a specific solicitation or who will participate in any part of the grant development and negotiation process on behalf of the public is ineligible to receive funds or personally benefit from funds awarded through that solicitation. Applicants should also be aware that certain State and federal agencies may submit proposals that will compete for funding. Employees of State and federal agencies may participate in the review process as scientific/technical reviewers but are subject to the same State and federal conflict of interest laws.

Failure to comply with the conflict of interest laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the proposal being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal actions may also be taken. Applicable statutes include, but are not limited to, California Government Code Section 1090 and Public Contract Code Sections 10365.5, 10410 and 10411.

B. Confidentiality

Once the Proposal has been submitted to the Conservancy, any privacy rights, as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived. Unsealed proposals are public records under the California Government Code Sections 6250-6276.48.

C. Labor Code Compliance

Grants awarded through the Conservancy's Ecosystem Restoration and Water Quality Grant Program may be subject to prevailing wage provisions of Part 7 of Division 2 of the California Labor Code (CLC), commencing with Section 1720. Typically, the types of projects that are subject to the prevailing wage requirements are public works projects. Existing law defines "public works" as, among other things, construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work done under contract and paid for in whole or in part out of public funds. Assembly Bill 2690 (Hancock, Chapter 330, Statutes of 2004) amended CLC Section 1720.4 to exclude most work performed by volunteers from the prevailing wage requirements until January 1, 2017.

The 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. Any questions of interpretation regarding the CLC should be directed to the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), the State Department having jurisdiction in these matters. For more details, please refer to the DIR website at <http://www.dir.ca.gov>.

D. Environmental Compliance

Activities funded under this grant program must be in compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Delta Plan, and other environmental permitting requirements. The applicant is solely responsible for project compliance and proposals may include in their budgets the funding necessary for compliance related tasks. The solicitation will provide information on common permits required and where to get information related to permit requirements.

For grant proposals prepared under the Ecosystem Restoration and Water Quality Grant Program that include an action that is likely to be deemed a covered action, pursuant to CWC Section 85057.5, the applicant is responsible for ensuring consistency with the Delta Plan policies. In such instances, the proposal shall include a description of the approach through which consistency will be achieved and may include in their budgets the funding necessary to complete related tasks.

E. Water Law

Funded grants that address stream flows and water use shall comply with the CWC, as well as any applicable State or federal laws or regulations. Refer to Section 2.3 (Specific Funding Requirements) of this document for specific requirements stipulated in Proposition 1 (CWC §79709). Any proposal that would require a change to water rights, including, but not limited to, bypass flows, point of diversion, location of use, purpose of use, or off-stream storage shall demonstrate an understanding of the SWRCB processes, timelines, and costs necessary for project approvals by SWRCB and the ability to meet those timelines within the term of a grant. In addition, any proposal that involves modification of water rights for an adjudicated stream shall identify the required legal process for the change as well as associated legal costs. Prior to its completion, any water right acquisition must be supported by a water rights appraisal approved by the Department of General Services Real Property Services Section.

All applicants must demonstrate to the Conservancy that they have a legal right to divert water and sufficient documentation regarding actual water availability and use. For post-1914 water rights, the applicant must submit a copy of a water right permit or license on file with the SWRCB. Applicants who divert water based on a riparian or pre-1914 water right must submit written evidence of the right to divert water and the priority in the watershed of that diversion right with their proposal. All applicants must include past water diversion and use information reported to the SWRCB, required by CWC section 5101. Such reports include Progress Reports

of Permittee and Reports of Licensee for post-1914 rights, and Supplemental Statements of Water Diversion and Use for riparian and pre-1914 water rights. All water rights must be accompanied by any operational conditions, agreements or court orders associated with the right, as well as any SWRCB orders affecting the water right.

F. Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

All projects affecting water quality shall include a monitoring component that, where applicable, allows integration of data into statewide monitoring efforts, including the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) that provides quality assurance and quality control requirements. Project water quality sampling must be conducted under an approved, SWAMP-comparable Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). The Scope of Work for projects must include tasks for developing an appropriate monitoring plan and a QAPP. SWAMP provides several tools to aid in developing a QAPP:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/quality_assurance/comparability.shtml.

Wetland restoration project data and wetland monitoring data shall be collected and reported in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program (WRAMP) framework and tools administered by the California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup (CWMW) of the Water Quality Monitoring Council. The framework can be used to decide on the kinds of data to collect based on how they will be used. The tools include the California Aquatic Resource Inventory (CARI; sfei.org/it/gis/cari) for classifying the distribution and abundance of wetlands throughout the state, rapid assessment tools, such as the California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM; cramwetlands.org), for assessing the overall condition of wetlands, and EcoAtlas (ecoatlas.org) for tracking project information and aggregating and visualizing data from multiple sources. For information on improvements to these tools and new tools being developed, contact the CWMW (http://www.mywaterquality.ca.gov/monitoring_council/wetland_workgroup/).

