

Track Change Version



SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN

DELTA CONSERVANCY

A California State Agency

GRANT GUIDELINES

Fiscal Year 201~~65~~-17~~6~~

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

Comment [JL1]: Needs to be updated in clean version.

Introduction.....	4
Background and Purpose	4
Purpose of Grant Guidelines	4
Eligibility Requirements	5
Funding Available	5
Geographic Area of Focus	5
Eligible Projects	5
Ineligible Projects	6
Eligible Applicants	7
Eligible Costs.....	8
Ineligible Costs	8
General Program Requirements	8
Conflict of Interest	8
Confidentiality.....	9
Labor Code Compliance	9
Environmental Compliance	9
Water Law	9
Monitoring and Assessment	10
Performance Measures.....	12
Grant Provisions.....	12
Proposal Selection	13
Grant Categories	13
Proposal Review and Selection Process	14
Evaluation Criteria for Concept Proposal.....	15
Evaluation Criteria for Full Proposal.....	16
Federal and Local Cost Share and State-Leveraged Funds.....	18
Consultation and Cooperation with State and Local Agencies and Demonstration of Local Support	19
Appendices.....	20

Glossary of Terms.....20

Key State, Federal, and Local Plans and Tools.....23

Introduction

A. ~~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~~ is focused 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 private lands purchased with public funds and that "maximize 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, the Conservancy's Strategic Plan, as well as applicable recovery plans. Links to Prop. 1 and the other plans and documents can be found in Appendix B.

~~B.~~ B. Purpose of Grant Guidelines

This section has been updated to reflect that we now have one guiding document for the Grant Program, and to make the text relevant for this year's solicitation.

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 required information and documentation for Prop. 1 grants, and provide instructions for completing the required concept proposal and full proposal for the Conservancy's grant program. ~~The Prior to their initial adoption, the~~ Guidelines were posted on the Conservancy's web site for 30 days ~~and prior to approval and were~~ vetted via three public meetings (Sec. 79706(b)). This revised version of the Guidelines has also been posted on the Conservancy's web site for 30 days prior to approval, and was vetted at a public meeting.

Eligibility Requirements

A. ~~A.~~ Grant Categories

This section was moved from another section later in the Grant Guidelines. It has been moved up so that applicants know what we're talking about when we refer to Category 1 and Category 2 proposals in the subsection immediately following.

The Conservancy will release funds for two grant categories. Category 1 proposals are limited to pre-project activities (e.g., planning, permits, etc.) that are necessary for a specific future on-the-ground project that meets the Conservancy Prop. 1 Grant Program criteria. Category 2 proposals are on-the-ground implementation and land acquisition projects. Please note that the awarding of a Category 1 grant for a project does not guarantee that a Category 2 grant will be awarded for the same project.

Category 1

Proposals are limited to pre-project activities necessary for a specific future on-the-ground project. A Category 1 proposal must meet all of the requirements for Category 2 proposals if it were to make it to the Category 2 stage. Examples of Category 1 activities include:

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

Category 2

Proposals include on-the-ground, implementation projects and land acquisition projects. Category 2 projects are subject to the State General Obligation Bond Law which requires that capital outlay projects be maintained for a minimum of 15 years (section 16727(a)).

Examples of Category 2 activities include:

- Habitat enhancement, restoration, and protection
- Pollution runoff reduction
- Working landscape enhancements

B. Funding Available

The dollar amounts in this section have been updated: \$10m total pot of funding, \$200,000 cap for Category 2 projects, and \$3m cap for implementation projects. Added language that explains the cap on planning funds, and the Conservancy's discretion to modify budget requests or to partially fund projects if oversubscribed, and to reserve funds.

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)." In the 2015-2016 grant cycle, the Conservancy awarded approximately six million dollars. The Conservancy intends to grant up to will award up to \$109 million during the 2016-2017 grant cycle. each year for 5 years.

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 proposals (on-the-ground projects) to eligible entities subject to approval by the Conservancy pursuant to these Guidelines.

A maximum of \$450,000 is available during each funding cycle for Category 1 proposals. Category 1 proposals may range from \$20,000 to ~~\$204,000,000~~. ~~Please note that the awarding of a Category 1 grant for a project does not guarantee that a Category 2 grant will be awarded for the same project.~~ A ~~minimum of maximum of up to \$98,550,000~~ is available during each funding cycle for Category 2 proposals. Category 2 proposals may range from \$25,000 to ~~\$32,000,000~~.

Comment [JL2]: Moved to section above

Category 1 planning proposals may use 100 percent of awarded funds for planning activities, however, these planning funds must relate to a future Category 2 and may not exceed 10 percent of the total project funds (Category 1 and Category 2 combined) requested from the Conservancy.

Funding recommendations and decisions will be based upon the scores received, the reasonableness of the costs, 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. When eligible projects (those receiving at least 75 points) exceed the amount of funds available in the funding cycle, the Conservancy may choose not to fund some of the eligible projects or to award partial funding. The Board may, within its discretion, approve a conditional award of funds or a reservation of funds to accommodate pending compliance actions (e.g., CEQA).

Comment [JL3]: Language drafted by Legal per PPS request

~~B.C.~~ **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.

~~G.D.~~ **C.** — Eligible Projects

Added language that references the 15-year minimum project "useful life" requirement that is found in the State General Obligation Bond Law.

Prop. 1 identifies projects to protect and restore California rivers, lakes, streams, and watersheds that can 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.
 - Fish passage barrier removal projects.
 - 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.
 - Projects that enhance habitat values on working lands.
 - Projects that recover anadromous fish populations and their habitats.
- Water Quality. Examples include:
 - Polluted runoff reduction projects that restore impaired waterbodies, prevent pollution, improve water management, and 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.
- Water-related Agricultural Sustainability. Examples include:
 - Agricultural analysis and investment strategy projects that will lead to on-the-ground changes.
 - 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.
 - Agricultural conservation that will result in pollution runoff reduction.

Comment [JL4]: This seems like we are inviting projects that are striving to reduce pollution through education alone, which is actually not eligible.

Comment [JL5]: It seems like this language is necessary to make this consistent with the bond.

This list is offered as guidance for potential applicants and is not exhaustive nor a guarantee of individual project eligibility or funding. Eligibility and funding determinations will be made on a project-by-project basis during the application review process. Projects must comply with all legal requirements, including the State General Obligation Bond Law in order to be deemed eligible. The State General Obligation Bond Law limits the use of bond funds to the construction, acquisition, and long term improvement of capital assets that have an expected useful life of at least fifteen years.

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.E.~~ **D. — Ineligible Projects**

Added the first bullet to reflect the need to comply with the State General Obligation Bond Law.

Examples of ineligible projects and costs include:

- Any implementation project that will not result in the construction, acquisition, or long term enhancement of a capital asset.
 - ~~Planning projects that do not relate to an eligible implementation project.~~
- 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.F.~~ **E. — Eligible Applicants**

Eligible grant applicants include public agencies, nonprofit organizations, public utilities, federally recognized Tribes, state Tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission’s California Tribal Consultation List, 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 an organization that is qualified to do business in California and qualified under Section 501(c)(3) of Title 26 of the United States Code.
- 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 or is federally recognized).
- 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. For more information, refer to the Conflict of Interest section.

~~F.G.~~ **F. — Eligible Costs**

At the recommendation of DOF audit staff, modified this section to use the term “indirect” instead of “administrative,” and included a draft definition for our indirect rate. Indirect rate has been increased to 20%, in line with other Chapter 6 grantors (CDFW – 20%; SNC – 15%; WCB – 20%).

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-indirect~~ costs must be directly related to the project and may ~~not exceed~~ be up to five-twenty (20%) percent of the project implementation cost. To determine the amount of eligible ~~administrative-indirect~~ costs, the applicant must first determine the cost of implementing the project, not including any ~~administrative-indirect~~ costs. Once the project implementation cost has been determined, the applicant may calculate ~~administrative-indirect~~ costs and include them in the total grant request up to the allowable twenty percent cap. ~~Similar to the traditional definition of “overhead” and “indirect”, administrative-indirect~~ costs must be reasonable, allocable, and applicable and may include administrative support (e.g., personnel time for accounting, legal, executive, IT, or other staff who support the implementation of the proposed project but who are not directly billing their time to the project), and office-related expenses (e.g., insurance, rent, utilities, printing/copying equipment, computer equipment, and janitorial expenses) and personnel. ~~These costs are subject to audit and must be documented by the grantee. Indirect expenses may not be added into the hourly rate for personnel billing directly to the grant. Personnel rates may only include salary and wages, fringe benefits, and payroll taxes.~~

G.H. ~~_____~~ Ineligible Costs

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, pay for tours, or for eminent domain processes. No part of the Conservancy's grant funding may be used to subsidize or decrease the mitigation obligations of any party.

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. ~~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. 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.

Comment [JL6]: This section requires administrative staff review to ensure consistency with our grant agreement template.

B. ~~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. California Conservation Corps

To give the subject matter more prominence, this section was created using text from elsewhere Guidelines and from CDFW's solicitation.

For Category 2 implementation projects, applicants shall consult with representatives of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) and CALCC (the entity representing the certified community conservation corps) (collectively, “the Corps”) to determine the feasibility of using their services as defined in section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code to implement projects (CWC §79734). See Appendix E for guidance and requirements necessary to ensure compliance with this provision. Applicants that fail to engage in consultation with the CCC and a certified local conservation corps will not be eligible to receive the Conservancy’s Proposition 1 funding.

~~C.D.~~ 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 California Labor Code (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.E.~~ E. Environmental Compliance

This section merges the text from the FY15-16 Grant Guidelines and Grant Application Packet. Added language that explains the Conservancy’s discretion to reserve funds pending 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, however awards for Category 2 projects cannot be finally approved until the required CEQA documents have been completed and the necessary findings made.~~ The Board may, within its discretion, approve a conditional award of funds or a reservation of funds to accommodate pending compliance actions (e.g., CEQA). The solicitation will provide information on common permits required and where to get information related to permit requirements. Applicants are responsible for CEQA compliance and all CEQA obligations must be met prior to the final approval of any Category 2 projects. A Category 1 grant may be made in order for an applicant to complete the CEQA process in advance of a potential Category 2 application. Approval of a Category 1 grant, however, is not a guarantee of final project approval and the Conservancy retains full discretion to approve or reject an associated Category 2 application.

Comment [JL7]: Moved from immediately below.

Comment [JL8]: Moved from immediately below.

Comment [JL9]: Language added by Legal

Comment [JL10]: To my knowledge, we didn’t actually provide this.

Comment [JL11]: Taken from Grant Application Packet

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 California Water Code (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.F.~~ **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. 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 State Water Resources Control Board (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.