Projects must include appropriate data management activities so project data can be incorporated into appropriate statewide data systems. The grantee shall upload all water quality data to the California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN). The grantee also shall provide a receipt of successful data submission, generated by CEDEN, to the grant manager prior to submitting a final invoice. Guidance for submitting data, including required minimum data elements and data formats, is available at <http://www.ceden.org> or the Regional Data Centers (RDCs). Contact information for the RDCs is included in the CEDEN web link.

Grantees are also required to demonstrate alignment with the Delta Science Plan, complete the Delta Stewardship Council's covered action requirements as applicable, and upload all relevant information to EcoAtlas. Links to these items are listed in Appendix B: Key State, Federal, and Regional Plans.

All grantees will be required to provide semi-annual progress reports during the implementation of the project and a final report within one month of project completion. The final report must include data related to the project performance measures. Specific grant report requirements will be included in grant agreements. Furthermore, grants may be subject to audit by the Department of Finance.

G. Grant Provisions

For each awarded grant, the Conservancy will develop an individual grant agreement with detailed provisions and requirements specific to that project. Please be aware that if you are authorized to receive a grant from the Conservancy, the provisions listed below also will apply:

- Actual awards are conditional upon funds being available from the state.
- Grant eligible costs may be incurred by the grantee only after the grantee has entered into a fully executed agreement with the Conservancy; only these costs will be eligible for reimbursement.
- Grant eligible costs will only be paid in arrears on a reimbursement basis.
- Grantees will not be paid if any of the following conditions occur:
 - the applicant has been non-responsive or does not meet the conditions outlined in the grant proposal and grant agreement,
 - the project has received alternative funding,
 - the project description has changed and is no longer eligible for funding,
 - the cost share for the project has changed, or
 - the applicant requests to end the project.
- To the extent practicable, Category 2 projects funded by Prop. 1 should include signage informing the public that the project received funds from the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014.

Grantees are encouraged to use the California Conservation Corps or a local conservation corps certified by the California Conservancy Corps to implement projects whenever feasible.

Proposal Selection

A. Grant Categories

A total of \$450,000 is available for Category 1 grants. Category 1 grants are limited to pre-project activities necessary for a specific future on-the-ground project. A Category 1 project must meet all of the requirements for Category 2 projects if it were to make it to the Category 2 stage. Examples of Category 1 grant activities include:

- Planning
- Permitting
- Studies (that will aid in a future on-the-ground project)
- Designs

Category 1 grant proposals may range in cost from a minimum of \$20,000 to a maximum of \$100,000.

Category 2 grants include on-the-ground, implementation projects. Examples of Category 2 grant activities include:

- Channel margin enhancement
- Restoration
- Pollution runoff reduction
- Working landscape enhancements
- Monitoring and evaluation (may not exceed 5 percent of funds requested from the Conservancy)

Category 2 grant proposals may range in cost from a minimum of \$100,000 to a maximum of \$2,000,000.

B. Proposal Review and Selection Process

The following steps will be followed during a grant cycle:

- Potential applicants are encouraged to attend a grant submission workshop to learn about eligible projects and the proposal process.
- Questions received at the grant submission workshop, or subsequently over the phone or via email, will be posted on the Conservancy's grant web page to assist others with similar questions.
- If potential applicants have questions that are not answered on the Conservancy's grant web page or via the grant submission workshop, potential applicants are encouraged to contact Conservancy grant staff BEFORE submitting a concept proposal. Once a concept proposal has been submitted, Conservancy staff will only be able to offer status updates.
- Potential applicant submits a concept proposal (See Grant Application Packet).
- The concept proposals will be reviewed by Conservancy staff to confirm project eligibility and to evaluate benefits, project design, and other factors (see concept proposal evaluation criteria below). If the concept proposal is complete, meets all concept proposal requirements, and scores a minimum of 85 points, a full proposal will be requested.
- Please note that a project's full proposal documents will not be accepted unless a completed concept proposal has been submitted for review, scored, and the Conservancy requests a full proposal.
- The full proposals will be reviewed and scored by the Conservancy grant team and a professional (technical) review team to evaluate benefits, project design and readiness,

and other factors (see full proposal evaluation criteria below). The technical review will review staff's evaluation of full proposals to ensure that staff's evaluation is consistent with grant guidelines and proposal requirements. ~~The most competitive projects will be recommended for funding.~~