G. Signage

To give the subject matter more prominence, this section was created using text from elsewhere Guidelines and from CDFW's solicitation.

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

H. Performance Measures

Moved this section up in the document to reflect that this is what's being monitored in the following section. Added definitions to clarify terms. Clarified expectations of Category 1 applicants and Category 2 applicants.

Performance measures must be designed so the Conservancy can ensure that projects meet their intended goals, achieve measurable outcomes, and provide value to the State of California. The Conservancy requires that all grant funded projects monitor and report project performance with respect to the stated benefits or objectives identified in the grant proposal. For the purposes of this grant program, goals are broad statements of purpose and intention; objectives are a specific action that supports the attainment of the associated goal.

Applicants are required to prepare and submit a Performance Measures Table, specific to their proposed project, as part of the full proposal. The Performance Measures Table requires applicants to align their project goals with measurable outcomes and outputs. For the purposes of this grant program, project outcomes are defined as:

The benefits or long-term changes that are sought from undertaking the project. They are achieved from the utilization of the project's outputs. Outcomes are linked with goals, in that if the outcomes are achieved then the project's goal(s) have been met. Targeted outcomes will have a measurable benefit and will be used to gauge the success of the project. At the end of the project the measures will help answer such questions as 'what have we achieved?' and 'how do we know?'

Project outputs are defined as:

Products/deliverables expected to be achieved through the completion of the proposed project to meet the identified outcomes. Project outputs are the things that will be produced as a result of working toward your goal.

Applicants must develop performance measures with clearly articulated metrics to which they will be held accountable. Appendix D includes a sample Performance Measures Table. For Category 2 projects, the Monitoring and Assessment Plan, described in the following section, will explain how the applicant will measure environmental performance for the duration of the grant.

The goals of the Performance Measures Table are to:

- Provide a framework for assessment and evaluation of project performance.
- Identify measures that can be used to monitor progress towards achieving project goals and desired outcomes.
- Provide a tool for grantees and grant managers to monitor and measure project progress and guide final project performance reporting that will fulfill the grant agreement requirements.
- Provide information to help improve current and future projects.
- Quantify the value of public expenditures to achieve environmental results.

Many projects include multiple activities that will require measurement of several parameters to evaluate overall project performance. Successful applicants must be prepared to

demonstrate the success of the project through the development and measurement of the appropriate metrics. These metrics may include acres of habitat restored; measurement-based estimates of pollution load reductions; feet of stream channel stabilized or restored; improved water supply reliability and flexibility; or other quantitative measures or indicators. These and other measures or indicators should be selected to fit the performance evaluation needs of the project.

F.I.F. — Performance Monitoring and Assessment

Clarified expectations of Category 1 applicants and Category 2 applicants. Rearranged text so that data collection and management is discussed in one place.

All proposals must include a plan to measure, track, and report on project performance (compliance and effectiveness) that is consistent with the project's objectives and performance measures. All grantees will be required to provide periodic progress reports and a final report that track their progress toward meeting performance measures. All Category 2 implementation grant proposals must include a monitoring and assessment plan that explains how the effectiveness of the project will be measured and reported. The monitoring and assessment plan will vary depending on the scope and nature of the project. A key attribute will be the inclusion of project-specific performance measures that will be used to assess progress toward achieving the project's stated objectives.

Applicants Monitoring and assessment plans should incorporate standardized approaches, where applicable, into their monitoring plans and evaluate opportunities to coordinate with existing monitoring efforts (e.g., California Coastal Monitoring Program, Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP; [website provided in Appendix B](#))) or produce information that can readily be integrated into such efforts. For more information, please see the SWAMP website (Appendix B).

Wetland and riparian restoration projects shall collect and report project and monitoring data 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 for classifying the distribution and abundance of wetlands throughout the state, rapid assessment tools, such as the California Rapid Assessment Method, for assessing the overall condition of wetlands, and EcoAtlas for tracking project information and aggregating and visualizing data from multiple sources. For more information, please see the California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup website (Appendix B).

Comment [JL12]: Moved below

The monitoring plan should include the following elements:

- What will be monitored;
- Monitoring objectives (why the monitoring is needed [e.g., comply with terms of grant, assess progress toward an objective]);
- Clearly stated assessment questions;

- The specific metrics that will be measured and the methods / protocol(s) that will be used;
- Linkages to relevant conceptual model(s);
- The timeframe and frequency of monitoring (including pre- and post-project monitoring);
- The spatial scope of the monitoring effort;
- Quality assurance/quality control procedures;
- Compliance with all permit requirements for monitoring activities (Scientific Collecting Permits, incidental take permits for listed species, etc.);
- Description of relationships to existing monitoring efforts; and
- How the resulting data will be analyzed, interpreted and reported.

Applicants are 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. Applicants are required to develop and utilize science-based adaptive management frameworks for ecosystem restoration and watershed management actions that are consistent with the Delta Plan’s adaptive management framework.

Data Collection and Management

Each proposal must describe how data and other information generated by the project will be collected, handled, stored, and shared. Projects must include data collection and management activities that support incorporation of project data into statewide data systems, where applicable. Environmental data and information collected under these grant programs must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users in a timely manner, except where limited by law, regulation, policy, or security requirements.

Unless otherwise stipulated, all data collected and created is a required deliverable and will become the property of the Conservancy.

Water Quality Data

If applicable, applicants should incorporate standardized approaches, such as those outlined by the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP), for data collection. If the project includes water quality monitoring data collection, it shall be collected and reported to the California Environmental Data Exchange Network [CEDEN] for surface water data (CWC §79704). The grantee shall be responsible for uploading the data and providing a receipt of successful data submission, generated by CEDEN, to the grant manager prior to submitting a final invoice. Guidance for submitting data, including minimum data elements, data formats, and contact information for the Regional Data Centers, is available on the CEDEN website. For more information, please see the CEDEN website (Appendix B).

Wetland and Riparian Restoration Data

~~Wetland and riparian restoration project data shall be uploaded to EcoAtlas. Monitoring data shall be uploaded to statewide data systems, as applicable, in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the WRAMP framework.~~ Wetland and riparian restoration projects shall collect and report project and monitoring data in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the Wetland and Riparian Area Monitoring Program (WRAMP) framework and tools administered by

Comment [JL13]: Text repeated immediately below.

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 for classifying the distribution and abundance of wetlands throughout the state, rapid assessment tools, such as the California Rapid Assessment Method, for assessing the overall condition of wetlands, and EcoAtlas for tracking project information and aggregating and visualizing data from multiple sources. For more information, please see the California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup website (Appendix B). ~~Wetland and riparian restoration project data shall be uploaded to EcoAtlas. Monitoring data shall be uploaded to statewide data systems, as applicable, in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the WRAMP framework. Wetland and riparian restoration project data shall be uploaded to EcoAtlas.~~

Comment [JL14]: Text repeated immediately below

Reporting

All projects will be required to provide periodic progress reports during implementation of the project and a final report prior to project completion. Specific reporting requirements will be included in the grant agreement. Among other requirements, all such reports will include an evaluation of project performance that links to the project's performance measures. The final report will include, among other things, a discussion of findings, conclusions, or recommendations for follow-up, ongoing, or future activities.

~~G. G. Performance Measures~~

Comment [JL15]: Section moved up.

~~Performance measures must be designed so the Conservancy can ensure that projects meet their intended goals, achieve measurable outcomes, and provide value to the State of California. The Conservancy requires that all grant funded projects monitor and report project performance with respect to the stated benefits or objectives identified in the grant proposal. Applicants are required to prepare and submit Project Performance Measures Table, specific to their proposed project, as part of the full proposal (See the Grant Application Packet, Appendix B for more information).~~

~~The goals of the PAEP are to:~~

- ~~• Provide a framework for assessment and evaluation of project performance.~~
- ~~• Identify measures that can be used to monitor progress towards achieving project goals and desired outcomes.~~
- ~~• Provide a tool for grantees and grant managers to monitor and measure project progress and guide final project performance reporting that will fulfill the grant agreement requirements.~~
- ~~• Provide information to help improve current and future projects.~~
- ~~• Quantify the value of public expenditures to achieve environmental results.~~

~~Many projects include multiple activities that will require measurement of several parameters to evaluate overall project performance. Successful applicants must be prepared to~~

~~demonstrate the success of the project through the development and measurement of the appropriate metrics. These metrics may include acres of habitat restored; measurement-based estimates of pollution load reductions; feet of stream channel stabilized or restored; improved water supply reliability and flexibility; or other quantitative measures or indicators. These and other measures or indicators should be selected to fit the performance evaluation needs of the project.~~

I. Land Acquisitions

New section created to provide guidance for acquisition projects.

The Conservancy may recommend awards up to \$3,000,000 for a land acquisition project. Acquisition costs may include personnel time, due diligence costs, closing costs, and the purchase of real property. The Conservancy will not pay for the Department of General Services (DGS) to review and approve the required appraisal; the grantee must pay DGS directly for this expense.

- Property must be acquired from a willing seller and in compliance with current laws governing relocation and acquisition of real property by public agencies¹ in an amount not to exceed Fair Market Value, as approved by the State.
- If a signed purchase option agreement is unavailable to be submitted with the application, a Willing Seller Letter is required from each landowner indicating they are a willing participant in the proposed real estate transaction. The letter should clearly identify the parcels to be purchased and state that “if grant funds are awarded, the seller is willing to enter into negotiations for sale of the property at a purchase price not to exceed fair market value.”
- Once funds are awarded and an agreement is signed with the Conservancy, another property cannot be substituted for the property specified in the application. Therefore it is imperative the Applicant demonstrate the seller is negotiating in good faith, and that discussions have proceeded to a point of confidence.
- The Department of General Services (DGS) must review and approve all appraisals of real property. Applicant must budget \$10,000 for the appraisal and/or transaction review, which is not an eligible project cost and must be covered by match funds.

Proposals for acquisition of real property must address the following, as required by section 32364.5 (b) of the Conservancy’s enabling legislation:

1. The intended use of the property.
2. The manner in which the land will be managed.
3. How the cost of ongoing operations, maintenance, and management will be provided, including an analysis of the maintaining entity’s financial capacity to support those ongoing costs.
4. Grantees shall demonstrate, where applicable, how they will provide payments in lieu of taxes, assessments, or charges otherwise due to local government.

¹ Government Code, Chapter 16, Section 7260 et seq.

For projects that propose to acquire an interest in real property, the following information is required at the time of application:

- A table including: parcel numbers, acreage, willing seller name and address, breakdown of how the funds will be budgeted, and an acquisition schedule.
- Copy of the Purchase Agreement or a Willing Seller Letter
- Appraisal or Estimation of Fair Market Value
- Preliminary Title Report
- Letter stating that applicant will directly pay DGS for review of appraisal and associated materials
- Map showing lands that will be acquired, including parcel lines and numbers.
- Analysis of mineral rights issues, if applicable.

Acquisition projects will be subject to a specific set of requirements that must be met prior to and immediately after closing escrow. For more information, please refer to the checklist provided in Appendix F

~~H.K.~~ **H.** — 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 ~~S~~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 from other sources that duplicates the portion or work or costs funded by a Conservancy grant;
 - the project description has changed and is no longer eligible for funding; or
 - the applicant requests to end the project.
- ~~To the extent practicable, Category 2 proposals 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.~~
- ~~Projects shall consult with representatives of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) AND CALCC (the entity representing the certified community conservation corps) (collectively, "the Corps") to determine the feasibility of the Corps' participation and,~~

where feasible, utilize their services (see Appendix E in the Grant Application Packet for CCC guidelines).

Comment [JL16]: Moved above

Proposal Selection Proposal Solicitation

The bulk of the Grant Application Packet text was brought in at this point.

A. Applying for a Grant

First paragraph below newly added for context; bullets moved from later in the document. Scoring threshold has been dropped to 75 pts. Added language that explains the Conservancy's discretion to modify budget requests or to partially fund projects if oversubscribed, and to reserve funding.

The Delta Conservancy runs a two-part proposal solicitation process. Concept proposals are invited from any eligible applicant. Concept proposals are scored by Conservancy staff, and those only those projects that meet or exceed the minimum point threshold at the concept proposal stage are invited to submit full proposals.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

The following steps will be followed during a grant cycle:

- The Conservancy will hold a proposal submission workshop. Questions received at the proposal submission workshop, or subsequently over the phone or via email, and staff's response will be posted on the Conservancy's Prop. 1 Grant Program web page to assist others with similar questions.
- If potential applicants have questions that are not answered on the Conservancy's Grant Program web page or via the proposal submission workshop, potential applicants are encouraged to contact Conservancy grant staff before submitting a proposal. Once a proposal has been submitted, Conservancy staff will only be able to provide status updates.
- Potential applicants will submit a concept proposal. Only proposals submitted prior to the submission deadline will be considered.
- The concept proposals will be reviewed for administrative and technical purposes as outlined in the concept proposal evaluation criteria. If the concept proposal is complete, meets all concept proposal requirements, and scores a minimum of 75 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. Only full proposals submitted prior to the submission deadline will be considered.
- The full proposals will be reviewed and scored by the Conservancy grant team according to the proposal evaluation criteria below. Conservancy staff will conduct a project site visit with each eligible applicant.

- The full proposals will also be reviewed by an independent professional review panel made up of state and federal agency technical experts. The professional review panel will provide an additional independent review of staff's evaluation and scoring.
- Following professional review, the staff team will assign final scores to each application.
- The final score will be posted on the Conservancy's website for final board approval at a public meeting. The Board will be provided with a list of all applications received, their final scores, and the staff recommendation for projects to be funded. Full proposals will be made available upon request. The Board action will involve ratification of the projects' scores and action on staff's funding recommendation. Applicants and members of the public will have the opportunity to appear before the Board at this time.
- A score of 75 points during either the concept or full proposal stage does not guarantee that a grant award will be made or that a project will receive all of the requested funding. Funding recommendations and decisions will be based upon the scores received, the reasonableness of the costs, 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. When eligible projects (those receiving at least 75 points) exceed the amount of funds available in the funding cycle, the Conservancy may choose not to fund some of the eligible projects or to award partial funding.
- If a project scores 75 points or higher during either the concept or full proposal stages but cannot demonstrate strong local support or a lack of significant conflict from local interests, the Conservancy reserves the right not to fund the project until the conflict is satisfactorily resolved.
- The Board may, within its discretion, approve a conditional award of funds or a reservation of funds to accommodate pending compliance actions (e.g., CEQA).
- 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.

Comment [I17]: NUR comment: To who? The Board? The public? Should you consider posting the full applications on line at this stage?

Comment [JL18]: Proposals will be available to any member of the public who requests them. The Board will have already received full proposals when they are sent out as part of the local notification process (see pg. 26 of this document). Applications will not be posted online because: 1. They consist of multiple files, making them very large and cumbersome; and 2. It's not clear than any other agencies or conservancies post whole proposals online. We will make ours available electronically for free, or in print for a fee and according to our public requests guidelines.

The Conservancy will hold a proposal submission workshop in September (the date will be announced on our website, and when the proposal solicitation is released). Questions received at the proposal submission workshop, or subsequently over the phone or via email, have been posted on the Conservancy's Prop. 1 Grant Program web page to assist others with similar questions. If potential applicants have questions that are not answered on the Conservancy's Grant Program web page, potential applicants are encouraged to contact Conservancy staff BEFORE submitting a concept proposal. Once a concept proposal has been submitted, Conservancy staff will only be able to offer status updates.

Comment [JL19]: Grant Application Packet text; redundant with bullets above.

B. Grant Cycle and Important Dates

Section below updated with information for this year's grant cycle.

The Conservancy's grant cycle is approximately 98 months long. Concept proposals are solicited in the fall, full proposals are invited in the winter, and funding is awarded the following spring. If all funds during a fiscal year are expended but proposals have been submitted that otherwise could be approved for funding, these proposals may be held and re-considered during the next grant cycle. All dates for the Conservancy's 2016-2017 grant cycle are subject to change. Please check the Prop. 1 Grant Program web page for the most up-to-date information.

Important dates for the 20165-176 grant cycle are:

- ~~— 2nd Concept Proposal Solicitation — November 5, 2015 to December 18, 2015~~
- Concept Proposal Solicitation – September 1, 2016 - September 30, 2016
- ~~— Board Approval of Concept Proposals — January 27, 2016~~
- Full Proposal Solicitation – ~~January 29, 2016 to March 11, 2016~~November 28, 2016 – January 20, 2017
- Board Approval of Full Proposals – ~~May 25, 2016~~April 26, 2017

C. Grant Categories and Funding Levels

~~There are two grant categories in this grant cycle. Category 1 proposals are limited to pre-project activities (e.g., planning, permits, etc.) that are necessary for a specific future on-the-ground project that meets the Conservancy Prop. 1 Grant Program criteria. Category 2 proposals are on-the-ground implementation projects. A maximum of \$450,000 is available for Category 1 proposals. Category 1 proposals may range from \$20,000 to \$100,000. Please note that the awarding of a Category 1 grant for a project does not guarantee that a Category 2 grant will be awarded for the same project. A maximum of \$8,550,000 is available during each funding cycle for Category 2 proposals. Category 2 proposals may range from \$25,000 to \$2,000,000.~~

Comment [JL20]: From Grant Application Packet; redundant with section at beginning of doc,

Comment [JL21]: Integrated into Eligibility requirements, section A

Proposal Selection

A. Proposal Review and Selection Process

Scoring threshold has been dropped to 75 pts.

Those interested in applying for Prop. 1 funds through the Conservancy must submit a concept proposal, which must clearly demonstrate the value of the project and provide the Conservancy with adequate information to evaluate the project. The concept proposal will be scored by Conservancy staff based on the concept proposal evaluation criteria.

If the concept proposal meets the scoring threshold of 785 points (as well as all concept proposal requirements), the applicant will be invited to submit a full proposal. 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.

Full proposals will be reviewed and scored by the Conservancy grant team and a professional review ~~panel to~~panel to evaluate benefits, project design and readiness, and other factors (see

full proposal evaluation criteria below). The professional review panel will be made up of state and federal agency technical experts, and will review staff's evaluation and scoring of full proposals to provide an independent review of staff's evaluation and scoring. A minimum of 785 points are required for a full proposal to be considered for funding. Conservancy staff will conduct a project site visit with each eligible applicant.

If a project scores 785 points or higher during either the concept or full proposal stages but cannot demonstrate strong local support or a lack of significant conflict from local interests, the Conservancy reserves the right not to fund the project until the conflict is satisfactorily resolved.

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. The Board will be provided with a list of all proposals received, and a staff recommendation for projects to be funded.

Proposals and scoring information will be made available upon request.

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.

B. Evaluation Criteria for Concept Proposal

Added eligibility requirements to avoid full review of projects that are not eligible for program. Modified criteria so that there is one criterion per evaluation category, and to differentiate between requirements for category 1 and category 2 proposals. Reassigned point values to balance point distribution.

Conservancy staff will determine the eligibility of a concept proposal using the criteria outlined below. If a concept proposal passes all three eligibility criteria, its merit will be evaluated by Conservancy staff using the concept proposal criteria listed below.

Eligibility Review

Conservancy staff will assess a project's eligibility based on the three criteria below, assigning a pass or fail for each criterion. A passing score will be assigned if the project meets all of the criteria as listed, or if the project could meet all of the criteria with minimal modifications. Projects that pass the eligibility review but require modifications to be eligible will be notified about eligibility requirements if they are invited to submit a full proposal. Eligibility will be reassessed during the full proposal review process.

Eligibility Criteria (Pass/Fail)

1. Will the project result in the construction, acquisition or long term improvement of a capital asset or is the project a planning effort that will lead to such project? A capital asset is tangible physical property that has a useful life of at least fifteen years.
2. Will the project produce ecosystem and/or water quality and/or agricultural sustainability benefits?
3. Is the project consistent with Proposition 1, the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation, and the Delta Plan?

Evaluation and Scoring

Staff will score projects based on the evaluation criteria below. If a project scores a minimum of 75 points (out of 100), a full proposal will be requested. The number in parentheses reflects the maximum number of points allocated to each criterion.

Project Description and Organizational Capacity (12 points)

1. The degree to which the project description clearly explains the location, need, goals and objectives, tasks, deliverables, and budget for the project, as well as the related experience and qualifications of all parties working on the project.

Comment [JL22]: Increased overall points available from 10 to 12.

State Priorities/Project Benefits (25 points)

2. (a). For Category 1 projects, the degree to which the project considers climate change, and the degree to which the specific, on-the-ground project for which planning is being conducted will yield multiple benefits that further Prop. 1 and state priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans.
2. (b). For Category 2 projects, the degree to which the project integrates climate change considerations, and the degree to which it will yield multiple benefits that further Prop. 1 and state priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans .

Comment [JL23]: Condenses three criteria into one: multi-benefit, consistency with state plans, and climate change. Decreased overall points available from 35 to 25.

Readiness (15 points)

3. (a) For a Category 1 project, the degree to which the proposal demonstrates how the proposed planning activities will advance the project toward implementation in a timely manner, and how previous and subsequent phases will ensure that environmental compliance and all data gaps are addressed.
3. (b). For a Category 2 project, the degree to which planning is complete and the project is ready to begin.

Comment [JL24]: Reworded to indicate that part of readiness includes when the planned for project will be implemented.