- The final score will be assigned to each grant proposal and posted on the Conservancy's website for final Board approval.
- Please note: A score of 85 percent during the concept or full proposal stages does not guarantee that a grant award will be made. When eligible projects (those receiving at least 85 points) exceed the amount of funds available in the funding cycle, funding recommendations and decisions will be based upon the scores received, as well as the diversity of the types of projects and their locations, which together will, create the maximum ecosystem benefit within the Delta as a whole.
- Funding recommendation(s) will be made by staff and scheduled for a Board meeting agenda as an action item at the direction of the Executive Officer and after all application requirements are completed.
- Application and scoring information will be made available upon request. Any applicant with questions regarding funding decisions may schedule a meeting with the Conservancy's Executive Officer.
- If a grant proposal is approved, Conservancy staff will work with the applicant to complete a grant agreement that outlines reporting requirements, specific performance measures, invoice protocol, and grant funding disbursement.

C. Evaluation Criteria for Concept Proposal

Concept proposals will be evaluated by Conservancy staff using the following criteria. If a project scores a minimum of 85 points (out of 100), applicants will be invited to submit a full proposal. The number in parentheses reflects the maximum number of points allocated to each criterion.

1. Tangible results from the project that further Prop. 1 and state priorities, including those found in the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, and the Delta Plan (20).
2. **The design and readiness of the project:**
 - a. If a Category 1 project, this means an understanding of how the planning activities relate to the entire project, the permits and plans needed, and data gaps (10);
 - b. If a Category 2 project, this means the completeness of the design and the readiness of the project to begin (10).

3. The degree to which the project develops a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes. If a project has a minimum of 25 percent cost share, it will score 5 points; if it has a minimum of 50 percent cost share, it will score 10 points (5-10).
4. The degree to which the project has multiple benefits and leverages other state funds (5).
5. The extent to which the scientific basis of the proposed project is clearly described and the degree to which best available science and adaptive management practices have been adopted and will be implemented. If scientific basis and adaptive management are not relevant for this project (e.g., a sustainable agriculture project), the extent to which best industry practices are used (10).
6. The extent which climate change considerations were taken into account in the purpose. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which climate change is vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project-(10).
7. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates a clear and reasonable method for measuring and reporting the effectiveness of the project, including project outcomes and outputs (10).
8. Category 2 projects (resulting in on-the-ground outcomes) will be given priority (~~5~~10).
9. The degree to which potentially affected parties, including local government and the Delta Protection Commission, have been informed and consulted, ~~or~~ good neighbor policies have been adopted and will inform the implementation of the project, and the Agricultural Land Stewardship Strategies (see Appendix B) have been applied (5).
10. The degree to which the project has local support, is consistent with similar efforts on nearby or surrounding lands and is part of larger plans or identified partnerships (~~10~~5).
11. A clear project description including project location, need for project, project goals and objectives, tasks, deliverables, and budget (requested funds and cost share contributions) (5).

D. Evaluation Criteria for Full Proposal

If a concept proposal scores a minimum of 85 points and a full proposal is invited, full proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria (for a maximum of 100 points). Projects will need a score of 85 points or better to be considered for funding.

1. How well does the applicant demonstrate consistency with Prop. 1 funding requirements and the Conservancy's mission and program goals (10).

2. How well does the applicant demonstrate the need for the project as it pertains to state-wide priorities (e.g., California Water Action Plan) or regional plans (see Appendix B of the Grant Guidelines for a list of relevant plans), and how well does the applicant demonstrate consistency with Delta Plan policies (10).
3. How well does the applicant demonstrate their ability to achieve expected project outputs and objectives, and articulates a plan for measuring and tracking progress toward achieving these results. This also includes a clear description of project tasks and the project timeline. (10).
4. Category 2 projects (resulting in on-the-ground outcomes) will be given priority (10).
5. How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability beyond the term of the grant proposals, and if applicable, including (a) third party monitoring and verification of the pre-project conditions, post-project habitat conditions, and the maintenance of habitat beyond the terms of the project; and (b) an adaptive management strategy plan as required and defined in the Delta Plan regulations that considers threats to habitat including climate change (5).
6. The extent to which the scientific basis of the proposed project is clearly described and the degree to which best available science and adaptive management practices have been adopted and will be implemented. If scientific basis and adaptive management are not relevant for this project (e.g., a sustainable agriculture project), the extent to which best industry practices are used (10).
7. The extent which climate change considerations were taken into account in the purpose. If an Category 1 or agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which climate change is vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (5).
8. The degree to which the project develops a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes. If a project has a minimum of 25 percent cost share, it will score 5 points; if it has a minimum of 50 percent cost share, it will score 10 points (5-10).
9. The degree to which the project has multiple benefits and leverages other state funds (5).
10. How well does the project employ new or innovative technology or practices, including decision support tools. If an agricultural sustainability proposal, how well does the project vet the relevancy and applicability of new or innovative technology or practices (5).
11. How well does the project avoid, reduce, or mitigate conflicts with existing and adjacent land uses, incorporate voluntary landowner participation that allows working agricultural landscapes to remain in production while also producing high quality habitat for species, and apply the Agricultural Land Stewardship Strategies (see Appendix B). (5).
12. How well can the applicant manage and complete the proposed project considering related experience, readiness, and staff qualifications and knowledge (5).
13. How well does the applicant demonstrate appropriate and necessary partnerships to help perform the project (5). How well does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's