Local Support (20 points)

4. (a). For Category 1 projects, the degree to which potentially affected parties will be informed and consulted as part of the planning process, and 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.
4. (b). For Category 2 projects, the degree to which potentially affected parties have been informed and consulted, and 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.

Comment [JL25]: Combined 2 criteria into one; noted different expectations for planning v. implementation projects. Increased total overall points available from 12 to 20.

Scientific Merit and Performance Measures (20 points)

Comment [JL26]: 2 criteria combined; criterion split for category 1 v. category 2.

5. (a). For Category 1 projects, the extent to which the scientific basis of the proposed project is clearly described, adaptive management is addressed, and to which goals, outputs and outcomes are presented.

5. (b). For category 2 projects, the extent to which the scientific basis of the proposed project is clearly described, and to which goals, outputs, outcomes, and a plan for tracking performance are described. Applicants should outline a monitoring framework for measuring progress toward achieving stated goals and outcomes, and discuss how adaptive management 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.

Funding: Cost Share and Leveraging (8 points)

Comment [JL27]: No change.

6. The degree to which the project develops a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes. For every 10 percent of cost share, a project will score one point for this evaluation criterion, to a maximum of 5 points. (5 points)

7. The degree to which the project leverages other state funds. (3 points)

C. Evaluation Criteria for Full Proposal

Added eligibility requirements to avoid full review of projects that are not eligible for program. Modified criteria to eliminate redundant evaluations, and to differentiate between requirements for category 1 and category 2 proposals. Added references to acquisition projects.

Eligibility Review

Conservancy staff will assess a project's eligibility based on the three criteria below, assigning a pass or fail for each criterion. A passing score will be assigned only if the project meets all of the criteria as listed.

Eligibility Criteria (Pass/Fail)

1. Will the project result in the construction, acquisition or long term improvement of a capital asset or is the project a planning effort that will lead to such project? A capital asset is tangible physical property that has a useful life of at least fifteen years.
2. Will the project produce ecosystem and/or water quality benefits and/or agricultural sustainability?
3. Is the project consistent with Proposition 1, the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation, and the Delta Plan?

Evaluation and Scoring

If a concept proposal scores a minimum of 75 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 75 points or better to be considered for funding.

Project Description and Organizational Capacity

1. Does the applicant provide a clear description of the project that addresses the need for the project, and project goals and objectives, tasks, deliverables, and budget? How well can the applicant manage and complete the proposed project considering related experience, staff qualifications and knowledge; and what is the applicant's performance on prior federal or state assistance agreements awarded in the past three years? Does the project description include a detailed project plan or implementation schedule; and budget with reasonable costs and clear identification of grant funds and cost share contributions? For acquisition projects, has the applicant satisfactorily provided all required additional information? (10)

Comment [JL28]: This section was the Readiness criteria last year – we were asking for double evaluation of deliverables and budget, so readiness text was added here and rewritten (see below).

State Priorities/ Project Benefits

Comment [JL29]: Broke out criteria for Category 1 v. Category 2; added acquisitions.

2. (a). For Category 1 projects, how well does the specific, on-the-ground project for which planning is being done demonstrate consistency with Prop. 1 and State priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans? Where relevant, projects should demonstrate consistency with regional plans (see Appendix B for a list of relevant plans) (15).

2. (b). For Category 2 projects, how well does the project demonstrate consistency with Prop. 1 and State priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans? Where relevant, projects should demonstrate consistency with regional plans (see Appendix B for a list of relevant plans). For acquisition projects, does the proposal address the factors required by the Conservancy's enabling legislation? (15)

3. (a). For Category 1 projects, does the applicant explain how the planning effort will include efforts to develop a plan to maintain environmental benefits for the required minimum of 15 years, and for developing and implementing an adaptive management plan? (5)

3. (b). For Category 2 projects, how well does the applicant demonstrate plans for long-term management and sustainability of the project for the required minimum of 15 years or longer, and how for the implementation of an adaptive management plan as required and defined in the Delta Plan? (5)

Comment [JL30]: Rewritten for clarity: distinguish between what is required for Cat. 1 v.2; specifically call-out 15-yr requirement for Cat. 2.

4. (a). For Category 1 projects, the extent to which the project considers climate change, and provides a mechanism for incorporating climate change considerations into the planning process. (5)

4. (b). For Category 2 projects, the extent to which the project integrates climate change considerations. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which the impacts of climate change are vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (5).

Comment [JL31]: Language closer to that for concept proposal criteria; broken out into category 1 v. category 2 per public request.

Readiness

5. (a). For Category 1 projects, how well does the proposal demonstrate how the proposed planning activities will advance the project toward implementation in a timely manner, and how previous and subsequent phases will ensure that environmental compliance and all data gaps are addressed? (15)
5. (b). For Category 2 projects, how complete is project planning, what is the status of CEQA and permitting efforts, and when will the project be ready to begin implementation? (15)

Comment [JL32]: Language closer to that for concept proposal criteria on readiness. For Category 2 projects, require some accounting for CEQA/permitting and project start date to accommodate Board request not to fund projects that will lapse into next grant cycle.

Local support

6. How well does the applicant demonstrate that they have local support? Full points will be provided only if a resolution of support from the County is included. (7)
7. To what extent has the applicant developed appropriate and necessary partnerships to help implement the project, and, if applicable, has the project been incorporated into larger plans or existing partnerships? (5)
8. (a). For Category 1 projects, how well does the proposal demonstrate plans inform and consult potentially affected parties, and to avoid, reduce, or mitigate conflicts with existing and adjacent land uses? (5)
8. (b). For Category 2 projects, has the applicant informed and consulted potentially affected parties, how consistent is the project with similar efforts on nearby or surrounding lands, and how well does the project avoid, reduce, or mitigate conflicts with existing and adjacent land uses? (5)

Comment [JL33]: Criteria clarified so that #5 reflects local support; #6 is for forming effective partnerships, and #7 is for working with affected partners and minimizing conflicts.

Funding: Cost Share and Leveraging

9. Does the project develop a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes? For every 10 percent of cost share, a project will score one point for this evaluation criterion, to a maximum of 5 points. (5)
10. Does the project leverage other state funds? (3)

Comment [JL34]: No change

Scientific Merit and Performance Measures

11. How well does the applicant explain the scientific basis of the proposed project and the degree to which best available science has been adopted? If scientific basis is not relevant for this project (e.g., a sustainable agriculture project), what is the extent to which best industry practices are used, and to which the impacts of climate change are vetted? (10)
12. (a). For Category 1 projects, how clear are the project's goals, outputs, outcomes, and performance metrics, and how well does the proposal demonstrate a plan for tracking progress toward stated performance measures? (10)

Comment [JL35]: Removed reference to adaptive management – this is evaluated above, in the State Priorities section.

12. (b). For Category 2 projects, how clear are the project's goals, outputs, outcomes, and performance metrics, and how well does the proposal demonstrate a plan for measuring, monitoring, tracking, and reporting progress toward achieving these results? To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a plan and approach for collecting and managing data consistent with existing State efforts, and for reporting project results or methods to private, State, and/or local government agencies beyond their own organization? (10)

Comment [JL36]: Broke out requirements for category 1 v. category 2, making it clear that monitoring plans are not required for category 1 projects.

13. 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).

Comment [JL37]: Unchanged

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

Second paragraph updated to better spell out how cost share is calculated.

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's 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. Only cost share commitments made explicitly for the project may count toward the cost percentage for grant proposal and ranking purposes. 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.

At both the concept and full proposal stages, for every 10 percent of cost share, a project will score one point, to a maximum of five points. 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. All in-kind cost share must be matched with cash at a one-to-one ratio. For projects without any cash match, in-kind cost share will not be calculated into the project's cost share score. Cost share will be calculated by dividing the total eligible cost share (only that from federal, local, or private sources, with all in-kind matched one-to-one with cash) by the total dollar amount requested from the Conservancy.

Comment [JL38]: Newly added explanation.

The Conservancy will also provide points (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.

E. 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, including the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. 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 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.

The Conservancy will work with the grantee to make all reasonable efforts to address concerns raised by local governments. 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.

A. ~~Concept Proposal Evaluation Criteria~~

~~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 category.~~

Comment [JL39]: Redundant – deleted. For comparison, note that strikethrough in this section is evaluation criteria as worded for FY15-16.

~~Project Description and Organizational Capacity~~

- ~~1. A clear project description including location, need, goals and objectives, tasks, deliverables, and budget (requested funds and cost share contributions). Explain related experience, qualifications of all individuals working on the project, and examples of similar projects (10).~~

~~State Priorities/Project Benefits~~

- ~~2. Tangible results from the project that further Prop. 1 and state priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans (15).~~
- ~~3. The degree to which the project has multiple benefits (10).~~
- ~~4. The extent to which climate change considerations were taken into account. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which the impacts of climate change are vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (10).~~

~~Readiness~~

- ~~5. 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 (15);

b. If a Category 2 project, this means the completeness of the design and the readiness of the project to begin (15).

Local Support

6. The degree to which potentially affected parties, including local government and the Delta Protection Commission, have been informed and consulted, good neighbor policies have been adopted and will inform the implementation of the project, and the Agricultural Land Stewardship Strategies (see link in Appendix B) have been applied (7).

7. 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. Full points will be provided only if letters of support from applicable local government entities are included (5).

Scientific Merit and Performance Measures

8. 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).

9. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates the project objectives including outcomes and outputs (10).

Funding: Cost Share and Leveraging

10. The degree to which the project develops a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes. For every 10 percent of cost share, a project will score one point for this evaluation criterion, to a maximum of 5 points (1-5).

11. The degree to which the project leverages other state funds (3).

B. Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria

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.

Project Description and Organizational Capacity

- ~~1.— Does the applicant provide a clear description of the project including the needs for the project, project objectives, tasks, deliverables, and budget. More specifically, how well can the applicant manage and complete the proposed project considering related experience, readiness, and staff qualifications and knowledge; and what is the applicant's performance on prior federal or state assistance agreements awarded in the past three years (10).~~

State Priorities/Project Benefits

- ~~2.— How well does the project demonstrate consistency with Prop. 1 and state priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans. Projects should demonstrate consistency with regional plans to show the multibenefit outcome of the project (see Appendix B of the Grant Guidelines for a list of relevant plans), and with Delta Plan policies (15).~~
- ~~3.— How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability beyond the term of the grant proposal, and if a Category 2 Restoration and Enhancement or Water Quality project, (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 plan as required and defined in the Delta Plan regulations that considers threats to habitat including climate change (5).~~
- ~~4.— The extent which climate change considerations were taken into account. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which the impacts of climate change are vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (5).~~

Readiness

- ~~5.— How well does the applicant provide a (a) detailed project plan or implementation schedule; and (b) budget with reasonable costs and clear identification of grant funds and cost share contributions (15).~~

Local support

- ~~6.— 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. Full points will be provided only if resolutions of support from applicable local government entities are included (7).~~
- ~~7.— How well does the applicant demonstrate appropriate and necessary partnerships to help implement the project (5).~~
- ~~8.— 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, if applicable (see link in Appendix B) (5).~~

Funding: Cost Share and Leveraging

- 9. ~~The degree to which the project develops a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes. For every 10 percent of cost share, a project will score one point for this evaluation criterion, to a maximum of 5 points (1-5).~~
- 10. ~~The degree to which the project leverages other state funds (3).~~

Scientific Merit and Performance Measures

- 11. ~~How well does the project demonstrate a plan for achieving expected project outputs and objectives, including a plan for measuring, tracking, and reporting progress toward achieving these results. Projects should demonstrate the plan and approach for reporting project results or methods to state or local government agencies within and beyond their own organization (10).~~
- 12. ~~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).~~
- 13.1. ~~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).~~

Application Process

This section describes the information and documents that must be submitted for both a concept and a full proposal.

A. Concept Proposal Instructions

Please read the instructions below to submit a complete, clear, and responsive concept proposal. All files should be submitted electronically one of two ways: 1) via email to prop1grants@deltaconservancy.ca.gov ; or 2) via USB or CD and mailed or hand delivered to 1450 Halyard Drive, Suite 6, West Sacramento, CA 95691. The concept proposal should not exceed ~~seven-ten~~ pages (not including the application form, budget, and support letters).

1. ~~1~~ Concept Proposal Application Form

The form (please see Appendix C) should be completed with additional pages for the items listed below. Please use at least 11-point standard font, single line spacing with one-inch page margins. The following information will be scored using the concept proposal evaluation criteria. ~~The total maximum number of points available is 100. Projects must score at least 85 points to~~

~~be invited to submit a full proposal.~~

Comment [JL40]: Redundant

a. Applicant Information

Applicant must list its organizational/agency name, address, the primary contact's name and contact information, and the organization's federal tax ID number. Applicant must also identify the type of organization it is.

b. Project Information

Applicant must provide specific information about the project. Name, location (county, city/community, and any information that is more specific to the project site), proposed start date, and the estimated completion date.

~~2. 2.~~ **Project Description and Organizational Capacity**

Comment [JL41]: Headings consistent with evaluation categories.

Provide a clear, detailed description of the project proposed for Conservancy funding. Include:

- ~~Location of project,~~
- Specific need for the project,
- The project's goals and objectives,
- Specific tasks that will be undertaken, ~~and~~
- Work products or deliverables, ~~and~~
- ~~Experience and qualifications of all parties working on the project.~~

Comment [JL42]: Moved from immediately below.

~~3.~~ **Organizational Capacity**

~~Discuss the organization's capacity and experience in planning and implementing similar projects.~~

Comment [JL43]: Moved above

~~3. 4.~~ **State Priorities/Project Benefits**

Comment [JL44]: Headings consistent with evaluation categories.

~~Demonstrate that the project will yield multiple benefits that are aligned with state priorities. Describe how the project's outcomes are consistent with the following:~~

- ~~Proposition 1~~
- ~~California Water Action Plan~~
- ~~The Conservancy's enabling legislation~~
- ~~The Conservancy's strategic plan~~
- ~~The Delta Plan~~
- ~~Applicable recovery plans and other related efforts~~

Comment [JL45]: Spelled out to alert applicants to need to address each.

~~Category 1 projects should describe the consistency of the specific, on-the-ground project for which planning is being conducted. Consistency with Funding Requirements, Project Selection, and Programmatic Criteria~~

~~Provide a clear description of how the project proposed for Conservancy funding is consistent with Prop. 1, the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, and key local, state, and federal plans. Projects selected to submit a full proposal~~

will be required to substantiate this consistency. ~~Also describe how the project will address general coordination with other related efforts.~~

~~Also, describe how climate change considerations are being taken into account. For planning projects, note how climate change will be considered as part of the planning process. For implementation projects, describe any risks posed by climate change and how the project has been designed to mitigate those risks, and explain any projected climate-related impacts or benefits of the project. If these are not relevant for this project (e.g., a sustainable agriculture project), then describe how best industry practices have been incorporated.~~

Comment [JL46]: Moved from section below to be consistent with evaluation criteria. Fleshed out language per public request.

~~2.4.~~ **5. — Readiness**

Describe the readiness to proceed with the project, ~~indicating any work that has already been done and any additional work that will need to be done: as is applicable for the type of grant you are applying (Category 1 or Category 2):~~

- ~~Discuss the readiness of the project to begin.~~
- ~~For planning projects, describe how the proposed planning activities will advance the project toward implementation.~~
- List any data needs or identified data gaps, and a process for addressing them.
- Describe any permits and landowner agreements that will be required, if applicable. This includes the status of CEQA compliance.
- ~~Discuss the status of cost share efforts, including the leveraging of state funds.~~

Comment [JL47]: Consistent with updated criteria

~~3.5.~~ **6. — Cooperation and Local Support**

List individuals and organizations who will be participating in the project, cooperating (providing guidance, etc.), and supporting the project (not actively engaged, but aware of the project and supportive). Describe how you have informed and consulted with affected parties and/or incorporated good neighbor practices into the project. ~~For Category 1 projects, describe how affected parties will be informed and consulted during the planning process, if they have not been already. Discuss how projects are consistent with similar efforts in surrounding areas, and integrated into larger plans and partnership. Applicants should include letters of support from applicable local government agencies, and should consult with the Delta Protection Commission are also required~~ (letters do not count toward ~~seven-ten~~ page maximum).

~~4.6.~~ **7. — Best Available Science and Adaptive Management Scientific Merit and Performance Measures**

Describe the scientific basis of the proposed project and how best available science and adaptive management practices have ~~been or will be adopted~~ integrated into the project and will be implemented. ~~Also, describe how climate change considerations are being taken into account. If these are not relevant for this project (e.g., a sustainable agriculture project), then describe how best industry practices have been incorporated.~~ ~~Include a general description of project goals, outcomes and outputs, describing the benefits they will yield. For Category 2~~

Comment [JL48]: Headings consistent with evaluation categories.

Comment [JL49]: Moved above for consistency with evaluation criteria.

~~projects, describe the approach to measuring and reporting the project's effectiveness, including how successes will be quantified.~~

Comment [JL50]: Moved from below, Project Assessment.

~~8. Project Assessment~~

~~Describe your approach to measuring and reporting your project's effectiveness, including how you will quantify your successes. Identify project objectives including a general description of project outcomes and outputs.~~

Comment [JL51]: Integrated above.

5.7. ~~9. Funding Request and Budget~~

Applicant must provide information about the total project cost as well as the amount requested from the Conservancy. Information about cash and in-kind contributions, including sources, must also be included. ~~For Category 2 grants, may not exceed 10 percent for planning monitoring costs may not exceed 20 percent. Category 1, planning proposals, may use 100 percent of awarded funds for planning activities, however, these planning funds must relate to future Category 2 and may not exceed 10 percent of the total project funds (Category 1 and Category 2 combined) requested from the Conservancy.~~

Please use the Concept Proposal Budget Template in Appendix C. ~~Explain how budget items in the attached table align with project tasks described in the project description. Include grant management and reporting, monitoring (for Category 2), and performance measure tracking costs in the total funding request.~~

B. Full Proposal Instructions

~~Removed application instructions, instead referring applicants to application form.~~

As described in the preceding section, all prospective applicants are required to submit a concept proposal. An applicant will be invited to submit a full proposal if the concept proposal has met all of the criteria and receives the minimum score. Only applicants invited to submit a full proposal will be reviewed and considered.

Applicants who are invited to submit a full proposal will be sent proposal submission instructions, ~~which will include a fillable PDF application form and other required attachments.~~ Prospective applicants ~~however,~~ should be prepared to submit the following information in a full proposal. ~~Full proposals are not to exceed 22 pages unless otherwise noted.~~

~~1. 1. Cover Page (1-page limit)~~

Comment [JL52]: All deleted information covered in application form.

- ~~a. Project Title;~~
- ~~b. Name of applicant and applicant's federal tax I.D. number;~~
- ~~c. Key personnel and contact information (i.e., email address and phone number);~~
- ~~d. Geographic location — general project location description including name of city and county of the project site;~~
- ~~e. Total project cost, Conservancy grant funds requested, and cost share;~~
- ~~f. Project start and end dates; and~~
- ~~g. Abstract/project summary — the abstract should begin with one or two sentences describing the main objective of the proposal. It should also include a listing of the main tasks to be accomplished, and a description of the final product(s).~~

~~2.~~ **2. Detailed Project Description Narrative (10-page limit)**

a. Describe the project tasks or components, the anticipated products associated with each task, and the anticipated timeline for each task. Include a description of the roles and responsibilities of the applicant. The narrative should be supplemented with a table displaying specific tasks, outcomes, and timeline (see Table 1 below). Include all six-month progress reports and the final report (indicating project completion in the schedule).

Table 1

Tasks	Timeline	Outcome(s)
1.1		
1.2		
1.3		
1.4		
2.1		
2.2		
2.3		

- b. Provide an organizational capacity narrative that details the applicant’s ability to complete the project as proposed. The narrative should identify the resources (staff, project partners, or contractors) intended to complete the tasks described in the work plan and should explain the applicant’s expertise or experience completing similar projects, including performance on prior federal or state assistance agreements awarded to that organization in the past three years.
- c. Describe how the project is consistent with Prop. 1 funding requirements and the Conservancy’s mission and programmatic goals.
- d. Describe the need for the project and how it contributes to statewide priorities (e.g., California Water Action Plan) or regional plans (e.g., Delta Plan; links to relevant plans can be found in the Grant Guidelines, Appendix B).
- e. Provide a narrative describing plans or planning for the long-term management and sustainability of the project.
- f. Indicate the degree to which the project has community and local government support, is consistent with similar efforts on nearby or surrounding lands and is a part of larger plans or identified partnerships. Also describe any known project opposition with an explanation of the nature of the concerns, and any efforts that have been taken to address the concerns. Discuss how the results of the project will be transferred to (other) state or local government agencies.

~~Describe the scientific basis of the proposed project and how best available science and adaptive management practices have been adopted and will be implemented. If this is not relevant for this project (e.g., a sustainable agriculture project), then describe how best industry practices have been incorporated and include a description of the use of any new or innovative technologies or practices. Discuss how the results of the project will be transferred to (other) state or local government agencies.~~

g. Describe how the California Conservation Corps (CCC) or local conservation corps certified by the CCC will be used. If it is not feasible to use a conservation corps, explain why. For more information regarding the use of the CCC, see [Appendix E](#).