plan for active transfer of project results or methods to state or local government agencies within and beyond their own organization (5).

14. What is the applicant’s performance on prior federal or state assistance agreements awarded to that organization in the past three years (2.5).

15. How well does the applicant provide a detailed budget, with reasonable costs and clear identification of grant funds and cost share contributions (2.5).

E. Federal and Local Cost Share and State-Leveraged Funds

The Conservancy will provide points to proposals with a federal, local, or private cost share component (other state funds may not count toward the cost share). Cost sharing is the portion of the project not borne by the Conservancy grant monies. Cost sharing encourages collaboration and cooperation beyond in-kind and written support. Applicants are encouraged to develop a cost share program to support their project. Projects with a cost share component—depending on the degree of the cost share—could be ranked higher (see Table 1 below) with a maximum of a 50 percent cost share. Only cost share commitments made explicitly for the project may count toward the cost percentage for grant proposal and ranking purposes.

Up to 50 percent of a cost share may be in-kind. For example, if the cost share is \$50,000, \$25,000 of that may be from in-kind sources.

Applicants stating that they have a cost share component must have commitment letters from cost share partners at the time the full proposal is submitted and include letters of commitment as part of the proposal requirements.

Table 1

Cost Share Percentage	Total Points
Minimum of 25 percent	5
Minimum of 50 percent	10

The Conservancy will also provide points (5—see evaluation criteria) for proposals that leverage state funds for multi-benefit projects. These projects must support multiple objectives as identified in various planning documents (see Appendix B). State funds may not count toward the cost share. Applicants stating that they are leveraging other state funds must have commitment letters from leverage partners at the time of the full proposal.

F. Consultation and Cooperation with State and Local Agencies and Demonstration of Local Support

In compliance with the Conservancy's governing statute (Public Resources Code Section 32363) and Prop. 1, local government agencies--such as counties, cities, and local districts--will be notified by the Conservancy about eligible grant projects being considered for funding in their area. The Conservancy shall coordinate and consult with the city or county in which a grant is proposed to be implemented or an interest in real property is proposed to be acquired and with the Delta Protection Commission. The Conservancy will also coordinate with the appropriate departments in state government that are doing work in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

For all applications under consideration, Conservancy staff will also notify the applicable public water agency, levee, flood control, or drainage agency (when appropriate), and request comments within 15 business days following notification. The Conservancy will work with the grantee to make all reasonable efforts to address concerns raised by local governments. The individual Conservancy Board members representing each of the five Delta counties will also be notified at this time and may wish to communicate with the affected entities as well.

Please note that it is also the applicant's responsibility to contact, seek support from, and coordinate with applicable state agencies, cities, counties, and local districts. If an applicant has a project-specific resolution of support from the affected city or county and local district, it should be included in the application package in order to facilitate the overall assessment process.

G. Performance Measures

Performance measures are used to track progress toward project goals and desired outcomes. They provide a means of reliably measuring and reporting the outcomes and effectiveness of a project and how it contributes to the Conservancy achieving its programmatic goals.

Applicants must propose project-specific performance measures at the time of full proposal submittal, using a project performance measures table as part of the overall Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (See Appendix B in the Grant Application Packet). Performance measures must be consistent and related to performance measures identified in the Delta Plan and other relevant planning documents (See Appendix B).

DRAFT

Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

Administrative Costs – Administrative costs include any expense which does not relate directly to project implementation. Similar to the traditional definition of “overhead,” administrative costs include such items as rent, utilities, per diem, office equipment and supplies, services such as internet and phone, etc.