3. 3. Detailed Budget and Narrative (4-page limit)

a. **Budget Table**—Using the Budget Table Template (see Appendix C: Full Proposal Budget Template), identify all project costs for which Conservancy funds are being requested, and provide detail for each category identified in the detailed budget form by task. All information needed to determine the cost effectiveness of the project should be provided in this form. Include costs for task elements outlined in the Detailed Project Description. Performance measure reporting should be included as a task or task element. Applicants should also include cost share contributions toward project completion provided by others. Note that funding requests should not exceed limits noted in the Guidelines. Applicants must also identify cost share contributions if receiving funding for the project from a source other than the Conservancy. List the amount expected in the cost share column. Budget estimate details such as the status and source of other funding contributions or explanations of revenues should be included in the Budget Narrative.

—Note that funds requested for planning and monitoring should not exceed 20 percent of total project costs, excluding cost shares. Category 1 funds are intended to be used for planning activities but should not exceed 10 percent of total project costs.

b. **Budget Narrative**—Provide a description of the proposed cost for each of the budget categories in the Budget Table. Explain if and how partners will contribute to the cost share. This section provides an opportunity for a narrative description of the budget or aspects of the budget such as other costs and contracts. Describe itemized costs in sufficient detail for the Conservancy to determine whether or not these costs are reasonable and allowed.

c. **Cost Allocation Plan**—The plan should be tailored to fit the specific policies of each organization. If your organization's policies are different in any of the categories, please specifically identify the methodology used. Although there are different methodologies available for allocating costs, the methodology used should result in an equitable distribution of costs to programs. Recipients must have a system in place to equitably charge costs. A sample Cost Allocation Plan has been provided on the Conservancy's web site (to be included in final).

~~4. 4. Performance Measures (5-page limit)~~

~~Describe the goals, outcomes, performance measures, measurement tools and methods, and targets in a project performance measures table, using Appendix B as a guide. This will serve as the basis for the development of the Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (to be developed when a project is funded). Performance measures must be project specific and consistent and related to performance measures identified in the Delta Plan and other relevant planning documents (See Appendix B of the Guidelines).~~

~~5. _____~~

1. Authorization or Resolution to Apply (2-page limit)

Applicants will be required to provide a copy of documentation authorizing them to submit an application for grant funding to the Conservancy. A project-specific governing board resolution is required for nonprofit organizations, tribes and local government agencies. However, if the organization’s governing board has delegated authority to a specific officer to act on behalf of that organization, that officer may, in lieu of a resolution, submit a letter of authorization along with documentation of the delegated authority. The documentation of delegated authority must include the language granting such authority and the date of delegation.

For both letters and resolutions, the authorized representative may be a particular person (or persons) or a position (or positions). The advantage of having a position named as the authorized representative is that a new letter or resolution would not be required should the person currently holding the position change. In lieu of a resolution, state and federal agencies may submit a letter authorizing the application. The letter must be on the agency’s letterhead, and must identify the position (job title) of the authorized representative.

~~Please note: The following items do not count toward the 22-page maximum.~~

~~2. 6.—Documents Required of Nonprofit Applicants (Does not count toward 22-page maximum.)~~

Nonprofit applicants are required to submit Articles of Incorporation, IRS letters, and signed Bylaws. If a nonprofit organization has submitted these documents to the Conservancy in prior funding cycles and its status has not changed, the applicant should notify Conservancy staff.

Note: If these documents are not already on file at the Conservancy, they must be submitted to the Conservancy if invited to submit a full proposal.

A nonprofit must meet eligibility requirements at the time of concept proposal submittal. Nonprofits incorporated outside of California must submit documentation from the California Secretary of State at the time of the application showing that they are permitted to do business in the State of California.

As required by statute, an eligible nonprofit organization is one that qualifies for exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of Title 26 of the United States Code and has charitable purposes that are consistent with the purposes of the Conservancy.

3. ~~7.—Documents Required of Public Utility (Does not count toward 22-page maximum.)~~

Public utilities regulated by the Public Utilities Commission must demonstrate that it has a clear and definite public purpose and that benefits the customers and not the investors.

4. ~~8.—Documents Required of Native American Tribe (Does not count toward 22-page maximum.)~~

Native American tribes must show proof of its inclusion on the National Heritage Commission's California Tribal List, or proof of federal recognition.

5. ~~9.—Documents Required of Mutual Water Company (Does not count toward 22-page maximum.)~~

Mutual water companies are required to submit a document that demonstrates a clear and definite public purpose and that it benefits the customers of the water system and not the investors.

Urban water suppliers must submit its urban water management plan in accordance with the Urban Water Management Planning Act (Part 2.6 (commencing with Section 10610) of Division 6).

Agricultural water suppliers must submit its agricultural water management plan in accordance with the Agricultural Water Management Planning Act (Part 2.8 (commencing with Section 10800) of Division 6).

Urban water suppliers and agricultural water suppliers must show proof of how it complies with the requirements of Part 2.55 (commencing with Section 10608) of Division 6).

6. ~~10.—Supplemental Documents (Does not count toward 22-page maximum.)~~

Changed language to only require a resolution from the county instead of "all applicable local government agencies." Added language regarding consultation with DPC and information required of acquisition project.

a. Partner and Community Letters of Support

Provide letters of support for the project, including support and commitment letters from partners providing a cost share.

b. Resolutions of Support from Applicable Local Government Agencies

Provide resolutions of support for the project from ~~all applicable local~~the county/counties in which the project is located government agencies.

c. Consultation with the Delta Protection Commission

Provide proof that the Delta Protection Commission has been consulted about the proposed project.

d. Information Required for Acquisition Projects

For projects that propose to acquire an interest in real property, the following information is required at the time of application:

- A table including: parcel numbers, acreage, willing seller name and address, breakdown of how the funds will be budgeted, and an acquisition schedule.
- Copy of the Purchase Agreement or a Willing Seller Letter
- Appraisal or Estimation of Fair Market Value
- Preliminary Title Report
- Letter stating that applicant will directly pay DGS for review of appraisal and associated materials
- Map showing lands that will be acquired, including parcel lines and numbers.
- Analysis of mineral rights issues, if applicable.

Acquisition projects will be subject to a specific set of requirements that must be met prior to and immediately after closing escrow. For more information, please refer to the checklist provided in Appendix F.

e.

e.f. ~~Maps, Photos, and Site Plans~~

Project Location Map

~~If applicable, provide~~ a map identifying the project site. The map should provide sufficient detail to allow a person unfamiliar with the area to locate the project. Applicants are encouraged to provide a satellite image or aerial photograph as the background of the map, if available.

Parcel Map with County Assessor's Parcel Number(s)

~~For all acquisition projects (required), and asf~~ applicable ~~for other projects~~, provide an Assessor's Parcel Map of the project area with the parcel(s) identified by parcel number.

Topographic Map

If applicable, submit a topographic map (preferred 1:24,000 scale) that is detailed enough to identify the project area and elements as described in the project description narrative.

Photos of the Project Site

If applicable, submit no more than 10 photos showing the area(s) to be restored, protected, or acquired. Photos should be appropriately captioned for greatest usefulness.

Site Plan

If applicable, provide a drawing or depiction indicating scale, project orientation (north-south), what work the grantee will accomplish, where the work will be done and the approximate square footage of any improvements that are part of the grant scope. The plan should also indicate access points to the site.

Comment [JL53]: Moved.

d.g. ~~Land Tenure Documents~~

~~In order for the Conservancy to consider projects for funding~~For all projects, agreements must be in place allowing the applicant to access property to construct and maintain the proposed project. If appropriate, define what, if any, agreements are in place, or plans

Comment [JL54]: Depending on what we decide to ask of our current grantees, we may want to update this to be more detailed.

(including a timeline) to acquire those agreements. Please be aware that a grant agreement will not be executed without proof of land tenure.

e.h. Leases or Agreements

If appropriate, provide copies of all leases, agreements, memoranda of understanding, etc., not already addressed affecting project lands or the future operation and maintenance thereof.

f.i. Regulatory Requirements/Permits

Regulatory Requirements/Permits: Provide a list and descriptions of existing and additional required permits for the project. If not applicable, declare that permits are not applicable, and provide the reason(s) why.

~~The Conservancy must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and, where applicable, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) when it authorizes grants.~~

~~At the time of application, the applicant must identify who it believes is the lead agency for the project and how it intends to comply with CEQA. If another agency is the lead agency, the applicant shall provide, at a minimum: (1) a filed Notice of Exemption, or (2) an initial study with a description of how the applicant will comply with CEQA. The Conservancy cannot approve a Category 2 grant until the required CEQA analysis has been completed and the necessary findings made.~~

~~At the time of application, the applicant must provide, at a minimum, either (1) a Notice of Exemption filed with the county clerk, or (2) an initial study with a description of how the applicant will comply with CEQA. The Conservancy cannot approve a Category 2 grant until the required CEQA documents have been completed and the necessary findings made. A Category 1 grant may be made in order for an applicant to complete the CEQA process in advance of a potential Category 2 application. Approval of a Category 1 grant, however, is not a guarantee of final project approval and the Conservancy retains full discretion to approve or reject an associated Category 2 application.~~

If NEPA is applicable to the proposed project, the applicant must complete the NEPA section of the CEQA/NEPA compliance form. Please check the box that describes the NEPA status of the project and complete the documentation component of the form. Applicants should also submit any permits, surveys, or reports that support the NEPA status.

Attach copies of adopted Environmental Impact Reports (EIR)—Public Review Draft and Final versions—Negative Declarations or Mitigated Negative Declarations and Initial Studies, or Notices of Exemption, if a public agency has acted to provide CEQA compliance.

If applicable, attach copies of all adopted and relevant NEPA environmental compliance documents, such as a Record of Decision/Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Finding of No Significant Impact/Environmental Assessment, or a Decision Notice/Categorical Exclusion. Applicants should ensure that all environmental documents are current enough to describe the current environmental conditions.

~~g.g. Site Plan~~

~~If applicable, provide a drawing or depiction indicating scale, project orientation (north-south), what work the grantee will accomplish, where the work will be done and the~~

Comment [JL55]: Deleted portions have been moved to section at beginning of doc

Comment [156]: This would not apply if the Conservancy is the lead agency.

~~approximate square footage of any improvements that are part of the grant scope. The plan should also indicate access points to the site.~~

Comment [JL57]: Moved above

~~A. Grant Categories~~

Comment [JL58]: Moved to Eligibility Requirements section at the beginning of the document.

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

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

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

~~Category 2 proposals include on-the-ground, implementation projects. Examples of Category 2 activities include:~~

- ~~— Channel margin enhancement~~
- ~~— Habitat restoration~~
- ~~— Pollution runoff reduction~~
- ~~— Working landscape enhancements~~

~~Category 2 proposals may range in cost from a minimum of \$25,000 to a maximum of \$2,000,000.~~

~~A. B. Proposal Review and Selection Process~~

Comment [JL59]: Moved to beginning of Proposal Solicitation section

~~The following steps will be followed during a grant cycle:~~

- ~~● The Conservancy held a proposal submission workshop on August 12, 2015. Questions received at the proposal submission workshop, or subsequently over the phone or via email, and staff's response have been posted on the Conservancy's Prop. 1 Grant Program web page to assist others with similar questions.~~
- ~~● If potential applicants have questions that are not answered on the Conservancy's Grant Program web page or via the proposal submission workshop, potential applicants are encouraged to contact Conservancy grant staff before submitting a proposal. Once a proposal has been submitted, Conservancy staff will only be able to provide status updates.~~
- ~~● Potential applicant submits a concept proposal (See Grant Application Packet). Only proposals submitted prior to the submission deadline will be considered.~~

- The concept proposals will be reviewed for administrative and technical purposes as outlined in the concept proposal evaluation criteria. 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. Only full proposals submitted prior to the deadline identified in the grant application packet will be considered.
- The full proposals will be reviewed and scored by the Conservancy grant team according to the proposal evaluation criteria below. Conservancy staff will conduct a project site visit with each eligible applicant.
- The full proposals will also be reviewed by an independent professional review panel made up of state and federal agency technical experts. The professional review panel will provide an additional independent review of staff's evaluation and scoring.
- Following professional review, the staff team will assign final scores to each application.
- The final score will be posted on the Conservancy's website for final board approval at a public meeting. The Board will be provided with a list of all applications received, their final scores, and the staff recommendation for projects to be funded. The Board action will involve ratification of the projects' scores and action on staff's funding recommendation. Applicants and members of the public will have the opportunity to appear before the Board at this time.
- A score of 85 points during either 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.
- If a project scores 85 points or higher during either the concept or full proposal stages but cannot demonstrate strong local support or a lack of significant conflict from local interests, the Conservancy reserves the right not to fund the project until the conflict is satisfactorily resolved.
- Full proposals will be made available upon request.
- 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 concept proposal criteria listed below. If a project scores a minimum of 85 points (out of 100), the applicant will be

Comment [JL60]: Moved above

notified to submit a full proposal. The number in parentheses reflects the maximum number of points allocated to each criterion.

Project Description and Organizational Capacity

3. ~~A clear project description including location, need, goals and objectives, tasks, deliverables, and budget (requested funds and cost share contributions). Explain related experience, qualifications of all individuals working on the project, and examples of similar projects (10).~~

Comment [JL61]: What is the applicant proposing to do?

State Priorities/Project Benefits

4. ~~Tangible results from the project that further Prop. 1 and state priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans (15).~~
5. ~~The degree to which the project has multiple benefits (10).~~
6. ~~The extent to which climate change considerations were taken into account. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which the impacts of climate change are vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (10).~~

Comment [JL62]: What is the applicant planning to achieve?

Readiness

5. The design and readiness of the project:

3. ~~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 (15);~~
4. ~~b. If a Category 2 project, this means the completeness of the design and the readiness of the project to begin (15).~~

Local Support

1. ~~The degree to which potentially affected parties, including local government and the Delta Protection Commission, have been informed and consulted, good neighbor policies have been adopted and will inform the implementation of the project, and the Agricultural Land Stewardship Strategies (see link in Appendix B) have been applied (7).~~
12. ~~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. Full points will be provided only if letters of support from applicable local government entities are included (5).~~

Scientific Merit and Performance Measures

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).

~~The extent to which the applicant demonstrates the project objectives including outcomes and outputs (10). The extent to which climate change considerations were taken into account. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which the impacts of climate change are vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (10).~~

Funding: Cost Share and Leveraging

4.—

6.—The degree to which the project develops a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes. For every 10 percent of cost share, a project will score one point for this evaluation criterion, to a maximum of 5 points (1-5).

7.—The degree to which the project leverages other state funds (3).

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.

Project Description and Organizational Capacity

Does the applicant provide a clear description of the project including the needs for the project, project objectives, tasks, deliverables, and budget. More specifically, how well can the applicant manage and complete the proposed project considering related experience, readiness, and staff qualifications and knowledge; and what is the applicant's performance on prior federal or state assistance agreements awarded in the past three years (10).

State Priorities/Project Benefits

2.—How well does the project demonstrate consistency with Prop. 1 and state priorities, including implementation of the California Water Action Plan, the Conservancy's enabling legislation and Strategic Plan, the Delta Plan, and applicable recovery plans. Projects should demonstrate consistency with regional plans to show the multibenefit outcome of the project (see Appendix B of the Grant Guidelines for a list of relevant plans), and with Delta Plan policies (15).

3.—How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability beyond the term of the grant proposal, and if a Category 2 Restoration and Enhancement or Water Quality project, (a) third party monitoring and verification of the

Comment [JL63]: Moved above

Comment [JL64]: Redundant with readiness criteria, below.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

pre-project conditions, post-project habitat conditions, and the maintenance of habitat beyond the terms of the project; and (b) an adaptive management plan as required and defined in the Delta Plan regulations that considers threats to habitat including climate change (5).

~~4. The extent which climate change considerations were taken into account. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which the impacts of climate change are vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (5).~~

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 4 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Readiness

How well does the applicant provide a (a) detailed project plan or implementation schedule; and (b) budget with reasonable costs and clear identification of grant funds and cost share contributions (15).

Local support

~~6. 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. Full points will be provided only if resolutions of support from applicable local government entities are included (7).~~

~~7.~~

~~8. How well does the applicant demonstrate appropriate and necessary partnerships to help implement the project (5).~~

~~9.~~

~~8. 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, if applicable (see link in Appendix B) (5).~~

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 5 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Funding: Cost Share and Leveraging

9. The degree to which the project develops a cost share with private, federal, or local funding to maximize benefits and outcomes. For every 10 percent of cost share, a project will score one point for this evaluation criterion, to a maximum of 5 points (1-5).

10. The degree to which the project leverages other state funds (3).

Scientific Merit and Performance Measures

~~11. How well does the project demonstrate a plan for achieving expected project outputs and objectives, including a plan for measuring, monitoring, tracking, and reporting progress toward achieving these results. Projects should demonstrate the plan and approach for reporting project results or methods to state or local government agencies within and beyond their own organization (10).~~

12. 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).

~~How well does the project demonstrate a plan for achieving expected project outputs and objectives, including a plan for measuring, monitoring, tracking, and reporting progress toward achieving these results. Projects should demonstrate the plan and approach for reporting project results or methods to state or local government agencies within and beyond their own organization (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). The extent which climate change considerations were taken into account. If an agricultural sustainability project, the extent to which the impacts of climate change are vetted and deemed relevant or applicable to the project (5).~~

E Federal and Local Cost Share and State-Leveraged Funds

Comment [JL65]: Moved above

~~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. Only cost share commitments made explicitly for the project may count toward the cost percentage for grant proposal and ranking purposes. 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.~~

~~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.~~

~~The Conservancy will also provide points (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~~

Comment [JL66]: Moved above

~~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, including the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.~~

~~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 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.~~

~~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.~~

Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

Adaptive Management - a framework and flexible decision making process for ongoing knowledge acquisition, monitoring, and evaluation leading to continuous improvements in management planning and implementation of a project to achieve specified objectives.

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

Comment [JL67]: Moved below; renamed “indirect costs”

Application - The individual application form and its required attachments for grants pursuant to the Conservancy’s Ecosystem Restoration and Water Quality Grant Program.

Best Available Science - Science with the following elements: (a) well-stated objectives; (b) a clear conceptual or mathematical model; (c) a good experimental design with standardized methods for data collection; (d) statistical rigor and sound logic for analysis and interpretation; and (e) clear documentation of methods, results, and conclusions.

Best Industry Practices - A best practice is a method or technique that has consistently shown results superior to those achieved with other means, used as a benchmark or standardizes, the most efficient and effective way to accomplish a desired outcome. A best practice is used to describe the process of developing and following a standard way of doing things that multiple organizations can use.

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 private, federal, or locals funds that will supplement the Conservancy’s Prop. 1 funding.

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

Encroachment Permits - An encroachment permit is a contract between ~~the Department of Transportation~~ a public agency and an encroachment permit holder, (permittee), that describes the terms and conditions under which the permit holder is granted permissive authority to enter onto ~~state~~ a public right-of-way to perform ~~the an~~ activity. An encroachment permit grants permission to the permittee or their agent (a contractor) to perform the within the ~~state’s-public~~ right-of-way, and assignment to another party is prohibited.

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.

Impaired Waterbody – A waterbody listed on Federal Clean Water Act Sec. 303(d). A waterbody (i.e., stream reaches, lakes, waterbody segments) with chronic or recurring monitored violations of the applicable numeric and/or narrative water quality criteria.

Administrative Indirect Costs – ~~Administrative Indirect costs include any expense which does not relate directly to project implementation. Indirect costs may include administrative support (e.g., personnel time for accounting, legal, executive, IT, or other staff who support the implementation of the proposed project but who are not directly billing their time to the project), and office-related expenses (e.g., insurance, rent, utilities, printing/copying equipment, computer equipment, and janitorial expenses).~~

~~Similar to the traditional definition of “overhead” and “indirect,” administrative costs include such items as rent, utilities, per diem, office equipment and supplies, and services such as internet and phone, etc.~~

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.

Natural System Functions - Features of wetlands, waterways, riparian areas and other vegetation that enable them to function as a natural system. Good practices can help in restoring natural system functions such as reducing surface run-off; filter sediments, nutrients and chemicals; provide habitat for fish and animals, native plants and create suitable habitat for nesting sites on wetlands

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.

Outcomes – The benefits or long-term changes that are sought from undertaking the project. They are achieved from the utilization of the project’s outputs. Outcomes are linked with objectives, in that if the outcomes are achieved then the project’s objective(s) have been met. Targeted outcomes will have a measurable benefit and will be used to gauge the success of the project. At the end of the project the measures will help answer such questions as ‘what have we achieved?’ and ‘how do we know?’

Outputs - Products/deliverables expected to be achieved through the completion of the proposed project to meet the identified outcomes.

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.

Formatted: Normal

Pollutant – As defined in Clean Water Act Sec. 502(6), a pollutant means dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials, heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt, and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste discharged into water.

Pollution – The man-made or man-induced alteration of the chemical, physical or radiological integrity of water.

Protection - Action taken, often by securing a conservation easement, to ensure that habitat or conservation values are maintained.

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.