Application – The individual application form and its required attachments for grants pursuant to the Conservancy Proposition 1 Grants Program.

CEQA – The California Environmental Quality Act as set forth in the Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. CEQA is a law establishing policies and procedures that require agencies to identify, disclose to decision makers and the public, and attempt to lessen significant impacts to environmental and historical resources that may occur as a result of a proposed project to be undertaken, funded, or approved by a local or state agency. For more information, refer to <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa>.

Conservancy – See Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy.

Cost Share – The portion of the project not borne by the Conservancy’s Prop. 1 funding.

Eligible Costs – Approved expenses incurred by the grantee during the performance period of the grant agreement.

Grant – Funds made available to a grantee for eligible costs during an agreement performance period.

Grant Agreement – An agreement between the Conservancy and the grantee specifying the payment of funds by the Conservancy for the performance of the project scope within the specific performance period.

In-kind Contributions – Non-monetary donations that are used on the project, including materials and services. These donations shall be eligible as “other sources of funds” when providing budgetary information on grant applications.

Monitoring Activities – The collection and analysis of observations or data repeated over time and in relation to a conservation or management objective.

Nonprofit Organization – A private, nonprofit organization that qualifies for exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of Title 26 of the United States Code, and whose charitable purposes are consistent with those of the Conservancy as set forth in Public Resources Code Section 32320 et seq.

Performance Measure – A quantitative measure agreed upon by the Conservancy and grantee to track progress toward project goals and desired outcomes.

Planning Activities – Initial project development work, including but not limited to permits, mapping, partner coordination, and planning exercises. Planning activities must have a direct link and provide a direct path to future on-the-ground activities.

Public Agencies – Any city, county, district, or joint powers authority; state agency; public university; or federal agency.

Reasonable Costs – Costs that are consistent with what a reasonable person would pay in the same or similar circumstances.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta – The confluence of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins, forming an inland delta.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy - As defined in Public Resources Code Section 32320, the Conservancy acts as a primary state agency to implement ecosystem restoration in the Delta and support efforts that advance environmental protection and the economic well-being of Delta residents. The Conservancy's service area is the statutory Delta (see Water Code Section 12220) and Suisun Marsh.

Statutory Delta – As defined in Water Code Section 12220. The legal definition can be found at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=12001-13000&file=12220>. A map of the statutory Delta can be found at <http://mavensnotebook.com/the-bdcp-road-map/environmental-impacts-of-alternative-4/bdcp-eir-ch-13-fig-13-1-statutory-delta/>.

Suisun Marsh – The largest contiguous brackish water marsh remaining on the west coast of North America and a critical part of the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta estuary ecosystem. The Suisun Marsh Preservation Act—further defining the Marsh—can be found at http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/laws_plans/suisun_marsh_preservation_act.shtml.

Appendix B: Key State, Federal, and Regional Plans

Prop. 1: <http://vig.cdn.sos.ca.gov/2014/general/en/pdf/text-of-proposed-law-prop1.pdf>

California Water Action Plan:

http://resources.ca.gov/california_water_action_plan/Final_California_Water_Action_Plan.pdf

Delta Conservancy's Enabling Legislation: <http://deltaconservancy.ca.gov/about-delta-conservancy>.

Delta Plan. Delta Stewardship Council (2013): <http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan-0>

2012 Strategic Plan. Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy (2012):

http://www.deltaconservancy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/docs/Delta_Conservancy_Strategic_Plan_Design_20June2012.pdf

Department of Water Resources Agricultural Land Stewardship Strategies:

<https://agriculturallandstewardship.water.ca.gov/>

Central Valley Flood Protection Plan:

http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/fessro/docs/flood_tab_cvfpp.pdf

Land Use and Resource Management Plan. Delta Protection Commission:

<http://www.delta.ca.gov/plan.htm>

2006 Implementation Plan. Central Valley Joint Venture (2006):

<http://www.centralvalleyjointventure.org/science>

Delta Science Plan. <http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Delta-Science-Plan-12-30-2013.pdf>.

Delta Stewardship Council Covered Actions: <http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/covered-actions>.

EcoAtlas. <http://www.ecoatlas.org>.

Economic Sustainability Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Delta Protection Commission

(2012): http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/ESP/ESP_P2_FINAL.pdf

Recreation Proposal for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh. California State Parks

(2011): http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/795/files/delta%20rec%20proposal_08_02_11.pdf

Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan. Bureau of Reclamation (2013):

http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=781

Yolo County Agricultural Economic Development Fund. Consero Solutions (2014):

<http://www.yolocounty.org/home/showdocument?id=26874>

DRAFT