Restoration - Habitat is considered restored when actions have been taken that re-establish or substantially rehabilitate that habitat with the goal of returning natural or historic functions and characteristics.

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 Local Plans and Tools

Plans

Proposition 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_Designed_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>.

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>

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Recovery

Plans: http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/protected_species/salmon_steelhead/recovery_planning_and_implementation/

Tools

California Aquatic Resources Inventory: www.sfei.org/it/gis/cari

California Environmental Data Exchange Network: <http://www.ceden.org>

California Rapid Assessment Method: www.cramwetlands.org

California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup:
http://www.mywaterquality.ca.gov/monitoring_council/wetland_workgroup/

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

EcoAtlas: www.ecoatlas.org

Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/quality_assurance/comparability.shtml

Concept Proposal Budget Template

Include costs for grant management and reporting, monitoring, and performance measure tracking. All costs should be explained in the proposal.

Budget Category	Total Cost	
	Conservancy	Cost Share (Please note source, and indicate cash or in-kind)
Personnel*		
Travel		
Supplies		
Equipment		
Contractual		
Other (describe)		
Indirect**		
Other		
TOTAL		

*Personnel rates may only include salary and wages, fringe benefits, and payroll taxes.

** Eligible indirect costs must be directly related to the project and may not exceed twenty (20) percent of the project implementation cost. To determine the amount of eligible indirect costs, the applicant must first determine the cost of implementing the project, not including any indirect costs. Once the project implementation cost has been determined, the applicant may calculate indirect costs and include them in the total grant request up to the allowable twenty percent cap. Indirect costs must be reasonable, allocable, and applicable and may include administrative support (e.g., personnel time for accounting, legal, executive, IT, or other staff who support the implementation of the proposed project but who are not directly billing their time to the project), and office-related expenses (e.g., , insurance, rent, utilities, printing/copying equipment, computer equipment, and janitorial expenses) . These costs are subject to audit and must be documented by the grantee. Indirect expenses may not be added into the hourly rate for personnel billing directly to the grant.

NOTE: Category 1, planning proposals, may use 100 percent of awarded funds for planning activities, however, these planning funds must relate to a future Category 2 and may not exceed 10 percent of the total project funds (Category 1 and Category 2 combined) requested from the Conservancy.

NOTE: Category 1, planning proposals, 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 10 percent of the total project funds (Category 1 and Category 2 combined) requested from the Conservancy.

Appendix D: Performance Measures

Describe project goals, outputs and outcomes that lead to environmental results

Comment [JL68]: DRAFT. Further explanation required.

Goals	Outputs	Scheduled Completion Dates	Outcomes	Metrics

Appendix E: California Conservation Corps Guidelines

California Conservation Corps and Certified Community Conservation Corps

Proposition 1 - Water Bond Guidelines – Chapter 6

Corps Consultation Process

June 2015

This process has been developed to ensure compliance with Division 26.7 of the Water Code, Chapter 6, Section 79734 that specifies the involvement of the CCC and the certified community conservation corps (as represented by the California Association of Local Conservation Corps-CALCC).

Section 79734 states “For restoration and ecosystem protection projects funded pursuant to this chapter, the services of the California Conservation Corps or a local conservation corps certified by the California Conservation Corps ***shall be used whenever feasible.***”

Applicants for funds to complete restoration and ecosystem protection projects ***shall*** consult with representatives of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) AND the California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC), the entity representing the certified community conservation corps, to determine the feasibility of the Corps participation. Unless otherwise exempted (see notes below), applicants that fail to engage in such consultation should not be eligible to receive Chapter 6 funds. CCC and CALCC have developed the following consultation process for inclusion in Prop 1 – Chapter 6 project and/or grant program guidelines:

- Step 1: Prior to submittal of an application or project plan to the Funder, Applicant prepares the following information for submission to both the California Conservation Corps (CCC) and CALCC (who represents the certified community conservation corps):
- Project Title
 - Project Description (identifying key project activities and deliverables)
 - Project Map (showing project location)
 - Project Implementation estimated start and end dates

- Step 2: Applicant submits the forgoing information via email concurrently to the CCC and CALCC representatives:

California Conservation Corps representative:

Name: CCC Prop 1 Coordinator Email: Prop1@ccc.ca.gov
Phone: (916) 341-3100

California Association of Local Conservation Corps representative:

Name: Crystal Muhlenkamp Email:
inquiry@prop1communitycorps.org
Phone: 916-426-9170 ext. 0

- Step 3: Within five 5 business days of receiving the project information, the CCC and CALCC representatives will review the submitted information, contact the applicant if necessary, and respond to the applicant with a Corps Consultation Review Document (template attached) informing them:

- (1) It is NOT feasible for CCC and/or certified community conservation corps services to be used on the project; or

- (2) It is feasible for the CCC and/or certified community conservation corps services to be used on the project and identifying the aspects of the project that can be accomplished with Corps services.

Note: While the Corps will take up to five days to review projects, applicants are encouraged to contact the CCC/CALCC representatives to discuss feasibility early in the project development process.

The Corps cannot guarantee a compliant review process for applicants who submit project information fewer than five business days before a deadline.

Step 4: Applicant submits application to Funder that includes Corps Consultation Review Document.

Step 5: Funder reviews applications. Applications that do not include documentation demonstrating that the Corps has been consulted will be deemed “noncompliant” and will not be considered for funding.

NOTES:

1. The Corps already have determined that it is not feasible to use their services on restoration and ecosystem protection projects that solely involve either planning or acquisition. Therefore, applicants seeking funds for such projects are exempt from the consultation requirement and should check the appropriate box on the Consultation Review Document.
2. An applicant that has been awarded funds to undertake a project where it has been determined that Corps services can be used must thereafter work with either the CCC or CALCC to develop a scope of work and enter into a contract with the appropriate Corps. Unless otherwise excused, failure to utilize a Corps on such a project will result in Funding Entities assessing a scoring penalty on the applicant’s future applications for Chapter 6 Funds.

**California Conservation Corps and Certified Community Conservation Corps
Proposition 1 - Water Bond
Corps Consultation Review Document
June 2015**

Unless an exempted project, this Corps Consultation Review Document must be completed by California Conservation Corps and Community Conservation Corps staff and accompany applications for projects or grants seeking funds through Proposition 1, Chapter 6, Protecting Rivers, Lakes, Streams, Coastal Waters and Watersheds. Non-exempt applications that do not include this document demonstrating that the Corps has been consulted will be deemed “noncompliant” and will not be considered for funding.

1. Name of Applicant: _____ Project Title: _____

Department/Conservancy to which you are applying for funding: _____

To be completed by Applicant:

Is this application solely for planning or acquisition?

- Yes (application is exempt from the requirement to consult with the Corps)
- No (proceed to #2)

To be completed by Corps:

This Consultation Review Document is being prepared by:

- The California Conservation Corps (CCC)
- California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC)

2. Applicant has submitted the required information by email to the California Conservation Corps (CCC) and California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC):

- Yes (applicant has submitted all necessary information to CCC and CALCC)
- No (applicant has not submitted all information or did not submit information to both Corps – application is deemed non-compliant)

3. After consulting with the project applicant, the CCC and CALCC has determined the following:

- It is NOT feasible for CCC and/or certified community conservation corps services to be used on the project (deemed compliant)
- It is feasible for the CCC and/or certified community conservation corps services to be used on the project and the following aspects of the project can be accomplished with Corps services (deemed compliant).

CCC AND CALCC REPRESENTATIVES WILL RETURN THIS FORM AS DOCUMENTATION OF CONSULTATION BY EMAIL TO APPLICANT WITHIN FIVE BUSINESS OF RECEIPT AS VERIFICATION OF CONSULTATION. APPLICANT WILL INCLUDE COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT AS PART OF THE PROJECT APPLICATION.

Appendix F: Land Acquisition Checklist

Delta Conservancy Proposition 1 Grant Program Checklist for Conservation Easement or Fee Title Proposals

Project
No: _____

Project
Name: _____

I. Information Submitted with Application:

- A table including: parcel numbers, acreage, willing seller name and address, breakdown of how the funds will be budgeted, and an acquisition schedule
- Copy of the Purchase Agreement or a Willing Seller Letter
- Appraisal or Estimation of Fair Market Value
- Preliminary Title Report
- Letter stating that applicant will directly pay DGS for review of appraisal and associated materials
- Map of plotted easements or fee title
- Underlying documents to title exceptions, upon request
- Analysis of mineral rights issues, if applicable

II. Staff Review and Evaluation:

- Staff will review and evaluate all submitted information and work with Legal Counsel to determine if these supporting documents are adequate and consistent with the requirements of the grant funds
POLICIES GOVERNING GRANT AGREEMENT FOR CONSERVATION EASEMENT OR FEE TITLE

III. Board Approval:

Staff recommendations for Board Approval include the following:

- A copy of the table including: parcel numbers, acreage, willing seller name and address, breakdown of how the funds will be budgeted, and an acquisition schedule
- A copy of the Purchase Agreement or a Willing Seller Letter
- A copy of the Appraisal or Estimation of Fair Market Value
- A copy of the Preliminary Title Report
- A copy of the map of plotted easements or fee title
- A copy of underlying documents to title exceptions, if requested

A copy of the analysis of mineral rights issues, if applicable

IV. Before Execution of Agreement:

Applicant submits the appraisal to the Conservancy for DGS review and approval

[DGS APPRAISAL GUIDELINES](#)

Staff reviews State Lands Commission holdings, if applicable

Applicant submits draft grant deed or conservation easement

Applicant provides any updates to PTR

Applicant's board provides a resolution for Grant Authority certifying that:

- Signatory has authority
- Acceptance of grant
- Acceptance of property interest

SAMPLE RESOLUTION DOCUMENT

Staff reviews mineral rights, if applicable

Applicant submits Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for review/approval by DC PL

Applicant submits stewardship plan

Applicant submits escrow instructions for review/approval by DC PL

Applicant submits an original, certified copy of the fully executed grant deed or conservation easement certified by the escrow officer holding the document

Applicant submits Disbursement Request with an original signature of Grantee's authorized signatory

SAMPLE DISBURSEMENT REQUEST DOCUMENT

Board approved the project (Date: _____)

Grant Agreement must be fully executed by Grantee & DC Executive Officer

V. Conservation Easement Grant or Fee Title - Closing Escrow (*Before final invoice is paid*):

DC PL must review/approve:

Baseline report

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR BASELINE REPORTS

Monitoring protocol

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR MONITORING PROTOCOLS

CLOSING THE PROJECT. After COE, applicant submit the following to DC PL (*Before grant is*

VI. *closed*):

A copy of the recorded deed

A copy of the recorded NUGA (*original to follow via County Recorder*)

A copy of the title insurance policy

Escrow closing statement

